



MINUTES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

LA CROSSE, WI
October 14-15, 2021

Approved by the Executive Committee January 29, 2022.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Executive Committee Meeting
October 14-15, 2021

CALL TO ORDER	2
CODE OF ETHICS	2
ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS	2
REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA	2
ROUNDTABLE	2
STRATEGIC DISCUSSIONS	2-8
NEW PRODUCTS	2-5
EVALUATING AND ENHANCING COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS STRATEGIC TO ASHRAE	5-8
OPERATIONAL DISCUSSIONS	8-13
STRATEGIC PLAN INITIATIVE 4	8
REHVA/CIBSE/ASHRAE EVENT ON 'FUTURE OF THE INDUSTRY'	8
A WORLD WHERE ASHRAE PRODUCTS ARE AVAILABLE AT NO CHARGE	9-11
THE NEED FOR A CARBON REDUCTION STANDARD OR GUIDELINE	11-13
LEE RASCH - LEADERETHICS	8
DISCUSSION	13-14
CLOSING THOUGHTS	13-14
ADJOURNMENT	15

ACTION ITEMS

Executive Committee Meeting

October 14-15, 2021

No. - Pg.	Responsibility	Summary of Action	Status	Goal Date
1 - 5	Littleton	Develop a plan for new product development.		
2 - 5	Maston, Brandt, Macauley	Make recommendations to ExCom for new product development based on discussions at the October 14-15 ExCom meeting (La Crosse).		
3 - 6	Littleton	Summarize the current MOUs, listing their renewal dates, and make recommendations as to which MOUs should not be renewed. The summary will be presented to ExCom in executive session at a future meeting.		
4 - 8	Schwedler	Empower the ASHRAE/CIBSE Working Group to reach out to REHVA regarding 'Future of the Industry' conference. The working group will be directed to include CEC before any commitments are made.		
5 - 11	Littleton, McGinn	Lead the charge to investigate revenues and margins of the three "flagship" standards.		
6 - 11	McGinn	Communicate to Building EQ that ExCom would like for the committee to investigate either selling the BEQ portal or coming up with a different recommendation that best serves Society.		
7 - 12	Schwedler	Communicate with the co-chairs of the TFBD of the general direction that ExCom feels would be beneficial for the task force to take.		



MINUTES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

October 14-15, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mick Schwedler, President
Farooq Mehboob, President-Elect
Ginger Scoggins, Treasurer
Don Brandt, Vice President
Dunstan Macauley, Vice President
Sarah Maston, Vice President
Tim McGinn, Vice President
Jeff Littleton, Secretary

GUESTS PRESENT:

Lee Rasch

STAFF PRESENT:

Candace DeV Vaughn, Manager - Board Services

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schwedler called the meeting to order at 9:04 am.

CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. Schwedler read the code of ethics commitment and encouraged all in attendance to read the full statement available online.

ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS

Members, guests, and staff introduced themselves. Meeting attendance is noted above.

REVIEW OF MEETING AGENDA

Mr. Schwedler reviewed the meeting agenda. 'MBI Update' and 'BOMA Conference Update' were added to *Operational Business*.

ROUNDTABLE

Members and staff shared personal stories and lessons learned from the pandemic.

STRATEGIC DISCUSSIONS**New Products**

Ms. Maston stated that this discussion topic came from what she has been exposed to since her time as a director on the BOD. She is currently serving as the official designee for the AEDG Steering Committee. The steering committee operates as an ASHRAE committee because Tom Phoenix leads it. There has been some concern that DOE doesn't want another publication. The multi-family AEDG is waiting to be printed and the committee is looking to see what is next.

New products are tending to be much more interactive. Society is viewed as a technology resource, but if we don't start looking into other ways to present information, Society will be at the mercy of the those who do create interactive products.

How do we better utilize our resources or what resources do we need to ensure that the AEDG line is uniquely ours? We're the premier technical resource, what's our next product line?

