



CMA PCP Task Group Conference Call Notes 5/8/07

Attendees: Gary Curtis and Mike Manteghi (Co-Chairs), Greg Carney, Tom Culp, Nelson Pena, Tony Rygg, Bipin Shah, Margaret Webb, Jessica Ferris (staff)

Meeting commenced at approximately 11:30 AM (EDT).

The group reviewed the current version of the CMA-PCP from where the group left had off at the last conference call (4/24/07):

Section 1.3 - Glossary and Terminology

- **Commercial Building:**
Action Item: Tom Culp will provide the group with current definitions for “Commercial Building” found in ASHRAE and ICodes. Our proposed definition is in line with their definitions but the wording we have is a little confusing and should be clarified.

Staff confirmed that the NFRC 100 technical document has the same definition but a different term, “nonresidential building.”
- **Glazing Bite:**
Action Item: This definition should parallel GANA’s and IGMA’s. Bipin Shah will review and confirm whether this is the case. Margaret Webb indicated that she can re-send IGMA’s definition to Bipin for his reference.
- **Vision Percent:**
Action Item: Staff will find out if this term is still referenced on the latest draft of the label certificate. If it is not, this term can be deleted from the Glossary.

Section 2.3 Framing System Approval – Discussion: Tom Culp indicated to the group that the frame grouping research project is currently on target and that it will be ready by October for balloting in November. There will be an update on this research project at the July meeting.

Tom Culp indicated to the group that there are still issues and questions to resolve with the test validation procedure. Perhaps this group can assist.

Action Item: Mike Manteghi will contact Mike Thoman, Chair of the CMA Validation Testing Task Group, about current status of the CMA validation test procedure development.

Section 4.2.B.iv – There was discussion regarding referencing standard size ratings only. Mike Manteghi indicated that for commercial products there will be a definite need to rate complex products, which are not standardized. What will be the procedure for that? A procedure needs to be developed.

Action Item: Mike Manteghi will contact Mike Thoman on this need as well.

Section 5.1.2 – Discussion regarding 100% Mfr. ACE Calculation Reviews by IAs. Tom Culp indicated to the group that he has his proposal for the Board for reducing the number of reviews for mfr. ACE's with a good track record, but has been waiting for the appropriate time to submit it to them for their consideration. Much of this would affect LAP language more so than PCP language.

Action Item: Tom Culp will provide the group with a copy of the proposal prior to submitting it for the Board's consideration.

Next Steps – Over the next two weeks the following will be completed:

1. The PCP document will be re-sent to the group with the latest revisions based on today's call along with an outline proposing the combining of the CMA and the current PCP language;
2. Technical issues will be addressed with Mike Thoman; and
3. Board proposal from Tom Culp will be provided to the group.

The group will then decide whether or not there is a need to convene another conference call before the July meeting.

Meeting Adjourned @ 1:00 PM.