**RESNET® SDC1550 Full Working Group Meeting Minutes**

**January 9th, 2024**

*MEETING RECORDING HERE*

Present:

Erin Bordelon

Philip Squires

Chris Magwood

Ariel Brenner

Tracy Hunyh

Jane Bindas

Brian Shanks

Andy Buccino

Jacob Racusin

Jeff Bradley

Ari Rapport

Yatharth Vaishnani

Bennett Doherty

Brett Welch

Webly Bowles

Matthew Cooper

Joel Martell

Victoria Muharsky

Staff: Clara Hedrick, Rick Dixon

**Welcome & Announcements (5 min)**

Meeting was called to order at 12:03 PM ET

Graham Wright introduced himself to the group as he is the only new addition to the roster since it’s last meeting.

**Decision-Making Protocol**

Chris clarified that this particular group has no voting power- the purpose of this group is to draft language to be reviewed/approved by the full SDC.

**Purpose and Scope Draft Language**

The group discussed the language drafted

Mike Browne yes

Erin Bordelonyes

Alex Rees yes

Asa Foss yes

Brian Shanks yes

Andy Buccino yes

David Arkin yes

David Watts yes

Alexis Minniti yes

Ari Rapport yes

Ariel Brenner yes

Bennett Doherty yes

Charlie Haack yes

Jacob Racusin yes

Jane Bindas yes

Joel Martell yes

Matthew Cooper yes

Philip Squires yes

Tracy Hunyh yes

Victoria yes

Webly yes

Yatharth yes

**Assessment Types Draft Language**

The group discussed the draft language in section 4.2 Assessment Types. Currently there are two assessment types- confirmed and projected. Some discussion within the subgroup on this topic included ensuring accuracy in the documents used to conduct projected assessment. In projected assessments a GWP factor average must be used if an actual data point is not available.

Informative footnotes specifying these clarifications can be considered.

The group further discussed the GWP values to be used with projected assessments.

Mike Browne yes with the note that he would like to see three levels of categories used for type of embodied carbon factor applied

Chris Magwood yes

Erin Bordelon abstain

Alex Rees yes agree with Mike

Asa Foss yes

Brian Shanks Abstained due to the changes proposed not readily available at the time of this vote.

Andy Buccino yes

David Arkin yes with tweaks

Nigel Watts yes

Alexis Minniti yes

Ari Rapport yes- defer to those who feel that changes are needed

Ariel Brenner yes

Bennett Doherty yes with minor clarification

Charlie Haack yes with clarifications

Jacob Racusin yes

Jane Bindas

Joel Martell yes

Matthew Cooper yes

Philip Squires abstain

Tracy Hunyh yes

Victoria yes

Webly oppose until we see tweaks

Yatharth yes

Jeff Bradley oppose

Brian and Webly agreed that abstaining was necessary because they would like to see the changes needed. Chris Magwood proposed to bring back the language for review in future meetings.

Mike Browne asked if it was possible to make known which working group is reviewing and working on the language being voted on today.

**Life Cycle Stages Draft Language**

This language includes three tiers each of which includes different stages of life cycles. The working group focusing on this language was not able to find a consensus. Mike Browne is only in favor or Tier I at this point. This is in the interest of being able to pass a workable current standard ASAP. Then updates to this standard to include more phases should definitely be an significant on-going effort.

Chris and Ari discussed what of the language applies directly to carbon emissions and carbon storage. Ari made the point that he finds the language not directly clear to those in the building industry.

Webly also agrees with Tier 1 and is apprehensively in favor of including Tier 2 but is in favor of adding Tier 3 as this topic further develops. Webly also suggests adding clarity for the modules defined in the tiers and including the ISO references.

The group discussed the definition of “negative emissions”.

Jacob Racusin is in favor of the structure of this section but agrees it needs more work.

Jeff Bradley would like to account for onsite carbon factors such as solar panels as an impact so they don’t get accounted for elsewhere. Chris Magwood shared that this sub group has determined that the scope should only focus on the building and not the site.

Ariel inquired about the incentives or guidance for builders to go beyond Tier 1. Chris and the group agreed this could be considered in the future once the tiers are better defined.

California and other leading cities/states are implementing legislation and requirements regarding embodied carbon. This standard may not be considered by those entities because of regulation requiring them to adhere to other references. The data for some of the tiers are not fully developed, but Chris believes that some kind of starting point can help that data develop from this starting point.

Webly suggested removing the third tier to ensure the standard can be implemented or another way to ensure the building industry will be in favor of adopting as soon as possible.

The group agreed that a definitions section will be vital.

Brian feels that a basic version of these recommendations such as only including Tier one should be implemented as the standard to be firmed and developed on a 3-5 year process.

Tracy reiterated that including Tier 3 is most relevant to the publication of the standard. The group discussed how the third tier could impact the industry, even if that’s a reference for data necessary to be accounted for in the future.

A vote did not take place on this topic. Strong opinions on any items in this draft language should be communicated in some way to Chris or Tracy to ensure its accounted for.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 pm ET