Ms. Scoggins stated that Society needs a decarbonization standard. That is where the industry is trending and we are behind. If we don't fill it, someone else will.

Mr. McGinn stated that Society is in a race against time because IEC is developing this in conjunction with their appendix. Voluntary appendices are needed so they can get done quickly. There doesn't seem to be a cohesive direction from the Decarbonization Task Force.

Mr. Littleton thanked Ms. Maston for bringing up this issue. Don't think it is as easy as saying we create a decarbonization guideline. What is the process for developing new products in general? Need a bottom-up approach in the process that we use to develop new products - a business development process. The current legacy processes take too much time. What are the new publications? Are we looking to acquire publishing companies? What is our business development strategy?

Have to get more aggressive and be more intentional with the manner in which we go about developing new products and standards. IECC already has a net zero appendix in it. Speed of development of standards is a complicated issue. We need to understand the products and standards that meet the needs of our members instead of waiting for a TC to decide that a new standard will be developed.

Mr. Littleton suggested a business development committee or group, or a business development component to each council. There are a lot of ways we can go about this.

Mr. Brandt stated that if we insist on a consensus process, Society doesn't have a lot of leeway. Important to keep in mind that ICC is often criticized for not using the consensus process.

My vision is that if we are going to change our way to market, need to find somebody who is not ASHRAE affiliated. Society can't keep doing business the same way and expect different results. Are we willing to put money into this process as a starting point?

Mr. Littleton stated that there is some maneuvering room between consensus and non-consensus and a quicker pace.

Mr. Macauley stated the ANSI process is slow, but Society needs to be fast to market. Can we come up with a guideline first so there is something on the market and then come up with the standard? If we are slow to market someone is going to step in and absorb that space.

Society has to look at the business industry; have to look at what firms are doing that support our membership and participation and target what they need. Our standards are sold on an individual basis, but a company would be likely to buy a subscription. Suggested that a separate marketing plan be developed for business so we can sell enough products and standards. He expressed that Society hasn't been aggressive enough in developing online tools; need to find partners to develop online tools with.

Mr. McGinn stated that Tech Council is looking into conducting a pilot to speed up the standard development process. Need to focus on what our members bring to the table and have professionals work alongside them to speed up the process. A partnership between Society and private developers may be the way to go.

Ms. Scoggins stated that she sees this as a staff led effort, with a staff group that is focused on product development. Volunteers can't dedicate the time it takes to meet faster timelines; expecting volunteers who have full time jobs to get standards out in a timely manner is too much. This change would require a paradigm shift.

Mr. Mehboob stated that he was surprised that the group was having this discussion. In 2015 Pub and Ed Council ad hoc presented a report on this issue. Part of Society's issue is that we don't listen, we don't act, and just hope that things will right themselves. We don't let the facts speak for themselves because we are not driven by data. There is very little ownership. Need continuity and need to not forget and keep reinventing.

Ms. Scoggins stated that there is an opinion among staff because if they wait, the idea will go away. The bulk of the work has to get done with the continuity of staff. The bigger discussion is what are the expectations of staff and volunteers. Volunteers should serve as a think tank.

Mr. Schwedler stated that the discussion seemed to be centered around the Society's current products, but different delivery. What products can we offer to school boards? What can we offer to the building owners who are dealing with the issues? What aren't we doing today? What aren't other groups doing?

The ETF introduced Society to people who had never heard of us before. The ETF also used a different delivery method - ETF created content and it was delivered by the local members.

Mr. Mehboob stated that Society needs to identify deliverables and assign members and staff to do the work. Currently, there is not a deliverables list, no deadlines, and no accountability. Referencing the Pub and Ed ad hoc report, he suggested that it is better to develop bundles of products. It is necessary to identify deliverables, deadlines, cost, and who is accountable. Staff will wait members out, so we need to solve the continuity issue.

