

Results of RESNET Board Ballot on Adopting the April 2, 2015 Draft RESNET SWOT Analysis Developed by the RESNET Strategic Planning Committee

April 13, 2015

Shall the RESNET Board of Directors adopt the April 2, 2015 draft SWOT analysis developed by the RESNET Strategic Planning Committee (Attachment A)?

Yes (20)

No (0)

Abstain (0)

Ben Adams

Jacob Atalla

David Beam

Dave Bell

Steve Byers

Dennis Creech

Brett Dillon

Philip Fairey

David Goldstein

Andy Gordon

Roy Honican

Cardice Howard

Mark Jansen

Frank O'Brien-Bernini

Lee O'Neal

Jim Petersen

Nancy St. Hilaire

Kelly Stephens

Dennis Stroer

Barb Yankie

The SWOT analysis was adopted.

Attachment A



Setting the **Standards** for **Home Energy Efficiency**

Draft Revised RESNET SWOT

April 2, 2015

STRENGTHS

RESNET is recognized by respected organizations for consensus based processes resulting in the development of credible Standards and an established market based HERS Index, as exemplified by the inclusion of the HERS Index for code compliance and as the pathway to higher performance homes.

WEAKNESSES

RESNET currently has limited market awareness for its brand, products, and services.

There is an undesirable perception among some internal and external stakeholders about what RESNET does, how we do it, and how stakeholders benefit.

OPPORTUNITIES

Leveraging our experience establishing the HERS Standards to create similar standards in adjacencies such as a Water Efficiency Rating Index.

Maximizing internal and external resources to address Threats and Weaknesses.

Collection of empirical data to further refine the predictive value of HERS ratings.

Positioning RESNET HERS Raters to meet the need for outsourced energy code inspections.

Leverage "Big Data" trends (based on data in RESNET registry) as a source of future revenue and influence for RESNET.

THREATS

Lack of specificity in IECC regarding what an Energy Rating Index is, which could allow less rigorous rating systems to be recognized by code officials.

Inconsistency in the production and generation of ratings and insufficient oversight of the rating process.