



CMA-Labeling Task Group Meeting Notes
NFRC Membership Meeting - Austin, Texas
3/5/3007 – 11:00AM

Note taker: Joe Hayden

Summary of responses to ballot on CMA Label Certificates:

- Product Label Certificate (negatives)
 - Confusing
 - Air leakage is not part of CMA
 - Table with vision percent is inappropriate
 - E+ name not needed/not NFRC
 - Add frame IDs
 - Some re-arrangement of fields

- Product Label Certificate (approved with comments)
 - Actual size info needed on label
 - Reduce the range of vision percent

- Project Label Certificate (negatives)
 - Not clear if mandatory or optional
 - Don't fill in examples
 - Too NFRC
 - Terminology is wrong
 - Don't use glazing contractor as SA example
 - Don't list IGU info.
 - What to do if there is more than one SA?
 - Specialty windows?

- Project Label Certificate (approve with comments)
 - See C. Curcija's PPT presentation

- For Product and Project Label Certificates:
 - Charlie will work with staff to assemble a focus group with some code officials to better define what the label certificates should look like and what information they should convey.
 - Will work in parallel with current effort at NFRC.

- Straw poll – is Product Label too confusing?
 - Yes – 22
 - No - 2

- Straw poll – include air leakage on product label?
 - Yes – 10 (as an option)

- No - 3
- Straw poll – include vision percent table on graph on the Product Label certificate?
 - Yes – 10
 - No – 9
 - Prefer table format? – 3
 - Prefer graph format? - 4
- Straw poll – do we need a project label certificate?
 - Yes – 10
 - No – 7

- It was requested that more time be requested for the next task group meeting in Denver.
- Chair request more input from membership between now and Denver meeting.
- Conference call will be scheduled.
- Meeting Adjourned at 12:05 PM