Mr. Macauley stated that one of the things we need to do is empower staff and give them a path if things are not moving forward. Right now, staff respects members and are there to support members and feel that there is no path to go to a higher body if needed. That way, if there's a roadblock, they have an avenue to go to a higher body to keep things moving.

Mr. Littleton stated that he does not feel that staff waits for changes in volunteers to avoid doing something. He agreed that staff needs to be empowered. There is currently a lack of empowerment of staff that impedes them from flying, which is a morale issue.

Mr. McGinn stated that he has concrete examples of staff waiting out volunteers. He has tried to empower staff in the past and got the uncomfortable feeling that there was agreement up front, but the initiative was being stalled.

Ms. Maston stated that she has seen staff empowered, but not really supported.

Ms. Scoggins stated that it is difficult for staff to have different leaders with different focus each year. She suggested a new product division led by staff that is advised by a volunteer think tank. She expressed that she does not feel that staff is doing anything malicious - it is a difficult position to be in to have different leadership each year.

Ms. Maston stated that discussions of how to define Society's market spurred this conversation. Within the world of commercial real estate, they are in the middle of somewhat sudden legislation surrounding energy efficiency and there is no real path to get there. She expressed that she feels that this is an opportunity for Society; if we don't step into that gap, somebody else will. What are the markets we can enter to provide our members with the tools they need to be better at business, to get business, and to serve their clients?

Mr. Macauley stated that there is an opportunity to collaborate and suggested IMT. IMT was coming to our conferences and a strong relationship was being developed. There are ASHRAE members who work there, and we can tap into those relationships and expand on those opportunities. IMT can be out front, and we can follow with the standards and guidelines on how to implement. Society doesn't have to be in competition for everything, can be in partnership; find partners and collaborate with them.

Mr. Mehboob asked if we as a BOD or ExCom have an idea of what the growth of publications should be. What kind of target are we looking at? He suggested that Ms. Scoggins' recommendation be considered seriously and decide on a group. We're always looking to put blame on the staff but I see a lot of

officers that don't do what they should; he suggested performance evaluations of regional leaders. We may be volunteers, but we aren't volunteering to waste other people's time.

Ms. Scoggins asked if the work of the ETF has generated revenue. She stated that there is talent in the design engineering community that Society is not tapping in to. Need to find a way to pull in people who have knowledge of what is needed. We have people that want to help but they don't see a place to contribute.

Mr. Littleton reported that Society sold \$80-90,000 in sponsorships on the ETF webpage.

Ms. Maston reported that there have also been multiple webinars that are revenue generating.

Mr. Mehboob expressed his opinion that the free webinars are hurting Society's reputation internationally. He expressed concern over RAL membership declines.

Staff will develop a plan for new product development.

AI - 1

Ms. Maston, Mr. Brandt, and Mr. Macauley will make recommendations based on the new product discussion.

AI - 2

Evaluating and enhancing collaboration with other organizations strategic to ASHRAE.

Mr. Mehboob outlined the objectives of the discussion - *Have concrete ideas which we all agree upon. Not going to table any ideas at all. How do we evaluate who we want to do business with? What are the metrics? How do we evaluate and enhance collaboration with other organizations?*

Mr. Mehboob reported that Society has over 60 MOUs with over 60 associate societies. Some of the benefits are tangible and some are indirect. He added that AASA has had this same discussion.

Mr. Littleton stated that 90% of MOUs were created because they were requested by the other organizations and many of the agreements serve the other organizations better than Society. Recommended eliminating 85-90 of the "feel good" MOUs that don't benefit Society.

There are strategic benefits to having relationships with for-profit companies. Society should do a better job of exploring these potential relationships. Mergers and acquisitions are a way to grow. Great opportunities to collaborate with other segments of the industry, specifically utilities. Need to be relentlessly focused on mission and members.

Ms. Maston asked about the possibility of working with an organization without a formal MOU.

Mr. Macauley stated that if a new MOU is proposed, the benefits should be clearly outlined before moving forward.

