**RESNET® SDC 200 RFI Certification Requirements TG Meeting Minutes**

May 14th, 2025

Second & Fourth Wednesdays of the Month

11:30 AM – 12:30 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/TaAvmCukgJqP-vBoESM2nlrlN_iRA37TYBOaNnG_Rr1n2HWCGcOfps9M49YNJC1b.eFoLmkdheFTrWWD7)

Passcode: .8^TK@7W

**Members Present:** Tei Kucharski, Mark Schroer, Mary English, Doug McCleery, Rod Buchalter, Sharla Riead, Robert Cantrell

**Staff:** Katie Stewart

Meeting began at 11:35 AM ET

**New Work Item**

The most recent scope expansion effort builds upon a prior request initiated by Sharla Riead, which was partially incorporated into the last revision. However, further work remains to bring consistency and clarity to the certification and recertification process for HERS Raters and Rater Field Inspectors (RFIs), with a goal of standardizing expectations and elevating quality.

1. **Inclusion of Recertification Standards**: The prior scope change introduced recertification requirements, but these now need formal integration across both Rater and RFI pathways. NWI MINHERS-2013-084 (used to align certification and recertification standards). Ensure shared requirements between certification and recertification, reducing variability in expectations and strengthening the credentialing process.
2. **Working Group Status**: The RFI Working Group has not yet discussed whether current EFI (Energy Field Inspector) certification requirements are sufficient.
   1. There are concerns that current requirements are minimal or inconsistent and do not fully reflect needed building science competencies or practical inspection knowledge.
   2. These requirements should be reviewed and potentially updated by the Standard Management Board (SMB).
3. **Relevant Standards Under Review**
   1. **ACCA Standard 310**: Section 206.2.4.1.2 should be aligned with and reflect recertification requirements for both Raters and RFIs who have not maintained activity or standards compliance.
   2. **MINHERS 207.1.1.3**: If a certified individual has not conducted any mentored field inspections within three years, they should be required to recertify. Ensures practical, up-to-date experience is maintained and verified.
   3. **MINHERS 206.2.1.1.1**: Currently requires the RESNET Practical Simulation Test for initial certification. Proposal: Add a training component prior to this test to cover:
      1. RESNET standards
      2. Certification processes
      3. Applied Building Science and construction math
      4. Address foundational gaps and ensure uniform understanding before simulation-based assessment
4. **Need for Improved Training and Videos**: Current training materials, especially videos, are not adequate in preparing Raters and RFIs (Rater Field Inspectors).
   1. There is a gap in foundational understanding, particularly concerning building science.
   2. Update RESNET’s core curriculum separate from the core standards.
5. **Lack of Building Science Emphasis**: Building science, especially from a Rater’s perspective, has not historically been a focus.
   1. Important concepts like the movement of energy, relative humidity, and building envelope definitions are not well understood by many in the field.
   2. The importance of detailed inspections (e.g., ensuring every chase is sealed at pre-drywall) is often overlooked.
6. **Mandate and Standardization Needed**: There’s concern that someone needs to officially define what counts as “building science” for RESNET. Without a standard, inconsistencies will persist across Rater and RFI training.
7. **Responsibility and Accountability**: Currently, too much responsibility is placed on individual Raters rather than systemic training or provider oversight. Certification is sometimes rushed (e.g., a two-week turnaround), leading to inadequate preparation.
8. **Inadequate Field Evaluations**: Field evaluations are not comprehensive.
   1. Large rating firms often do not require RFIs to review full plan sets or verify things like window placement and field measurements.
   2. Current evaluation documents are outdated and need revision.
9. **Proposed Additive Changes to 207.1.1 and 207.1.1.2**: The proposed updates to 207.1.1 and 207.1.1.2 include considerations for other professional development training(s) that are RESNET approved.
   1. The goal is to allow flexibility in the number of required training hours (currently set at 18 hours over three years). The suggestion is to mirror the approach used in HERS rater training, where hours are not fixed to 18 hours over a set period.
   2. Instead of requiring a fixed number of hours, the updated language could refer to 207.1.1.2.1 and 207.1.1.2.2, which would include that professional development can be completed via live or virtual attendance at RESNET approved conferences or through training provided by RESNET Accredited Training Providers.
10. **Recertification Hours**: A key point discussed was the number of hours required for recertification. There is support for reducing the current requirement from 18 hours to 8 hours. The proposed method for recertification would allow one of the following:
    1. One full day of recertification field evaluation OR
    2. Completing 8 hours of professional development through approved training or other qualifying activities.
    3. Further discussion to be held regarding whether to finalize the reduction of required recertification hours from 18 to 8. The proposed change will allow either a one-day recertification field evaluation or completion of 8 hours of training.
11. **Approved Training Topics**: RESNET publishes an annual list of approved training topics, which would be referenced in the updated standards to guide what qualifies as professional development.
12. **Rater Led Evaluations**: The discussion also addressed the process for Rater Led Evaluations for the RFI (Rater Field Evaluations). It was proposed that candidates should submit all evaluations (not just the final one) to the Rater Quality Assurance Providership for review.
    1. A question was raised about whether this submission process is already part of the RESNET standards or if there is a need to clarify the requirement for uploading all graded evaluations to RESNET for proper collection.
    2. Encourage the use of the RESNET portal to submit **all** rater evaluations for tracking and quality assurance purposes.
13. **RESNET Portal for Evaluations**:
    1. RESNET has a portal that allows for the uploading of evaluations, the intention is to add all of them not just the final one. This platform could be utilized to streamline the submission process and ensure proper tracking and review of all evaluations.
    2. Clarify whether the submission of all evaluations (not just the final one) is a current standard or if this needs to be integrated into the official requirements for RESNET certification.

**Recommendations**

* **Formalize Recertification**: Clarify expectations across all certification levels (Rater, RFI, etc.) and ensure documentation aligns with ACCA Standard 310.
* **Review Certification Requirements**: Evaluate if current certification standards meet industry needs, with an emphasis on Building Science knowledge and practical inspection skills.
* **Prerequisite Training for Simulation**: Implement mandatory training on RESNET protocols and building science basics before simulation-based certification.
* **Update and Communicate Standards**: Revise standards using MINHERS language, and clearly communicate changes to providers, trainers, and certification bodies, including implementation timelines.
* **Strengthen Building Science Training**: Make building science a core focus of all training programs, including energy flow, moisture control, and chase sealing.
* **Mandatory Field Evaluations**: Require providers to collect three graded field evaluations for Raters, including plan reviews, field measurements, and quality verification.
* **Update Training and Evaluation**: Revise training materials and field evaluation forms to reflect modern standards and ensure a comprehensive certification process.
* **Enforce Accountability**: Hold rating firms accountable, particularly larger ones, to ensure full plan reviews and adherence to field protocols.

**Next Steps & Future Meetings**

* Deadline: End of June 2025 for approval.
* Send this document to Eurihea Speciale for review and approval (not present for today's meeting).
* After receiving Eurihea’s feedback, send the proposal to the full SDC for evaluation and potential voting.
* If approved by the SDC, the proposal will go out for public comment.

Meeting adjourned at 12:31 PM ET