**RESNET® SDC 1550 Technical Task Group Draft Meeting Minutes**

April 15th, 2025

12:30 PM – 1:45 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/ZMida4NijaAVspx14Ph2ZBIh9L30CkcAyjFlI3WcBPVZEr43SivOiQPt4Etvvip0.fsL--WnjkHVlCv38?startTime=1744734719000)Passcode: Jjx7L^7&

Present: Chris Magwood, Tracy Huynh, Andy Buccino, Amanda Hickman, Ariel Brenner, Brian Shanks, Jeff Bradley, Karla Butterfield, Matthew Cooper, Megan Cordes, Mike Browne, Philip Squires, Yatharth Vaishnani

Staff: Noah Kibbe, Katie Stewart

**Meeting started at 12:31 PM ET**

[Link to Comments](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/q3hav075rr9lqavu8v7zt/250306_1550-Comments_PDS01.xlsx?rlkey=qsse0tkxemk66xzfqyqlpixze&e=2&st=0he7g79s&dl=0)

[Link to Draft Standard PDS-01](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/4ine3cvrj4hs91lh8v8t2/250306_PDS02-RESNET-C1550.docx?rlkey=ldaow0956tyw1qiflzc69ewco&e=2&st=bldtfv8p&dl=0)

Resume addressing comments

**Row 62**

This is similar to a previous comment that referenced windows wells. Raters should know to verify window wells, so the addition is not needed. The comment was rejected.

**Row 63**

A proposal was made to move all references to the calculation of net emissions and reporting of net emissions to voluntary calculations. Brian Shanks clarified that it is a calculation, not an estimate. Chris Magwood suggested making net calculations voluntary rather than required. The comment was accepted in principle.

**Row 64**

This comment was addressed in the same way as Row 63.

**Row 65**

A discussion was held regarding the calculation of embodied carbon in multifamily buildings, specifically concerning the inclusion of common amenity spaces. Two pathways were proposed: treating the building as a single unit or using the threshold method, which combines emissions from unique units with those from foundations, roofs, and common areas.

The group agreed to reject this comment and proceed with the current approach without further revisions.

**Row 66**

The comments focused on aligning document retention requirements in the standard with other RESNET document retention standards. Matthew suggested that the retention period should be aligned with other RESNET standards, proposing a minimum of two years, but emphasized that specifying destruction or maintenance of documentation wasn’t necessary. Brian noted that their company’s legal team had worked extensively on the matter and required certain document retention standards to be included in the guidelines.

Chris recommended marking this for follow-up. If LDA members have legal requirements for document retention, those should take precedence. LDA should check with RESNET to clarify the origin of the seven-year retention period and discuss it further if necessary.

**Row 67**

This comment was addressed in the same way as Row 68.

**Row 69**

The commenter pointed out that the projected assessment report should clarify it is based on plans only, as the term "construction documents" was used in the definition. The comment was accepted in principle.

**Row 70**

This comment suggested adding "improved inspector" and "approved rater." The group discussed removing the term "approved inspector" from the reporting section. Matthew recommended that if the term is removed here, it should be removed everywhere for consistency, explaining that the RESNET standards allow for certified raters to conduct inspections, but not non-certified inspectors.

Brian raised concerns about using "certified rater" throughout, as it could make the standard proprietary to RESNET, potentially conflicting with American National Standards Institute (ANSI) accreditation. Mike clarified that "certified rater" is defined in **RESNET 301**, and "approved inspector" is a separate term. This would not make the standard proprietary but would still align with ANSI.

Chris suggested rejecting the comment and would opt to mark it as rejected. The text will be adjusted to remove the term.

**Row 71**

The first comment suggested cleaning up the language to ensure a uniform methodology for residential and commercial buildings. The group agreed that the term "uniform" already conveys the intended meaning, and the clarifying language was accepted.

**Row 72**

The discussion focused on whether to change "calculating" to "estimating" in certain sections. It was noted that "calculating" should be used in the standard, as it accurately reflects what is being asked, specifically in early sections like the introduction or forward.

Brian argued that changing "calculating" to "estimating" wasn’t necessary, as the current wording was aligned with LCA practices, which account for data uncertainty. Matthew disagreed, stating that the "verified component" in the standard points to calculation, and altering the language would weaken the process. Brian countered that the issue was more about wording than substance.

The comment was rejected.

**Row 73**

The comment proposed adding a note in the forward about possible result inaccuracies and the lack of QA guidelines. There was no plan to change "estimate" and the guidelines are still in development, the comment was rejected.

**Row 74**

This comment raised similar points as in Row 73. The comment was rejected.

**Row 75**

A suggestion was made to refine the sentence in the foreword about how Raters and home builders use results. Matthew disagreed as the topic of operational carbon was not relevant to this conversation. Chris clarified that the original text already covered this. The comment was rejected.

**Row 76**

Chris highlighted the need to differentiate "calculating" and "estimating" emissions, suggesting adding "verifying" to the purpose statement for clarity. The group agreed with this point. Brian noted that "calculating" and "verifying" align better than "estimating" and "verifying." Matthew supported keeping "calculating" and adding "verifying," but disagreed with changing "building products" to "building," arguing the current term was necessary for builders to assess qualifications.

The committee also discussed whether to use "certified raters" or "energy raters," with Chris suggesting simplifying by removing specific mention of who gathers the data. No further objections were raised to the changes in Column L.

**Row 77**

This comment references a section already addressed and was accepted in principle.

**Row 78**

The commenter noted that in the purpose of the scope, "embodied greenhouse gas emissions," is elsewhere referred to as "embodied carbon." The comment was accepted.

**Row 79**

This comment references a section already addressed and was rejected.

**Row 80**

The comment suggested adding commentary with a selected list of building products, similar to other standards. The proposed comment was rejected.

**Row 81**

The commenter suggested not directing users to the MEP default values, given that a data hierarchy is provided, and users can find an LCA. Chris disagreed, emphasizing that a significant amount of effort went into developing the MEP default table, and it provides reliable information that isn’t readily available elsewhere. Allowing users to turn to other standards could lead to inconsistent data. Brian agreed, noting that as EPDs and MEPs become more refined, the current approach will remain valid.

The proposed comment was rejected.

**Row 82**

The committee will address this comment later as it is part of the larger waste rates discussion.

The group will resume at **Row 83**.

**Meeting ended at 1:30 PM ET**