Mr. Mehboob asked what it does to the value of having an MOU with ASHRE if anyone can have one. He expressed his opinion that it should be difficult to get an MOU with Society.

Mr. Littleton reported that 10-12 years ago a boiler plate was created, allowing a Society President to sign at his/her discretion. The President was authorized to sign it anytime she/he felt it was appropriate.

Ms. Scoggins expressed agreement that MOUs are semantic only. She stated that she struggles with telling 85% of our partners that we don't want MOUs with them anymore. If there isn't consensus on a workplan then a MOU likely isn't needed.

She reported that AIA has a dedicated staff person that helps to manage the organization's external relationships.

Mr. McGinn suggested that a notification be sent to all organizations that Society has MOUs with that the BOD has decided that all MOUs are being dissolved and we are welcoming proposals for work plans. This will prevent bruising any egos.

Mr. Macauley suggested that the BOD define which MOUs are most relevant. Once there is a defined list, Society can start to focus on those organizations. The relationship with AIA has developed because a path forward was created and a group was organized to create continuity and ensure success.

He suggested that current MOUs be allowed to expire. Any new MOUs going forward should identify targeted goals and how the agreement benefits Society.

Mr. Brandt expressed agreement with letting all current MOUs expire.

Ms. Maston stated that Society does have too many MOUs. She expressed agreement with letting all current MOUs expire. She suggested that a member of the BOD be assigned to each organization that Society has an agreement or work plan with.

Mr. Schwedler stated that, from a relationship standpoint, letting all current MOUs expire is better. Society should have a strategic relationship with 5-10 organizations, to be evaluated periodically.

Mr. Mehboob stated that there seemed to be agreement that MOUs should be allowed to expire and then be evaluated carefully to select the 5-10 that Society wants to keep.

Staff will summarize the current MOUs, listing their renewal dates, and make recommendations as to which MOUs should not be renewed. The summary will be presented to the BOD in executive session at a future meeting.

AI - 3

Mr. Mehboob led a discussion on how to maintain the continuity of MOU relationships.

Mr. Macauley stated that Presidential Members have expressed that Society spends time training them to represent Society and then they are put out to pasture. He suggested that this is an opportunity for Presidential Members to continue to be of service to Society to foster these relationships; they understand that they can continue to be ambassadors to ASHRAE in a significant way.

He stated that AIA and ASHE are two of the most successful relationships that Society has; the common thread is continuity. He added that any working group will need multiple members.

Mr. McGinn stated that Presidential Members may not be connected enough to the committee structure of ASHRAE to foster MOU work plans.

Mr. Brandt stated that MOU relationships have to be maintained by a member of ExCom or DALs. He added that not all Presidential Members are engaged enough for this work. If there are only MOUs with 5-10 organizations that is much more manageable.

Mr. Littleton suggested that whoever is assigned to manage the relationship should also be the person to attend the conference of that organization.

Mr. Schwedler suggested that a Presidential Member be paired with a BOD member. He also suggested that a designated staff person be assigned to each MOU, to help with continuity.

Ms. Maston stated that there could be multiple staff assigned to manage each MOU relationship. She added that it might be worth polling some Presidential Members about their interest in this role; it's a pool of very experienced individuals who would bring something to the process.

She added that this could be an opportunity for younger members to step up and understand strategic relationships that ASHRAE has and why they are important. Having fewer relationships makes it much easier to manage.

Mr. Mehboob summarized that continuity is important and that multiple options for maintaining continuity were suggested. He asked if the President should make liaison assignments.

Ms. Scoggins stated that she prefers a model of having a Presidential Member chair a committee and having a BOD member assigned to the committee, with the BOD member attending the conference and bring that information back.

Mr. Brandt suggested that the President not have sole discretion to make these assignments.

Mr. Schwedler stated that the President could make the assignment, but it should be for three years.

