

Attachments Roundtable Discussion

Monday, November 16, 2009

8:30–10:30 a.m. EST

Chair: Joe Hayden

1. board wishes to provide the attachments industry additional guidance
2. attachments will be evaluated via the New Products Rating Guidelines
 - a. Will use the existing NFRC standards system
 - b. Create a new trademark representing NFRC Attachments
 - c. Allow attachments to have different ratings depending on the business needs
 - d. Separate NFRC technical documents will be developed (NFRC 100A etc)
 - e. Separate PCP documents will be developed
3. Do we require attachment product rating differ from whole product ratings – SHGC, VT, U factor , etc
 - a. The attachments ratings need to be technically sound, but that the ratings themselves would be alphanumeric, stars, etc. (does not have full board approval)
4. Mike Cienian – the attachments industry needs to voice their ideas on this possible rating system
5. Ross McCluney – there is a difference between a technical rating and what goes on a label.
6. Joe Hayden –
 - a. Pros – different rating differentiates from base product (windows)
 - b. Cons – we have existing attachment products already out there – films etc.
7. Tom Meresack – industry in general has published self measured values - R values and SHG
 - a. We would like a common measurement system
 - i. We will likely need to put numeric data in price lists for architects etc.
8. Lisa W. – we have absolutely not been here for years to get a star – we want real, tangible numbers
 - a. Comparison of varying climate zones
9. Dave DeBlock –U factor and SHGC numbers are important – technical info needs to be tied into the label somehow
10. Willie du Pont – a symbolic rating can be very course and may not differentiate attachments as well as a real number
11. John Gant – awning and projecting devices are typically sold to trade personnel, not the general consumer – these people need the real numbers for evaluation of the products. – dynamic products need to be able demonstrate their full potential.
12. Peter Lyons - on the Australian system the real numbers are presented along side of the symbolic rating
13. Nils Peterman – If the ratings are type dependent then dynamic product could get a differentiating rating.
14. Randy V – questions about composite products – energy codes and rebates go by real U factor and SHG numbers – we are looking at energy issues – code compliance.
15. Mike Thoman – we are having difficulty determining field installed rating – that is what CMA is attempting to do – A symbolic rating will not give the end user enough information to determine the product performance.
16. Merme (??) Fabrics – on numbers we need to look at the consistency from build to build on a product / system
17. Steve Johnson – maybe use a center of product type of value for comparison – not sure how – one number is OK for comparison – attachment product on a window we have a possible system, the issue is using a reference window system. How can the consumer make a choice based on a reference window – we need to rate in way that the consumer can reference it to their window.
18. Jim Krahn – we are focused on the current reward system (rebates, code compliance, etc) – maybe we need a better reward system that looks at other values than the numeric.
19. Ross Mc – the logical conclusion is create an annual energy performance system of rating
 - a. Now we need climate and operational performance metrics

- b. We are searching for simplicity in a world full of complexity
- 20. Darrel (films) – making choices – the only choices that NFRC looks at is coming up with technical standards, not how many stars relate to a code compliance of some sort.
 - a. We are treading on dangerous ground by moving away from hard numeric rating
- 21. Steve Selkowitz – we are 501c3 to serve the public interest – which public is that?
 - a. If someone calls in and asks about what shade to put into a new home or a refurbishment
 - b. From engineers – I am putting a shading system in to protect million dollar art collection – what should I use to restrict the incident UV and VT to XX value?
- 22. Mike C – is this the type of information you wanted to here
- 23. Joe Hayden – yes we need to try not to restrict ourselves too much.