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Meeting called to order at 12:05 PM ET.

Chris began the call by asking members of the SDC to introduce themselves. Other members were asked to provide a brief introduction via chat.

**Task Group Summary​**

The full group has met monthly since November 2023.

There are five working groups:

* Materials
* LCA
* Data
* HERS®
* Strategy

The draft of 1550 was approved to be brought to the SDC on July 9th.

**Purpose & Scope​**

Chris provided the full abstract & scope of the SDC. To summarize, the goal is to draft a Standard that enables HERS Raters & energy Raters to take the work they have already done & try to leverage the greatest amount of that effort to put into the embodied carbon model.

Andy Buccino & others are working to rate 100 homes in MA while creating a connection between Ekotrope modeling software & carbon modeling.

There are two pathways for a Rater to model for carbon:

Pathway 1: Do embodied carbon for each type of unit as a HERS Rater would do & separate embodied carbon; or…

Pathway 2: Model the entire building for carbon

Vladimir noted this was unclear; Chris will add this as a topic for discussion at the end of the meeting.

**SDC member feedback: Issues for discussion​**

**SDC member feedback: Issues resolved​**

Chris reviewed specific questions and concerns that were raised during the public comment period:

* Definitions at the beginning of the Standard: All suggestions were accepted & definitions will be revised
* A comment stated the term *rated* was used throughout the Standard in regards to embodied emissions. The commenter noted that *rated* is typically about assigning a value, but in the Standard, it is used as an assessment.
	+ Use of the term *rated product* and other similar uses of *rated* will be changed to *assessed product*.
* Section 5.1 Spatial Boundary: The Task Group defined spatial boundaries. The commenter noted this could lead to unfair comparison of different construction systems or different materials.
	+ The Task Group debated this issue by thinking about where the Rater currently places most of their attention, which was determined to be on the building itself.
	+ Graham noted via comment there may be a scale that is a Kg of CO2e, so ratings would be acceptable.
	+ Danuta asked what to do regarding underground parking.
		- Chris said this would not be considered.
		- Brian said parking beneath a structure would be included as part of that spatial boundary.
* Section 5.3.1.2: Suggestion to alert definition of Life Cycle Assessment from two years to five years.
	+ LCAs are commonly accepted for five years. The Task Group initially chose 2 years to push manufacturers from LCA to EPD.
	+ The proposed change was accepted.
* Section 5.3.2: There were two comments that noted this section does not address a scenario where a “generic product” is listed, but a specific product was used & known to the Rater.
	+ In 10.3, the verification piece of the Standard, the Rater is asked to specify all products that were on-site.
	+ Section 7.2 provides clarification on what to do if a specific product is not referenced in the plans but is found in the field.
		- Matthew said *assessed home* should be changed to *assessed building* in 7.2.
		- Brian asked if *dwelling unit* should be used instead. Chris said other RESNET® Standards do provide a distinct definition of dwelling unit but *home* is used as a generic term throughout these Standards.
		- Mike asked if a Rater is always required to research a product found in the field or if they can use a generic product. Chris said generic values will likely end up being used for the projected stage. When doing a confirmed assessment, if the Rater would find a product with an EDP, they would update the assessment accordingly.
	+ Vladimir said the word *discrepancy* should be changed; Matthew Cooper suggested *deviation* via chat.
		- Robert said that softening that word might cause the intent to be lost.
		- Jacob suggested providing a definition for *discrepancies*.
* Table 5.4: A commenter suggested adding a specific exception for all other detached structures including Accessory Dwelling Units. The comment was accepted.
* Section 5.4, Table 5.4.1: The commenter said sound & fire insulation should be added. Another comment said *shafts* should be added to interior construction. These comments were both accepted.
* Section 5.6: The commenter asked how the scores can be accurate if retained elements are not included.
	+ LCA norms do not count embodied carbon for existing materials/products in a building. Current retrofit activities are only measuring embodied carbon of new materials and products.
	+ Shawn Mullins submitted this comment & will withdraw the comment.
* Section 6.1 & Appendix 10.1: A comment was made by many regarding the use of imperial vs. metric units.
	+ Metric units are used in EPDs/LCAs, so all GWP values are expressed in metric.
	+ Chris will add clarification noting that imperial units can be used & converted for final GWP calculations. Chris will also clarify that results can be expressed in imperial units.
* Section 6.5: The commenter said this is overly subjective & possibly misleading.
	+ The Task Group determined this metric is worth reporting as it provides a lens for understanding the impacts of different typologies & designs.
	+ This is required by Vancouver’s carbon rules.
	+ Mike Browne said via chat that embodied carbon per bedroom could be defined & left to the market to determine how it is used.
* Table 10.1.1: The commenter said that some of the methods provided will result in incorrect estimations.
	+ The Task Group will work with NAHB to review.

General questions and concerns:

* QA measures should be developed or drafted prior to the Standard’s introduction into the market.
* *Embodied Carbon*: It is common practice to use carbon as a metric for benchmarking the impact of all emissions. *Embodied emissions* or *embodied greenhouse gas emissions* would be more descriptive & inclusive.
* Many definitions are inconsistent with RESNET/ICC 301-2019, IRC, & IECC. Recommend a review to ensure consistency between RESNET Draft Standard 1500 & other published Standards.
* NEHERS® would like to be sure that this Standard is positioned to implement an Embodied Carbon Index that can be used alongside the HERS Index.
* Include a note in the introduction on why the Standard is needed.

**Additional issues for discussion​**

Matthew Cooper asked the group for any additional feedback and requested that interested parties reach out to assist in reviewing and providing feedback.

**Next steps​**

A new draft will be prepared based on feedback and distributed by the end of August.

The SDC will review the draft by September 9th.

If there are no issues, the Standard will move to public review in the second half of September.

Ballots will be distributed electronically by Rick Dixon, RESNET, with the option to vote in favor, against, and include a comment.

Chris will request that Rick distribute a note to the SDC members on the voting process and what can be expected.

The group expressed its thanks to Chris & the SDC for the important work they have done on the Draft Standard.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM ET.