



**CMA Labeling Task Group
Conference Call Notes
4/13/2007**

Attendees: Charlie Curcija (Chair), Bruce Croak, Tom Culp, Frank Fisher, Greg McKenna, Bipin Shah, Dan Wacek, Margaret Webb, and Jessica Ferris

Meeting commenced by the Chair at approximately 1:15 PM (Eastern)

Comments from the March meeting label certificate ballots were reviewed by the task group.

The group agreed that the balloted Framing and Glazing Label Certificates will not be further developed and re-balloted at this time; rather, the task group will focus on the Product and Project certificate.

The group reviewed the Project Label Certificate balloted in March in relation to the ballot comments that had been received at that time.

There was some discussion by the group as to whether there would be a need for a product label certificate or would using the NFRC temporary label be sufficient. The sense of the group was that it would be simpler to have just one label certificate, the project label certificate.

The following modifications were made to the Project Label Certificate during the meeting:

1. Title of Certificate changed to “NFRC Label Certificate” – the word “Project” was removed.
2. Issuance date: remove reference to “no expiration.”
3. Change heading of “Specifying Authority” to “Identification of Specifying Authority.” The group agreed that there is to be only one specifying authority per Label Certificate issued.
4. Change heading of “Certification Authorization” to “Identification of Approved Calculation Entity (ACE)”
5. Remove reference to “Energy Plus Data File”
6. Add Framing Supplier and Glazing Supplier contact information on that first page.

7. Have Average Area Weighted data as optional information that may be included on the certificate; when included, the font for this data will be larger than what was balloted.
 - There was significant discussion about Average Area Weighted rating calculations – the understanding is that these ratings are calculated with actual size ratings, not NFRC ratings. Frank Fisher recommended that they be calculated to the NFRC size since that’s what’s always been done. The issue is that now that the CMA software tool will be able to calculate actual size ratings in addition to NFRC size ratings, we should provide actual size ratings for area weighted averages, since that’s most accurate for overall building performance analysis.
8. Remove from the product listing table the actual size U-factor, SHGC, and VT rating information, but leave reference to actual width and height. Also, remove the Air Leakage rating info.
9. Rename “IGU Listing” to “Glazing Listing.” And remove reference to cog U-factor, SHGC, and VT.
10. From spacer listing, remove K_{eff} .

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Staff will contact John Hogan and Nelson Pena for their feedback on what the expectation/understanding is in their respective states regarding Average Area Weighted ratings; is it their understanding that they are calculated per the products’ NFRC size or actual size?
 - o Staff will also provide Potomac Communication Group (PCG) with this issue to incorporate and ask code officials during their focus group sessions.
- Charlie will make additional revisions to the certificate per discussions had by the group today, and will then have this latest set of revisions e-mailed to the task group next week.

Meeting Adjourned @ 3:00 PM