**Chapter 1 and Chapter 9 Task Group Meeting Notes 2/27/2023**

**Zoom**

**12 PM Pacific**

Members Present: Sharla Riead, Leo Jansen, Christine Do, Laurel Elam, Scott Doyle, Michael Arblaster, John Hensley, David Choo

Members Absent: Chris McTaggart

**Discussion on time frames table**

Leo brought up whether the table of time frames would be an appendix or addendum, or rather a supplementary guide or summary table on the RESNET Standards page for people to reference.

The group concluded that it would be just a link on the standards page, but not into the standards.

**Remote QA Discussion**

SDC 900 vote had concluded as of last Friday and the NEHERS proposal was rejected from the ballot.

Scott summarized that if this group does not make any edits, and that RESNET is lifting emergency protocol soon, then the language will remain as it stands. Leo offered a merit-based approach, in which remote QA was tied to tiers rather than every year. Michael agreed and made a parallel to BPI’s certification.

Recap ([start recording](https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#/s/97644c0d387978407d6af306fa7977cfada95a72417685ba0891c769e1ca77c9))

Tying remote QA to tired merit based system that becomes part of standards

* In higher tier: will have access
* lower still have to do 1%
* First certification cycle not eligible for remote QA

Discussion about backstops,one in person every three year certification cycle

* Provider will have flexibility of deciding when to do that

If on first 3 year cert cycle - comfortable gaining access to remote based on performance or keep them in the field?

* Suggestion to be tied to volume - could be seen as penalizing low volume raters
* Suggestion that remote QA could be available for pre drywall remote QA - would be RFI (based on business models) based on how many finals/roughs they do
* Suggestion to require first year regardless, if perform well, give them the option to do remote QA option
* Also dependant on providership - if switching provider, they should be in the field with them.
* Suggestion that remote QA not be available until they have had a field QA of that type, as a beginning rater

Additional backstop to additional QA to minimums proposed:

* “New experience” - is the benefit to this line of thinking?
* Benefit to defining this and tracking this in the registry
* Would need to be able to flag if a provider missed that
	+ (ie, provider did not do a QA on a multi family, needs to do one)
	+ Defining new experience suggested:
	+ Rating types - confirmed threshold vs confirmed rating (true multi family vs single family)
	+ providers currently are required to pull sampling of randomly selected different builders, areas, and building types

Registering projected ratings - provider could theoretically report they have not done this rating before, could say, lets schedule a QA on this.

Leo has raters who are at the final stage without his knowledge that they won this new business, may not get to it on first instance - would like to see the first one

Seeing product of pre drywall is advantageous to rater and QA

Long term improvement to standards

Suggestion of rating profile that decides it now

* Building type
* Rating type
* Rating profile including QA that was done, what is percentage is final and what percentage is at pre drywall
* This would follow someone to a new providership
* Suggestion to add EPA, energy star, ipa, zero energy ready
* Standard 310 inspections
* Ok with if the previous provider did it, are they good for the next provider?

Different scenarios:

* New rater new employee
* One field QA
* Existing rater moving under new provider - first year
* Existing rater with same provider - full 3 years to do one field QA

In the registry improvement - is there a plan to note type?

* Has not talked about it but are open to add
* Ap could track type, remote v in person - available via API
* Would have the data, would know types, locations, etc
* Question would be how/if we share that information to the next provider
* Shareable part of the profile

Scores on checklist being visible to other providers? If a rater wanted to be under two providerships?

* Discussion hasn't been had yet - are there stakeholders who are asking for results of the quality assurance checklist?
* A lot of people may not want that information shared
* In the case where there are two providers then it could be shared
* Design instructions now you are limited to what you can see to your raters in your providership - data would be limited right now to QAD doing oversight for that rater
* Rater could elect to share their information with another provider prior to signing with them

Other instances where we wouldn't want to allow remote QA?

* If not allowing remote QA during the certification period (more restrictive than today) instead restriction would be there would need to be a live QA of that type (pre drywall vs final QA)
	+ If you're a rater doing substantial volume, three years would be a long time to be ineligible - burn rate for some companies could mean few people would get to that point

RFI vs Rater

* Keeping the same percentages or changing that?
* If were going to different types, new, changing providerships or seasoned RFI - doesn't think it should matter
* Keep a consistent level of field qa as requirement whether you're a rater or not

Leo had reached out to EPA about submitted comment (SCC 900)

* Elliott Seibert replied that they didn't love the idea of having two separate metrics
* Are we saying that that will be the only option for remote QA?
* Elliott did submit a comment - will wait until all comments are submitted to consider his comment
* If we draft proposed language, this will replace existing amendment language when were looking at NEHERS and what they are trying to cross out - that section still exists in chapter 9 - suggestion is to strike that section out and replace it with this alternative

Addendum 72

* however that lands this language will have to be updated to match that merit based system
	+ Yes, dependant on timing as well - lots of moving parts while making all these changes
	+ Spoke to the QA team about this - how to organize and coordinate the changes going out
	+ Get information out to industry, get feedback, then coordinate different changes that need to be implemented

Steve had asked that raters be required to have error and omissions insurance - approved

* Expect lots of challenges due to income generation and future of our industry becoming a possible target for litigation
* Had the requirement for liability and air and emissions for tax credit work - have language we could lean on to incorporate
* If having made an error - errors and omissions insurance could help with that
* Surprised that it is not already a requirement
* Upon poll - people who work for larger builders, that insurance is already required
	+ Small builders did not know about professional liability and airs and emissions

- Provider would require it as part of the liability insurance requirement

 - A lot of insurance companies don't understand the insurance type needs therefore policies are not written

**Action items:**

1. Christine to put Section 104 into Google Doc for next time for Sharla