



Shaping Tomorrow's
Built Environment Today

1791 Tullie Circle NE ▪ Atlanta, Georgia 30329-2305 ▪ Tel 678.539.1211 ▪ Fax 678.539.2211 ▪ <http://www.ashrae.org>

Michael R. Vaughn, P.E.
Manager Research & Technical Services

mvaughn@ashrae.org

TO: Michael Sheerin, Chair SSPC 170, michael.sheerin@tlc-eng.com
James Moore, Vice-chair SSPC 170,
CC: Paolo Tronville, Research Liaison Section 9.0, paolo.tronville@polito.it
FROM: Michael Vaughn, MORTS, mvaughn@ashrae.org
DATE: November 6, 2018
SUBJECT: Research Topic Acceptance Request (1864-RTAR), "Investigating the applicability of Standard 62.1's Ventilation Rate Procedure for Healthcare Rooms"

During their fall meeting, the Research Administration Committee (RAC) reviewed the subject Research Topic Acceptance Request (RTAR) and voted to accept it with comments for further development into a work statement (WS) provided that the key comment(s) and question(s) below are addressed to the satisfaction of your Research Liaison, Paolo Tronville, paolo.tronville@polito.it, or RL9@ashrae.net, in the work statement draft.

1. Reason for abstention vote is missing on the front page.
2. It is unclear why Standard 62.1 and Standard 170 should be harmonized.
3. The RTAR should be a more detailed in the approach envisioned.
4. The validation procedure should be described better. Clarify the approach and samples.

The work statement draft must be approved by the Research Liaison prior to submitting it to RAC.

An RTAR evaluation sheet is attached as additional information and it provides a breakdown of comments and questions from individual RAC members based on specific review criteria. This should give you an idea of how your RTAR is being interpreted and understood by others. Some of these comments may indicate areas of the RTAR and subsequent WS where readers require additional information or rewording for clarification.

The first draft of the work statement should be submitted to RAC no later than **August 15, 2020** or it will be dropped from display on the Society's Research Implementation Plan. The next likely submission deadline for a new work statement on this topic is **May 15, 2019** for consideration at RAC's 2019 Annual meeting. The submission deadline after that for work statements is **August 15, 2019** for consideration at the RAC's 2019 fall meeting.

Project ID	1864	
Project Title	Investigating the applicability of Standard 62.1's Ventilation Rate Procedure for Healthcare Rooms	
Sponsoring TC	SSPC 170, Ventilation of Health Care Facilities	
Cost / Duration	\$125,000 / 24 Months	
Submission History	1st Submission	
Classification: Research or Technology Transfer	Basic/Applied Research	
RAC 2018 Fall Meeting Review		
Essential Criteria	Voted NO	Comments & Suggestions
Background: The RTAR should describe current state of the art with some level of literature review that documents the importance/magnitude of a problem. References should be provided. If not, then note it in your comments.		2 - Timely and well described RTAR. 9 - Clearly described, with refs. 10 - Reason for abstention vote is missing on the front page. It is not clear why ASHRAE Strategic plan is listed in the references. In the reference list there is just one ASHRAE Transactions paper and no peer-reviewed journal paper. It's hard to believe that there are no journal paper available on this topic. 8 - good discussion
Research Need: Based on the background provided is the need for additional research clearly identified? If not, then the RTAR should be rejected.		2 - Quite logical. 9 - The question is clearly a valid one. 10 - To reach the goal of saving energy it is necessary to investigate whether the ventilation rates prescribed by Standard 170 are strictly necessary or not. If that was already investigated (and described in the scientific literature) then Standard 170 minimum requirements could be changed, regardless of what is prescribed by Standard 62.1. In other words, Standard 170 does not need to emulate Standard 62.1 for saving energy. SSPC 170 could go ahead and make the appropriate modifications based on scientific evidence. Therefore a research project focusing whether to replace some requirements of Standard 170 with Standard 62.1 ones is not needed. 8 - this environment is rich for reducing over-prescribed ventilation rates.
Relevance and Benefits to ASHRAE: Evaluate whether relevance and benefits are clearly explained in terms of: a. Leading to innovations in the field of HVAC & Refrigeration b. Valuable addition to the missing information which will lead to new design guidelines and valuable modifications to handbooks and standards. Is this research topic appropriate for ASHRAE funding? If not, Reject.		9 - The work is based on RP CO-RP3, a lit review that showed the knowledge basis is incomplete. Definite benefit to ASHRAE by harmonizing different guidance in two standards, using solid scientific basis. 10 - Whether to replace parts of Standard 170 with others from Standard 62.1 is relevant for ASHRAE. However, as discussed above, such way to proceed is questionable.
IF ABOVE THREE CRITERION ARE NOT ALL SATISFIED - MARK "REJECT" BELOW & CONTINUE REVIEW BELOW		
Other Criteria	Voted NO	Comments & Suggestions
Project Objectives: Based on the background and need, evaluate whether the project objectives are: 1. Aligned with the need 2. Specific 3. Clear without ambiguity 4. Achievable If not, then appropriate feedback should be provided.		9 - Two objectives: I) identification of healthcare spaces for which full understanding of conditions can be found, and ii) determine whether 62's approach can be applied. 10 - The objectives are not clearly defined. The preliminary objective is to obtain a "thorough understanding of the types and generation conditions of the healthcare-unique contaminants". What does that mean? What is the expected outcome? The second objective is to determine the value of a constant in an equation so that the new equation would adapt one of the equations in Standard 62.1. However, it is not mentioned what are the criteria for determining such constant. 8 - would like further details on room types, contaminants details, and possible descoping of complex cases.
Expected Approach and Budget: Is there an adequate description of the approach in order for RAC to be able to evaluate the appropriateness of the budget? If not, then the RTAR should be returned for revision. Anticipated funding level and duration:		4 - Expected approach is unclear. It must be clearly specified which actions are field measurements, which are based on surveys etc. The minimum size of samples need to be provided. 9 - Approach is clear, but does not break down the \$125k and 24 month request. 15 - While the need for this work is real, I think the RTAR should be a bit more detailed in the approach envisioned. 10 - Lab testing is checked among the activities without mentioning experimental activity in the text. The validation procedure should be described better.
References: Are the references provided?		10 - There is a list of reference but no peer-reviewed journal paper present.
Decision Options	Initial Decision?	Final Approval Conditions
ACCEPT AS-IS		4 - It is unclear why 62.1 and 170 should be harmonized. Although I understand the need to examine the potential benefits (for energy) by utilizing VRP in the scope of 170 62.1 and 170 refer to two completely different environments with different exposures and different methods protecting against the exposures as well as most likely use different endpoints. 62.1 use comfort endpoint in VRP which by default may not be sufficient in protecting against biological contaminants that may occur in healthcare facilities. 7 - RTAR is well written. Severability across the two primary objectives should be very clear in the Work Statement. 9 - There is a clear need for solid scientific-based guidance to re-concise guidance in Std 62 and 170. Whilst energy efficiency is important, the project should ensure that there is a 'safety net' ventilation rate so as not to compromise occupant health and safety. This aspect should be taken into account. 10 - If scientific evidence about minimum ventilation rates for healthcare facilities is not available yet, then a research project should investigate that, regardless of what is prescribed by Standard 62.1. An exhaustive literature search may help the authors to understand what are the research needs for Standard 170. The reduction in ventilation rates shall not affect the environmental quality of healthcare facilities. For this reason an experimental validation of the findings is important. 8 - address comments on project objectives
ACCEPT W/COMMENTS		
REJECT		

