**RESNET® SDC 900 Task Group Meeting**

**Monday, April 28th, 2025**

11:00 AM – 12:00 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/ql_reBWq5U7xLckIMeexF7mMvoCbZZupO4-RE4r5isreLBsBm-Q5uBEFe3QhBazr.mbsikvBt6GmylCzP?startTime=1745852500000)

Passcode: zm%4jCFY

**Present:** John Hensley, Leo Jansen, David Choo, Michael Arblaster

**Staff:** Laurel Elam, Scott Doyle, Katie Stewart  
  
Meeting started at: 11:02 AM ET

The meeting focused on reviewing public comments related to Draft PDS-01.2 Addendum 67 and the readiness of the QA app for the January 1, 2026, compliance deadline. The key issue was whether the app should be required even if not fully implemented by that date.

1. The committee reviewed public comments on section 102.1.1.1.3.1.2. Some members debated that waiting for a fully functional app could delay the process, while Billy Giblin previously noted before today's meeting that third-party developers might not meet the deadline for full EAP checklist integration.
   * 1. The committee rejected the comment, emphasizing that the app should be used as soon as possible, even if not fully functional. The RESNET QA Team will provide guidance for any checklist items not integrated by the compliance date.
2. The committee discussed section 102.1.1.2, specifically whether the app should allow video recording and immediate upload to the registry. It was clarified that the standard requires video storage, but not immediate upload. Video storage will be the provider's responsibility, as storage is inexpensive and manageable.
   1. Long-Term Considerations: RESNET is piloting a remote inspection app and may standardize video recording for QA purposes, offering it to providers through extended contracts or bundled fees. The goal is to ease video storage and sharing for providers, particularly with large files.
   2. Remote QA Option: Remote QA is optional. Providers can choose this method but must ensure adequate records for auditing purposes. Video storage costs are minimal.
      1. The committee rejected the suggestion for immediate video upload functionality, affirming that video storage and management are the provider's responsibility.
3. The committee then discussed section 102.1.10, addressing the transfer of rating files between providers. The main concern was situations where a rater cannot continue their contract (e.g., suspension or business closure), leaving stranded homes with incomplete inspections. The task force is considering how to allow these files to be transferred to another rater, with authorization from the original rater.
   1. There was uncertainty about where to add language on file transfers. Some members suggested handling it within RESNET's policy for transferring the rater of record.
   2. The committee emphasized that the intent is not to allow predatory actions but to facilitate transfers in specific situations, such as business closures.
      1. The committee rejected the comment, as they were unsure where to add the language, but noted that the standard edition will address file transfer scenarios.
4. The committee discussed the requirement for rating quality assurance providers to maintain Errors and Omissions (E&O) insurance under section 102.1.13. E&O covers errors in services, while General Liability (GL) insurance covers broader business operations. Some national contracts already require E&O, and LBA plans to mandate it. The committee agreed that E&O is beneficial for both providers and RESNET.
   1. The committee also noted that the current $500,000 coverage requirement is outdated, with most providers now carrying $1 million in coverage.
      1. The committee rejected the proposed language but agreed that the insurance requirement should remain a mandate for rating quality assurance providers, not for the rating companies or raters themselves.
5. Section 102.2.9.2.1.2: The committee discussed adding a radio button in the QA app to waive the disclosure form requirement when it is not generated. They decided not to change the standard, but to update the app with this functionality.
   1. The committee also proposed a timeline for the registry to reflect suspensions within five days. While they discussed automating updates, they acknowledged the rater verification system might need adjustments.
      1. The committee rejected the suggestion to automate this process, proposing instead an app update to include the radio button for waiving the disclosure requirement when applicable.
6. The committee found that section 102.2.9.3 was incorrectly cited and decided no action was needed. This was rejected by the committee.
7. The committee rejected a suggestion to include certain testing and commissioning procedures for HVAC contractors under section 106.2. While the idea had merit, there was no proposed language change for the standard, it was rejected.

Meeting ended at: 11:54 AM ET