**SDC 900 Task Group Meeting**

Thursday, June 15, 2023 | 10 AM Pacific

Meeting recording [LINK](https://zoom.us/rec/share/HFmBF_m7iF7k51MajzlkYYz35c7MLmAg08sK9X0RYjlmelh0tHd9XIjMpCWfWilM.OV6u8wHvokBcm-ZN?startTime=1686848533000 Passcode: %q6D+ZR3)

**Attendees:**

John Hensley (chair)

David Choo

Leo Jansen

Sharla Riead

Chris McTaggart

Michael Arblaster

**RESNET Staff:**

Laurel Elam

Christine Do

*Meeting notes prepared by Christine.*

The meeting started at 10:01 AM Pacific.

Sharla and John provided a brief update of where the group was at. The group is gathering data/determine what type of data should be utilized as a starting basis. Chris agreed, stating that the the Registry has various flags that has been utilized to guide QAD education.

* What flags are effective?
* Which need more attention than others?
* Essentially, where are the problems and are they getting better?

Leo agreed, stating that as a pilot program participant, that there is a significant amount of information available, but the big need is that the Registry needs to track QA checklist scores per Rater and have some way to show trends within provider (“grading a provider for their use of the QA checklist”) and provider compliance. Additionally, there is a need to show from a rater dashboard side what flags are in/out of compliance.

Sharla discussed her comments on the shared Google [Doc](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CYRishycSYndACV2ri_3JLG5nRpbtPF5/edit).

Leo asked if RESNET is taking ownership of a rater’s tier, or if that would still be managed by the rating providers.

Chris asked if this group could make some sort of recommendation to the board about enabling a system of analytics (“here’s what it would take to implement something like this” … e.g. 3-year plan). There were previous discussions on the RESNET board for the past years about incentivizing good behavior (monetary, quantity, etc.).

John’s suggestion is that this group first focus on finishing up Addendum 72 and addressing the task at hand, and then work together to make recommendations after the comments have been addressed. It can be a recommendation to the board. Sharla stated that procedurally, a NWI can also be requested.

Sharla discussed her next comment, regarding timing of the submission/information handling. Does there need to be a requirement that QA be performed within a reasonable time of submission of the rating to the registry? The rest of Sharla’s comments were agreed upon and discussed by the group, all the way to Comment #13 on page 23.

John to follow-up with Rick Dixon regarding NWI.

From the group’s discussion thus far, the l**ist of items to include:**

1. Previous calendar year’s average percentage score
2. Raters’ average percentage score (for this year)
3. Tier for rater (if this is chosen to implement)
4. QA reasonable time of submission (from time that rating is submitted to registry)
   1. Could add to a three year plan
5. Flag for experience with current provider
6. Construction Type
7. EEPs (is this in the standards?)
8. ANSI/RESNET/ACCA Standard 310 Inspections
9. When someone was certified, with the Rater/RFI/Modeler (“rater experience portfolio”)
10. \*\*Defining Rating Company – add to Chapter 9 change\*\*

The group also suggested to RESNET staff that upcoming QAD webinars could incorporate discussions amongst QADs on how they read the checklist, how they are conducting the QA and what their thoughts are during the process.

Meeting ended at 11:04 AM Pacific.