

NFRC CMA PCP  
**NFRC Ballot Comments through February 18, 2008**  
**Ratings Committee – CMA Ratings Subcommittee**



**Legend:**  
*AC – Approve with Comment*  
*NEG – Negative response with Comments*

Company Name, Rep Initials	AC/ NEG	Section and/or Page #	Comment/Alternate Language	Resolution
ATI	NEG	General Comment	<p>I cannot approve this ballot as it does not represent the due process of this subcommittee. In March of 2007, the entirety of section 2.3 was removed from the PCP pending completion of the frame grouping research, based on the premise that it was not possible to approve the language in this section without understanding the impact of the frame grouping rules.</p> <p>The language in this ballot of section 2.3 has not been restored in its entirety as it existed in March of 2007. It is incomplete as it does not address the issue of frame validation testing, which is required by the technical procedure and is noted earlier in the PCP as a responsibility of the manufacturer.</p> <p>This language should be restored in its entirety for balloting at this point, as the content of the language was not voted against in the past. The language was simply put on hold for later review.</p>	Negative found persuasive and sent back for re-balloting
Edgetech	NEG	General Comment	There is no applicable language in the referenced LAP concerning submittal requirements for spacer component approval. Once again, this seems to be an “Approval by Proxy” of references that do not exist. I cannot approve this unless I know what is being required for spacer component submittal.	Negative found persuasive
WESTLab		General Comment	Yet again I can not approve this without see the outcome of the technical ballots. I believe the technical procedures are flawed therefore I can not approve this language.	Addressed by previous action

Company Name, Rep Initials	AC/NEG	Section and/or Page #	Comment/Alternate Language	Resolution
TRACO	AC	Section 2.3.2.C	<p><b>Section 2.3.2.C</b> – What does “framing system information” includes? Should it be elaborated here?</p> <p>For pre-calculated performance value, frame PFD (projected frame depth) information is critical to the overall U-factor calculation. We must mention to include PFD for frames using pre-calculated values.</p>	<p>TG will review to see if the comment deals with technical or PCP documents.</p>