Mr. Macauley suggested that Senior Officers make the decision of who to assign so that there is buy in from the people who will be President in the coming years.

Mr. McGinn suggested that if a staff person is assigned to manage the MOUs, they should be part of the decision of who serves on the committee. He also suggested that one person be assigned for the life of the MOU.

Mr. Mehboob summarized the consensus of the group that a Presidential Member, BOD Member, Vice President, and staff liaison manage MOU relationships.

Mr. Mehboob led a discussion of evaluating MOUs. The following metrics were suggested by Members of ExCom:

- Value to members
- Widen ASHRAE's reach and horizon
- Support of Society's strategic plan
- Enhancing the profile of the industry
- Collaborative vs. competitive
- Look for organizations as partners whose strengths compliment Society's strengths
- Joint programs

Mr. Littleton stated that in evaluating MOUs, Society leadership must be candid and honest. He suggested that before a new MOU is developed, a work plan should be created first. A work plan adds value to the MOU relationship.

OPERATIONAL DISCUSSIONS**Strategic Plan Initiative 4**

Mr. Schwedler reported that the document attached to the agenda is a response from the Planning Committee. Members of ExCom were asked to provide any comments on the document to Mr. Schwedler.

He reported that the document is a first step. Mr. Schwedler will work with staff to gain a better understanding of the cost per member metric and how it is defined.

Mr. McGinn reported that he developed the cost per member metric. The metric aims to measure value of effort to deliver services to members. At the time the metric was developed, there was a trend of dollars per member going up and the metric was meant to investigate if dollars per member is tied to value or uncontrolled spending.

REHVA/CIBSE/ASHRAE Event On “Future of the Industry”

Mr. Schwedler reported that he was contacted by Sheila Hayter. Ms. Hayter asked if Society would like to bring REHVA under the same umbrella to develop a three-pronged event.

Ms. Scoggins suggested that the working group be empowered to make the decision and inform ExCom and CEC of their decision.

Mr. Mehboob stated that a single conference is distinct from the working group. He expressed the opinion that any conference suggestions need to go to CEC for them to make the decision. He suggested that the working group propose a plan to CEC.

There was consensus that ExCom won't disempower the working group from reaching out to REHVA and then including CEC, before any commitments are made, as needed.

Mr. Schwedler will empower the ASHRAE/CIBSE Working Group to reach out to REHVA regarding the 'Future of the Industry' conference. The working group will be directed to include CEC before any commitments are made.

AI - 4

The meeting recessed at 11:49 am.

The meeting reconvened October 15, 2021 at 8:02 am.

LEE RASCH | LEADERETHICS

Mr. Schwedler introduced Lee Rasch and he made a presentation on 'Ethical Leadership During Politically Divided Times' to the committee.

OPERATIONAL DISCUSSIONS

A World Where ASHRAE Products Are Available at No Charge

Mr. McGinn stated that the biggest threat to Society is our Standards being free. Society must find sources of revenue to offset loss of revenue that may happen from the loss of Standards. He suggested that certain design information should be removed and placed in design guides, creating an implementation product and a standard product.

If this is really a threat what should leadership be doing? Do we know how big of a threat this is?

Mr. Littleton stated that leadership should be cautious about managing this issue from a position of fear. He stated that it is more about the opportunity to take a blank slate approach and investigate how the Society goes about advancing design.

He stated that he struggles with the opportunity to influence the design by making standards free. There is a sense that paying for standards in some ways inhibits Society's influence to design. If standards were free how much more influential would ASHRAE Standards be? How can ASHRAE do a better job of using the curated collective knowledge to influence design practice?

Ms. Maston stated that best practices influence design more. She stated that a lot of organizations are looking for best practices and are willing to spend money for them. This is an interesting debate and there are arguments for both ends of the spectrum. Where is the middle ground?

Mr. Mehboob stated that he tends to favor Mr. Littleton's approach. He expressed agreement that putting the standards out there is the kind of service to fulfill the Society's mission. He stated his opinion that standards will become free eventually regardless.

