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**Welcome & Announcements (5 min)**

Meeting was called to order at 1:33 PM ET

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

**Timeline & Decision Tree**(Chris)

Chris quickly reviewed the timeline of this committee’s work and the decision tree formed. The only change is that there was a sub-group added (HERS). The goal is to have the draft standard out for public comment in June 2024.

**Working Group Updates** (Chris)

Data Working Group:

This group determined two paths: a path for buildings in design a path and for buildings already built. This is adherent to what other peer groups follow for process. This group also formed a way to use average-data rather than specific materials in the as-designed pathway to prevent gaming the system for unfair credit. The group discussed this strategy and clarified a few points on scope. The scope for this working group and others can be found in the dropbox [here.](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/hk59rb74jibxm8r0vb965/h?rlkey=yhrdama6uugcr3kkmaumdw7i4&dl=0)

Decisions or recommendation on the data to be included and any differences between the two pathways in specific products or averages will be determined in the future. Matthew Cooper suggested considering adjustable modeling adjustments into the as-designed process.

The group agreed that no post-close verification will take place in this standard’s recommendations and further discussed the two proposed pathways. An alternative to “As-Built” could be “Confirmed”.

Some members believe a single pathway is the most appropriate way to proceed to meet QA measures across RESNET’s and other organization’s standards.

The group also clarified the language of “pathway” and discussed how to better phrase this. Brian outlined this as one procedure with two “stops”- projected and confirmed.

The committee members also agreed that the less work on the Rater side, the better. There appeared to be much more discussion needed on this topic, so the conversation was tabled for future meetings. Chris resolved to come prepared with actual draft language to be voted on by this group rather than a concept such as what was presented by this group.

Chris clarified that “on-average” data or verified data for embodied carbon does not currently exist, therefore the results of both the projected and verified “pathway” is a valuable product and should somehow be pursued.

LCA stages:

This group had no official recommendations for this call but intends on meeting in December to discuss “future emissions” strategy. Other standards are going through all life cycles A-C, but this group has the autonomy to use a different process if determined to be most appropriate.

The purpose of this standard is clearly to reduce emissions. At the product level, this is quite simple. In B&C stage emissions, the builder can only influence these life cycles as the power transfers to the homeowner’s decision making. This group found that some information related to these later stage life cycles is attainable, such as product warranties or specs.

The group discussed the projected outputs outlined in B-C. Matthew Cooper believed that reliable data cannot be obtained from Raters or others in the field.

Philip Squires clarified that this standard is voluntary and talked further about the adoptability of the standard as a whole. The group further discussed other topics on LCA stages.

**Materials Working Group:**

Chris outlined the work of the materials group and the group discussed how to prevent redundancy with what already exists in a Rater’s field data collection.

**HERS alignment working group:**

Members reviewed the Rater workflow and formed a table of what data a Rater collects as well as what is not. This group brainstormed ideas on how to collect the data that is missing. Andy and other members are forming a mapping of workflow similar to what Cerclos implements.

**Strategy Working group:**

December meeting will focus on examination on pathway and any deadlines present. Erin suggested not rushing this project to be included in any codes or standards until its well developed and well rounded, but these code/standard deadline cycles are important to remain on schedule.

**Builders Convening/Forum** (Brian)

Builders on this committee have decided to form their own meetings to ensure builders can include informed guidance on this standard’s development. Brian is sourcing for more builder participation as well as forming final details on these meetings for the future.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30 pm ET