ACCEPT Vote - Topic is ready for development into a work statement (WS).

ACCEPT W/COMMENTS Vote - Minor Revision Required - RL can approve RTAR for development into WS without going back to RAC once TC satisfies RAC's approval condition(s)

REJECT Vote - Topic is not acceptable for the ASHRAE Research Program

Research Topic Acceptance Request Cover Sheet

Date:

(Please Check to Insure the Following Information is in the RTAR)

- A. Title
- B. Executive Summary
- C. Background
- D. Research Need
- E. Project Objectives
- F. Expected Approach
- G. Relevance and Benefits to ASHRAE
- H. Anticipated Funding Level and Duration
- I. References

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Title:

RTAR #

(To be assigned by MORTS)

Results of this Project will affect the following Handbook Chapters, Special Publications, etc.:

Research Classification:

- Basic/Applied Research
- Advanced Concepts
- Technology Transfer

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Responsible Committee:

Date of Vote:

For		<input type="checkbox"/>
Against	*	<input type="checkbox"/>
Abstaining	*	<input type="checkbox"/>
Absent or not returning Ballot	*	<input type="checkbox"/>
Total Voting Members		<input type="checkbox"/>

RTAR Authors

Lead:

Others:

Co-sponsoring TC/TG/MTG/SSPCs (give vote and date)

Expected Work Statement Authors

Lead:

Others:

Potential Co-funders (organization, contact person information):

Has an electronic copy been furnished to the MORTS?

Has the Research Liaison reviewed the RTAR?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Reasons for negative vote(s) and abstentions

RTAR # _____

Title:

Insert proposed project title

Executive Summary

Describe in summary form the proposed research topic, including what is proposed, why this research is important, how it will be conducted, and why ASHRAE should fund it (50 words maximum)

Background

Provide the state of the art with key references (at the end of this document) substantiating it (300 words maximum)

Research Need

Use the state of the art described above as a basis to specify the need for the proposed effort (250 words maximum)

Project Objectives

Based on the identified research need(s), specify the objectives of the solicited effort that will address all or part of these needs (150 words maximum)

Expected Approach

Describe in a manner that may be used for assessment of project viability, cost, and duration, the approach that is expected to achieve the proposed objectives (200 words maximum).

Check all that apply: Lab testing , Computations , Surveys , Field tests , Analyses and modeling , Validation efforts Other (specify) ()

Relevance and Benefits to ASHRAE

Describe why this effort is of specific interest to ASHRAE, its impact, and how it will benefit ASHRAE and the society. How does it align with ASHRAE Strategic Plans and Initiatives? How does it advance the state of the art in this area in general? Are there other stakeholders that should be approached to obtain relevant information or co-funding? (350 words maximum)

Anticipated Funding Level and Duration

Funding Amount Range: \$_____

Duration in Months: _____

References

List the key references cited in this RTAR

Feedback to RAC and Suggested Improvements to RTAR Process

Now that you have completed the RTAR process, RAC is interested in getting your feedback and suggestions here on how we can improve the process.