Mr. Mehboob stated that the Society's revenue stream needs to keep going. He expressed agreement with Ms. Maston that design guidance may be needed and that a multi-pronged approach could be beneficial.

Mr. Schwedler stated that it is probably too late to make any changes to the 2022 standards. He stated that Society does not know what the financial impact would be. He suggested that it would be beneficial to look at what the costs of covering the major standards would be, so we know what the margin is.

Mr. Schwedler suggested that ASHRAE could be the first organization to offer major standards for free. Society could even offer to develop standards and provide advanced information for a fee.

Mr. Littleton stated that he is not personally convinced that pulling information out of the standard is the right thing to do, it could reduce the influence that the standard has on design practice. If Society's standards were readily available, how many people would want to take a course on a standard? This new business model could get complicated, but it is also exciting.

Mr. Littleton also suggested that access to standards could be a benefit of membership. He stated that these business model questions are important to the future of the Society.

Mr. Macauley stated that Society needs to look at a business case and find the business opportunities and revenue generating opportunities that can come from standards and determine if there are ways to

replace that revenue. Once an equivalent amount of income can be generated, then the case to make standards free is easily justified.

Mr. Brandt stated that if standards are accessible on the web there is a cost associated with that as well as a loss of revenue. He expressed his opinion that leadership has an obligation to start down two paths and at some point one of them will go away.

Ms. Scoggins stated that Mr. Gullede led an ad hoc that looked at the possibility of offering standards for free. She suggested that the final report be sent out and that their work be continued. She expressed the opinion that whether standards are offered free, an opportunity is being missed to offer training on standards. If standards were offered free, the revenue from standards training could offset that loss. The success of the HVAC design courses is a great model for other trainings, 90.1 for example.

Mr. Macauley suggested that Society focus on a couple of different opportunities - reaching outside of North America and training code officials. Are there opportunities to provide these services through Government Affairs? He stated that there are revenue streams associated with standards that Society is not currently tapping into.

He suggested that current training be marketed to architects and engineers.

Mr. Schwedler stated that during his time as chair of 90.1, the best attended trainings were when architects and engineers were invited, and they were advised that local code officials would be in attendance. The architects and engineers were interested in knowing what the code officials would be hearing and enforcing.

He stated that long term, Society can likely figure out how to replace the revenue stream of free standards, but that the issue will be addressing the revenue loss in the short term. Is this something a donor could help with? He suggested that to find a donor, a final decision has to be made.

Ms. Maston suggested that Society reach out to the code official on the AEDG Steering Committee. She suggested that Society ask DOE what we can do for them.

Mr. Littleton reported that DOE funds the labs that do the technical work that ASHRAE teams use to develop the AEDGs.

Mr. Macauley suggested that there is a business opportunity to validate compliance to codes. He asked if there are business opportunities that Society can create to assist code officials?

Ms. Maston asked if interpretations could be offered in real time.

Mr. Littleton responded that Steve Hammerling currently fields thousands of technical inquiries a year.

Mr. McGinn stated that whether Society makes access to standards a member benefit, or if standards are free and standards related income is generated, it is important to understand what it means to migrate from prescriptive to performance-based codes. He added that possibilities for bridging the transition financially should also be discussed.

Mr. Mehboob stated that leadership has had three years of sporadic discussion; he proposed that a timeline be decided on this Society year. He also suggested a staff/volunteer partnership, led by Mr. McGinn and Mr. Littleton. He stated that it is important to know the gross margin for the three

standards that are being discussed as well as the share of sales that come from North America versus international to determine impact and help guide the plan. This data is necessary to help direct marketing efforts. He suggested that there would be great marketing opportunities for groups that would partner with Society.

Mr. Littleton and Mr. McGinn will lead the charge to investigate revenues and margins of the three “flagship” standards.

