

Proposed Amendment of Chapter 9 to Revise Onsite QA Field Reviews Comments

Comment #: 1

Commentator: Bob Chomko

Organization: Building Science Institute Inc.

Clause Number: 131

Paragraph: 904.4.2.4

Comment Intent: Objection

Comment Type: Technical

Comment:

September 5, 2014

I have a few brief comments that address the Proposed QA field review (904.4.2.43)

A recent technology that is quickly being adopted by police departments and our military is the use of body camera's in order to video record events.

Justification: My recommendation would be to require all **field ratings**, as well as other field work to be **recorded using a body camera** to record all field work and preserving these recordings for the record. Consistency in the reported results and the opportunity for corrective action, if necessary, would be achieved. Current pricing of body cameras have decreased to the point where a good one may be purchased for \$100-\$150, with some much lower.

The recorded field work would **preclude the expense of QA field audits** as well as having a **permanent digital record**. Of course not all recording's need be reviewed by the QA but the record would exist. Overall, this change would enhance the public confidence in the rating process and increase stakeholder trust in the reported results.

What comes to mind is the BPI field exam vs. RESNET avatar testing. Avatar testing provides consistency in evaluating the ability and knowledge of a person . The proposed video recording method is in line with ANSI standards when considering consistency of results related to field work as well as the QA process.

Comment: An additional thought related to ratings concerns the appraisal industry and other stakeholders. In order to have an accurate picture of a home's energy consumption, we should consider including all energy consumed on the property being evaluated. That should include the total energy consumed and metered for electrical, gas and other fuels and sources of energy. The appraiser must have an accurate picture of a homeowner's utility expenses in order to assess expenses associated with energy consumption.

I hope these thoughts help. The QA designee position would still be required in order to review the recordings and provide guidance and mentorship when needed. Expenses associated with field audits

would be minimized. Outside stakeholders could have a reasonable assurance the rating process including QA procedures have followed.

Thank you.

Bob Chomko

bob@buildingscience.pro

Proposed Change:

Proposed Change:

~~904.4.2.4 QA field reviews shall be conducted on an ongoing basis as appropriate for the volume of ratings being completed, and at a minimum annually.~~ The provider shall complete a minimum of 1% quarterly field rating video recording reviews of the Providers ratings, based on the total number of ratings registered the previous quarter, until all annual QA requirements for the Provider have been met for each Rater. QA field video recording reviews are not required on every Rater every quarter.

Response:

Accept

Reject

Reason:

A very interesting idea that deserves more thought. It is, however, too early to incorporate as a requirement in the RESNET standards. Specifications and procedures are needed to be developed before it can be made a requirement.

Proposed Amendment of Chapter 9 to Revise Onsite QA Field Reviews Comments

Comment #: 2

Commentator: Brett Dillon

Organization: IBS Advisors, LLC

Clause Number: 1

Paragraph: 904.4.2.4

Comment Intent: Not an Objection

Comment Type: General

Comment:

I support this proposed amendment.

Proposed Change:

No proposed changes and no response from the Committee needed.

Response:

Accept

Reject

Reason:

Comment in support of the amendment. No amendment proposed.

Proposed Amendment of Chapter 9 to Revise Onsite QA Field Reviews Comments

Comment #: 3

Commentator: Chuck Greening

Organization: The House Inspector, LLC.

Clause Number: 1

Paragraph:

Comment Intent: Objection

Comment Type: General

Comment:

I have an objection to the added quarterly QA field visits. The added visits will increase the costs for providing rating services to builders and homeowners. The current custom home market is still very price conscious and is not willing to pay for any price increases related to processing and quality assurance.

Proposed Change:

Leave the QA requirements as they currently are.

Response:

Accept

Reject

Reason:

The longer a period of quality assurance review on completed custom homes the more difficulty there is getting access to the occupied homes.

Proposed Amendment of Chapter 9 to Revise Onsite QA Field Reviews Comments

Comment #: 4

Commentator: Sharla Riead

Organization: Accurate Rater Network by Hathmore Technologies

Clause Number: 1

Paragraph:

Comment Intent: Not an Objection

Comment Type: Editorial

Comment:

This change does a good job of clarifying the intent of the proposed amendment and is much more in line with the way Field QA works in the real world. However, it is the QAD who performs the QA field reviews so I suggest the following change.

Proposed Change:

The ~~Provider~~ QAD shall complete a minimum of 1% quarterly onsite QA field reviews of the Provider's ratings, based on the total number of ratings registered the previous quarter, until all annual QA requirements for the Provider have been met for each Rater. QA field reviews are not required on every Rater every quarter.

Response:

Accept _____

Reject X

Reason:

The provider is responsible for implementing quality assurance requirements of the RESNET Standards