**SDC 900 Task Group Meeting**

Thursday, April 3rd, 2025

**Members Present:** Laurel Elam, Noah Kibbe, Katie Stewart, Sharla Riead, Scott Doyle

**RESNET Staff Present:** John Hensley, David Choo, Leo Jansen

Meeting began at 1:03 PM ET

**Review of Addendum 67 Public Comments**

1. **Public Comments Review:**
   1. **Comment #8** is a new item and not part of today’s strike-out. Decisions will be made in future meetings.
   2. **Comment #6** involves 3.5 pages of changes and needs additional time to review and respond.
2. **Proposed Changes:**
   1. Lauren Elam confirmed that the team agrees with the proposed changes in section 102.1.13.
   2. John Hensley expressed support for accepting the proposed changes in section 102.1.13.
3. **Minimum Coverage Question:**
   1. **Leo Jansen** raised the question of whether the language is sufficient to require a minimum of $1 Million.
   2. **Action:** Ensure explicit language is added to clarify the need for $1 Million in coverage, with verbiage on adding principals.
4. **Editorial Changes:**
   1. No editing provided for editorial comments.
   2. Laurel will confirm and accept any edits once agreed upon.
5. **Registry Data Requirements:**
   1. The team reviewed required actions related to registry data.
   2. Accepted in Principle: No objections to the compromise, and changes will align with other required actions.
   3. Providers must update the registry in a timely manner as per their contract.
6. **Registry Update Timelines:**
   1. Discussion on whether it's reasonable to change the update timeline to 5 or 10 days (California standard is 10 days).
   2. Finalize the decision and communicate to providers by the v10-25-24 deadline.
7. **Eligibility Confirmation (Section 206.2.3):**
   1. Confirming the eligibility of individuals in accordance with section 206.2.3.
   2. Action: Ensure compliance with section 206.2.3 regarding eligibility criteria.
8. **Editorial Changes to Chapter 1 (edited comments proposed by Jerica Stacey):**
   1. **101.1:** The committee accepted the edited verbiage based on the recommended editorial change.
   2. **102.1.1.1:** Per the committee's approval that the rating quality assurance provider will be defined, and the term "Quality Assurance (QA)" will be used after the first mention.
   3. **102.1.1.1.3.1.1 ("Rating Providers"):** This was addressed in the previous edit. No further changes needed, rejected by the committee.
   4. **102.1.1.1.3.1.2:** Confusion about whether the data must be shown in the checklist first before an alternative can be approved. The committee clarified the language to resolve this issue.
   5. **102.1.7:** The committee accepted the removal of the Oxford comma as noted throughout the document.
   6. **102.1.9:** The change was rejected as no new or changed verbiage was provided.
   7. **102.1.9 (Page 3):** Request to Define "EEP": The term "EEP" has already been defined in the document, and the suggestion was rejected.
   8. **102.1.11 (Page 4) Confirmation of Understanding on "These Standards":** Clarification recommended on the wording of "these standards" in relation to 206.2.3 - Eligibility for ANSI/RESNET/ACCA Standard 310 Inspections. The committee felt the wording was clear and rejected the change.
   9. **"Rating Field Inspectors (RFI)" in 102.1.11 (Page 4):** Recommended to consistently use "RFI" after the first mention of "Rating Field Inspectors." The committee accepted this change.
   10. **Page 5: 102.2 Minimum Standards for Rating Quality Assurance Provider Accreditation:** Recommended to strike the language as it is duplicative. The committee rejected this change, and work is underway to add titles to the standards where referenced.
   11. **102.2.7.4.2 (Page 6) - Oxford Comma Consistency:** The editorial change to apply the Oxford comma was approved.
   12. **102.2.9.3 (Comment on Sentence Structure):** Missing components to form a complete sentence. The committee's response was that this is part of a bulleted list and does not need to be a full sentence. The change was rejected.

**Next Steps:**

* Address Cindy Zies' comments at a future meeting.
* Finalize language for registry updates and minimum coverage.

The meeting adjourned at 2:02 PM ET.