AI - 5

Mr. McGinn will communicate to Building EQ that ExCom would like for the committee to investigate either selling the BEQ portal or coming up with a different recommendation that best serves Society.

AI - 6

The Need for a Carbon Reduction Standard or Guideline

Mr. Macauley stated that there is a consensus that Society should move faster. In the 70s, when ASHRAE was challenged to create a standard to respond to the energy crisis, Society responded in six months with 90.1. Society needs to be able to respond faster to market with today’s challenges.

He reported that other organizations are developing carbon standards. The Biden plan is focusing on emissions which means DOE is going to start looking for carbon standards which will be a pivot away from 90.1.

Mr. Brandt reported that the goal of the Task Force for Building Decarbonization is to release a decarbonization guideline as quickly as possible.

Mr. Mehboob stated that the task force needs to be asked to provide a timeline and deliverables.

Mr. McGinn stated that the best way to move forward quickly is to develop appendices for standards. They can be voluntary appendices to existing standards.

He stated that it is right for ExCom to be considering this important issue.

Ms. Schwedler stated that going through the process for TPS cannot be fast, current processes would likely not allow that. He expressed agreement with the suggestion to develop informative appendices. He stated that the quickest way forward would be a continuous maintenance proposal to 189.1.

Mr. Macauley stated that there is an opportunity for Society to follow two paths - how to get to market fastest and developing a separate standard.

There was consensus that Society needs to move quickly to develop a document. The fastest way to market is to create an operational carbon appendix to 189, 90.1, and potentially 228 and 100.

Mr. Mehboob shared his summary of the conversation, stating that he heard that the TFBD needs to provide a TPS, schedule of activities, and communicate what is happening around the world. He suggested that a continuous maintenance proposal could be a path forward. He stated that once a TPS has been developed, a cognizant TC will be needed.

Ms. Scoggins moved and Mr. Mehboob seconded that

1. The Task Force on Building Decarbonization provide either a TPS for a new standard or an informative appendix to an existing standard, on operational carbon, for submission to the proper body before the ASHRAE 2022 Winter Conference.

Ms. Scoggins stated that a presidential discussion is needed with leaders of the task force, requesting deliverables and a timeline.

Members of ExCom expressed agreement with Ms. Scoggins.

Mr. Macauley stated that he would like to shorten the timeline and request deliverables from the TFBD before the fall BOD meeting.

Mr. Mehboob moved that

2. MOTION 1 be amended as follows:

The Task Force on Building Decarbonization provide ~~either~~ a TPS for a new standard ~~or~~ and an informative appendix to an existing standard, on operational carbon, for submission to the proper body before the ASHRAE 2022 Winter Conference.

MOTION 2 failed to second.

The Committee continued discussion of MOTION 1.

Mr. McGinn stated that an appendix allows information to get out the quickest; the scrutiny and timeline for an informative appendix is much shorter than a standard.

Ms. Scoggins spoke against the motion. She stated that she did not think the motion was necessary. Presidential direction is needed. If there is a TPS before Vegas, could be ready for a standard by January.

Mr. Littleton expressed agreement with Ms. Maston and Mr. Mehboob. He stated his opinion that an informative appendix and additional standard are needed. He stated that he did not think that this body or the TFBD can tell a cognitive SSPC what to add to their standard and that it would be undue influence for ExCom to do so.

Ms. Scoggins withdrew the motion and Mr. Mehboob objected.

Mr. Schwedler advised the body that the motion, if passed, would constitute undue influence and should be voted down.

Mr. Macauley called MOTION 1 to question.

CALL TO QUESTION PASSED (5:1:0, CNV).

MOTION 1 FAILED (1:4:1, CNV)

Mr. Schwedler will communicate with the co-chairs of the TFBD of the general direction that ExCom feels would be beneficial for the task force to take.

Mr. Mehboob recommended that the TFBD be given clear direction from the president.

