**Chapter 1 and Chapter 9 Task Group Meeting Notes 11/21/2022**

**Zoom**

**1 PM Pacific**

Members Present: Scott Doyle, Sharla Riead, David Choo, Leo Jansen, Christine Do, Laurel Elam, John Hensley, Chris McTaggert

Members Absent: Michael Arblaster

**Began new work at the beginning of Chapter 9**

Talked through proposed changes to 903.1.2 based off additions that have been made so far, and adding in RESNET QA Checklist as method of submitting feedback to Raters for both file and field QA.

Chris proposed that we remove the option to turn the Checklist to the registry, and instead make it mandatory. Scott and Laurel talked through their thoughts and feasibility of doing so, and committee agreed to add this requirement. Leo will investigate where this needs to be added into the standards and make a proposed edit.

Talked through adding back in the Primary QAD into the notification party for Administrative Probation, there were no issues with this recommendation.

Talked through requirement to notify RESNET when there is a change to a Provider’s policies and procedures manual. Chris brought up the idea of RESNET creating a template Policies and Procedures and Rater Agreement for the industry to use, and a Provider could use that as a base and add to it if they choose to.

Talked through changing notification party for 903.1.3.5 Right to Hearing from the QAD to the Accredited Rating Quality Assurance Provider, the committee agreed with this recommendation.

Talked through feasibility of making changes to 904.3 Quality Assurance of HERS Raters and Ratings, specifically on 1% Field and 10% File methodology. Laurel and Scott informed the group that the RESNET QA Team is working on a separate amendment that addresses these changes, and it should be ready for review within 2 weeks after review by SDC900 Chair, but that the work might or might not be handled by this committee.

We talked about the need to define what a “severe violation” of the code of ethics would be and have this defined in the standards. We discussed that the code of ethics has not been looked at or updated since 2017 and that it and the code of conduct should also be reviewed. Sharla agreed to take a look at these for potential updates and a better understanding of what constitutes a “severe violation”.

**Ended new work at 904.6**