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Meeting began at 11:34 AM ET

The committee is reviewing comments received for Addendum 84.

Comment 1:

The comment believes that adding steps to the certification process will add additional costs to providers and does not feel that the update will bring any additional benefits to existing RFIs. The comment proposed to require it for new RFI’s but have it as an optional recertification tool to existing RFIs.

After some discussion, the comment was accepted.

Comment 2:

This comment asked if RESNET would be creating training courses, or if the courses would just be RESNET approved.

The group clarified the commenter’s misinterpretation that RESNET staff will define the required curriculum but not create it. Since no language was proposed, the comment was rejected.

Comment 3:

The comment requested that the exam be more in-depth. The group discussed that the RFI certification was set up this way purposely, and adding additional testing requirements would make it inaccessible to some.

The comment was rejected since no language was proposed, and the group felt that the practical simulation test and the field evaluation provide the necessary competency checks.

Comment 4:

The comment would like to remove sections of the PDS and request changes to items that were not up for comment. Specifically, they want to remove the building science requirements and stated that recertification requirements did not need to be expanded, which the group noted was not the case.

The group felt that building science knowledge was necessary for RFI’s to be able to effectively do the work. They also noted that the comment misinterpreted some sections and clarified those in their response. The group also notified the commenter that their suggestion to remove the requirement for existing RFIs to pass the practical simulation exam was accepted in a previous comment.

The comment was rejected, and the group invited the commenter to use the RESNET standard amendment change since some of their comment was to update language currently out of scope for the group.

--

The group will send this version of the standard to Rick Dixon to advise on whether it will need to go out for another round of public comment. The amendment will go out for a vote to the committee soon.

There is another standard out for public comment that will be discussed during the next committee meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:37 PM ET