Ms. Scoggins stated that when task forces are formed the goal is for them to sunset themselves when the work is complete. She suggested that a discussion for a future meeting could be task forces in general.

Mr. Schwedler stated that the success of the ETF set a precedent for task forces to have free reign.

Mr. Mehboob stated that the success of the ETF had a lot to do with the leadership of that group.

DISCUSSION

Closing Thoughts

Members of ExCom shared their closing thoughts, suggestions for strategic direction for the Senior Officers meeting, and suggestions for future meetings. Comments are summarized below.

Mr. Macauley - It was a great meeting format that covered some important topics; the group came up with great ideas and action items. He added that he would like to see this format used more for both ExCom and the BOD. There was frank and open discussion with respect for different points of view and this is hopefully a format that can be replicated at the BOD level.

He suggested that the senior officers discuss equity programs and diversity initiatives. Are there opportunities for Society to be more philanthropic? Are there fundraising opportunities for more philanthropic initiatives?

He thanked President Schwedler for his hospitality and the group for an enjoyable retreat.

Mr. Brandt - Thanked President Schwedler for hosting. Expressed that it was fantastic to be face to face again. There was lots of good discussion - smaller groups are more easily able to respectfully disagree.

He suggested that senior leadership discuss creating a smaller BOD. As times goes on, a smaller BOD will help Society move forward.

The Senior Officers portion of the meeting may need to be eliminated.

Mr. Mehboob - Thanked President Schwedler for hosting and for his hospitality.

The sooner Society modifies Roberts Rules of Order, the better. Have to come to the realization that the BOD is not going to shrink itself and leadership needs to examine an alternative path to shrink the BOD.

He stated that full transparency is needed; everything leadership does should be out of executive session as much as possible and reported to the members. There is nothing wrong with having non-ASHRAE members come in to train and share.

Senior Officers need to think about growth opportunities.

Ms. Scoggins - So great to have face to face meetings; encouraged ExCom to have face to face meetings whenever possible.

There is no body recognized as Senior Officers in any governance documents. The Senior Officers meeting should have no motions and no final decisions made. The only advantage of this meeting is continuity of leadership.

The BOD will not make itself smaller. Smaller discussion groups are an option for the BOD at its current size. A SWOT analysis is needed.

Mr. Littleton - This was a fantastic meeting and was very energizing.

Senior Officers can discuss leading boldly, making quick and decisive decisions. Society tends to be very risk adverse and every now and then calculated risks need to be taken. Very good at perceiving the legacy of the way we've always done things. Pushing decisions down is positive as long as there is strong leadership at the committee level.

Will be taking great messages and energy back to the staff team.

Mix of meetings and social events was a great format; suggest extending the meeting times.

Mr. Schwedler - Had no idea how the meeting structure would work. Appreciate members taking ownership of topics. Thought the format worked well and will try it with the BOD in November.

There will be no agenda for the Senior Officers meeting. The focus will be on philosophy and helping things move forward. Where do we look from a visionary standpoint?

He thanked members for their time and contributions. He thanked Mr. Brandt and Mr. McGinn for their perseverance; this was the first time ExCom was able to come together in person during their tenure.

Ms. Maston - Being face to face has been awesome. The meeting had a great discussion format and she learned a lot.

Suggested that Senior Officers consider the role that has been given to ad hocs and task forces. What are the benefits and detractions? Ad hocs and task forces have been a crutch and work around for the BOD. Direction, deadline, and deliverables will help to keep groups focused.

Suggested a think tank that includes non-ASHRAE members.

New product development should be top of mind.

Mr. McGinn - The burning issue is BOD size.

Is there a way to pull the streamlining budget and allow the bodies of ASHRAE to apply that funding? If not, it will be years before anything meaningful can be done.

Not sure why the Vice Presidents aren't able to participate in the Senior Officers meeting.

He thanked President Schwedler for organizing the meeting and social events.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:34 am.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'JH Littleton', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Jeff H. Littleton, Secretary