

Rebecca,

Thank you for your work on the Commercial Oven specification, and Draft 2.

Comments from Duke Manufacturing:

- Agree with notes starting at lines 129, 149, and 161
- No objection to notes starting at lines 201, 240 (these do not pertain to products that we manufacture)
- Agree with notes starting at lines 268, 279, 290, 307, 331, 340.
- Note starting at line 354: Suggest that consideration be made for manufacturers to test/submit data on "worst case" construction (i.e. glass doors vs solid doors, least efficient control) and allow listing of a model number family. In many cases, this same "worst case" criteria is used by ETL/UL/CSA, (as examples of regulatory agencies) for evaluating construction safety/temperature testing. Duke Mfg. already has established a unique model number to each combination of variables within a model family, but it would be preferable to list the complete model family if the worst-case model complies. In the event that the worst-case model does not pass, we would then list the individual models that do.
Suggestion to evaluate the influence of controls: FSTC could run tests on a typical oven fitted with three different controls (electro-mechanical, solid state digital, programmable electronic types) to quantify idle energy consumption rates. We do not believe this will show significant differences, and if this is agreed to, the "control" variable could be removed as a contributor. Similarly, an idle energy test could be run to prove that glass door construction is worst-case compared to solid door construction option, and models that pass with glass doors could also be listed to pass if they contain higher-efficiency solid doors.
- Agree with notes starting at lines 369 and 378. Please advise date of availability for QPI form and Partnership Agreement for the Commercial Oven Program...we are very interested in starting.

I am looking forward to our discussions at NRA.

Regards,
Rob Reese