**Chapter 1 and Chapter 9 Task Group Meeting Notes 12/12/2022**

**Zoom**

**1 PM Pacific**

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

Members Absent:

**Begun new work on recapping previous meetings from people that were missing from the 12/5/2022 meeting.**

John is going to follow up with David Goldstien on addition of CO2 index to this standard language.

Committee approved proposed definition of Providership.

Committee agreed that we do not need to have a special provision for a disclosure form for just existing homeowners, and can just keep it as a process managed by RESNET.

Committee further discussed language in 102.2.9.3.3 of when notification is required to Rater’s known clients, and whether or not it should be added to standards as a requirement for Raters to notify Provider of their list of clients. Chris further discussed the idea that we should not make the standards so grandiose that we cannot enforce them. Committee landed on better language on this and decided to define the term “Rating Client”.

Reviewed proposed edits from 102.1.3 and 102.1.10. Conversation went to when multiple HERS scores exist for the same address, how does that impact both the reporting side and the multiple files in the Registry. Committee discussed process how we could fix this in the standards language, via RESNET policy / Staff actions, or programmatically via notification to the initial Provider, the new Rater, and RESNET staff. Committee did not approve the proposed language, Leo will take another look at it and be ready next call.

Chris also brought up idea of adding negative price incentive for people who are under more stringent investigation.

Scott and Leo proposed language for 102.1.3 and 102.1.10 from 10/25/2022, below are the notes on the changes we wanted the group feedback on:

* Changing the wording in 102.1.3 of “the latest” to “a correct” version of a software to allow for the Transition Period windows established in section 502 between a VCD and an MCD - Per changes we made to 105.2, this should actually be “an approved”
* Changing the notification requirement for Providers to inform their ENTIRE Providership of changes to include both changes to the software and changes to the standards, and giving them until 30 days prior the MCD or a date established by the Board to do so, whichever is sooner
* Rolling all of the compliance methods outlined in section 101.1 a Rating can be used as qualification for into its own phrase so we can use it as a catch all in sections 102.1.3 and 102.1.10 - “other compliance methods outlined in Section 101.1”
* Use of the word “substantive alteration” without providing a definition of this other than anything that does not impact the calculation impact of the HERS Score or other compliance methods, do you feel this would allow for anything nefarious or would it only entail things like an address change? I would prefer not to have to list out all the instances where this type of change would be acceptable
* For the First Criteria of RESNET’s intent for Section 102.1.10 we discussed, it would only be ok for a Provider to make a change to a Rating without consent of the original Rater when a certified QAD in their Providership identifies something during a Field QA, otherwise they would need their affirmative or written consent from the original Rater to do so
* For the Second Criteria of RESNET’s intent for Section 102.1.10 we discussed, I feel like my description is kind of wordy, but what I was trying to say was that no one either in the original Rater’s Providership or a different Providership or Rating company could use the original Rater’s work to verify minimum rated features that are no longer verifiable for whatever reason except for scenarios outlined in the new policy we discussed. That way, that policy could flesh out the other stuff we talked about like obtaining the original Rater’s consent, QA oversight requirements, RESNET’s approval oversight decision process / authorization to waive QA oversight, and the process for a builder / new Rater to apply for this scenario could live
* Finishing with the statement that any effort outside of these examples would be expressly prohibited

**Ended new work after reviewing notes from previous meeting**