**Leo and Scott Meeting to Discuss Changes to Section 102.1.10 Notes 10/25/2022**

Zoom

12 PM Pacific

Scott provided intent from RESNET for reworked language to meet the below criteria:

* When a Rater has performed a Rating and submitted it for registration, it should not be modified by the Provider in such a way where it would change the HERS score or its compliance with a state code, above code program, public incentive (i.e. Tax Credit) or private incentive (i.e. Utility Program) without the Rater’s consent or knowledge
  + Minor changes to data points that don’t impact the above (i.e. correct address formulation) would be allowable by a Provider based off the Provider’s willingness to perform them for the Rater to expedite the processing of the file versus sending the file back to the Rater to correct

AND

* When a new Rater is “re-doing” a Rating on the same address, a new Rater cannot use an old Rater’s work as the basis of a new Rater’s work to “reverse-engineer” a new Rating without that original Rater’s consent and being in the same submitting Providership, to ensure that the new Rater’s work is subject to Quality Assurance
  + For instance, a new Rater could not use an obtained software file or data sheets for a Rating where insulation was noted as Grade I, or the blower door or duct leakage test information in a now occupied home without having verified that information themselves
  + Specific to the second requirement, we discussed the limitation of this requirement for scenarios where the old Rater, for whatever reason (i.e. death of a Rater, Rater going out of business, unable to contact Rater, Rater refuses to finish Rating, etc.) was not able to complete the initial Rating, leaving the Builder without recourse to gain compliance with a state code, above code program, public incentive or private incentive without going to a new Rater in a different Providership
    - If the old Rater’s work was to be used in a new Rating file, technically the new Providership would have QA oversight responsibilities of the old Rater, where a business relationship might not exist and neither party wanted to make it so
    - To solve this hurdle, we brainstormed idea of having RESNET creating some sort of oversight decision process / authorization to authorize a new Provider / new Rater to use the old Rater’s work WITH old Rater’s consent, but not have the old Rater be subject to QA requirements for the file
      * This new process would be governed by a new policy manual, and referenced here in the standards, but managed by RESNET staff
      * This new policy manual would contain overview of process, a specific list of reasons where this situation would be acceptable, a list of supporting backup information that would be required, a PDF or electronic form all parties to sign and complete prior to the new Rating File to be allowed to be registered
* All other instances of a Provider or a new Rater attempting to modify an existing Rating or “re-doing” a Rating on the same address without the old Rater’s consent or knowledge would be expressly prohibited

Leo agreed to take a stab at drafting changes to 102.1.10 and will send it to Scott for review