

**Draft Minutes
Inter-Jurisdictional Regulatory
Collaboration Committee
August 8, 9 & 10, 1997 Meeting
Calgary, Canada**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the host Russ Thomas who welcomed the group to Canada.

II. Attendees

Mr Hiroichi Kawashima, Deputy Director, Building Guidance Division, Housing Bureau, Ministry of Construction, Japan

Dr. Russell Thomas, Senior Advisor, Canadian Codes Centre, National Research Council of Canada

Mr Jon Traw, President, International Conference of Building Officials, USA

Mr. Brian Cashen, Legal Advisor, Building Industry Authority, New Zealand

III. Chairman and Secretary

The question was asked as to what the committee wanted to do relative to the chairman and secretary for this meeting since the decision was delayed to this meeting from the meeting in Los Angeles on the basis of anticipating further attendees. Rather than selecting a permanent chairman the group decided to have the host member act as chairman when the meeting was in their country. For secretary to the committee, the group decided to accept the offer of the Australian members to act as permanent secretary of the committee. Since the Australian representative was not present, Jon Traw offered to act as the secretary for the meeting in Calgary only.

V. Brief Update of each Countries Performance Based Code Effort

Each of the country representatives provided an update on the current status of developments within their country.

a) Canada

Russ Thomas explained that Canada was still moving the country to the use of objective based codes. He stated that the choice of using the objective-based description rather than performance-based was to address concerns their group felt would exist within the design, construction and enforcement segments of the industry. Further that the difference in descriptions would not in his opinion affect the work of this committee. They are using a committee composed of representation of the construction industry consisting of approximately 20 people who meet quarterly. The National Research Council's role is to produce the model code documents.

b) United States

Jon Traw explained that the development process in the United States by the International Code Council was proceeding on schedule and that their committee was looking strongly at the Australian Model but was open to all concepts.

c) Japan

Hiroichi Kawashima explained that Japan has a very centralized form of creation of regulations for building construction through the Ministry of Construction. They have a specific directive to put in place a performance-based code. He stated they have had several amendments since 1989 of which the most

important was the allowance for three story residential structures. Indicated they are developing a document which examines the current prescriptive provisions. Currently drafting the code for introduction in Feb 1998. Diet to approve prior to June 1998 then will be ready for promulgation (publication) in June 1998. July 1999 set as date for application of a performance-based code to new construction.

d) New Zealand

Brian Cashin gave a very detailed explanation of the system in place in New Zealand. He also commented that the question of durability can in their opinion be addressed. The group was especially interested in learning how the code was applied to the handling of historic buildings.

V. Committee Membership Status

The question of additional membership on the committee was raised as it relates to a specific request received from the National Fire Protection Association. Traw indicated that he would check with other representative groups in the International Code Council and see if they have any objection and report back to the committee.

(Footnote: No objections raised so an invitation to NFPA could be extended).

VI. Review of Draft Outline and Current Text Contributions

The group reviewed the handouts from the members and concluded that there was a need to further discuss the organization of the report. It was concluded that the issues draft document prepared at the prior meeting was good as the first step but it was not the format necessary for further refinement. It was decided to take the text proposals and fit them under the most appropriate issues statements. The group members took segments of the texts and agreed to review them in the evening and be prepared to make a recommendation as to proper placement as the first order of business on the following day.

The group then turned to discussing the current legislative and enactment authority for each of the countries and outlined a flow diagram of the various systems (See Exhibit 1). It was the consensus that the members needed to understand both the commonalities and differences in order to be better prepared to draft new text and comment on submitted text. It was also felt the flow diagram would be useful in graphically representing the system for further discussion at future meetings.

The group also discussed the current systems used for the evaluation of products and system for the same reason as above and constructed a flow of the processes (See Exhibit 2).

Attention was then turned to examining the outline of issue to determine several important points including but not limited to:

- a) Are their duplicates.
- b) Can several items be covered by a revised issue statement.
- c) Have they been properly categorized.
- d) Are they clear.

A revised listing of issues was prepared and the submitted texts were placed under the new listing resulting in a very rough draft document outline with some amount of text. It was noted that the document at this point may appear disjointed to other than committee members but would result in identification of both needed text development and editorial review.

The group also agreed to a modified layout for the report which is reflected in the revised draft document. In addition, the format should allow for a general subdivision within each section as follows::

General

Country Specific
Australia
New Zealand
Canada
United States
Japan
Summary

VIII. Assignment of tasks for next meeting.

Assignments for next meeting:

Australia (Mike) - Section 2.3
New Zealand (Brian) - Section 2.4
Canada (Russ) - Section 2.5
United States (Brian) - Section 2.1 & 2.2
United States & Japan (Hiroichi & Jon) - Section 1.0

Each individual to review the draft document and edit and add for distribution for committee prior to next meeting.
Discussed formatting issues.

IX. Other Business.

Russ reported on ISO recent activity and indicated that a representative of the United States who was participating in the CIB was pushing for the creation of a new SC14. The scoping of their task is being questioned by some since it appears they are developing a code covering the performance for attached and detached single family dwellings.

IX. Future meeting dates.

Nov 8,9&10 in Tokyo
Tentative February, 1998 in Australia. Need to ask the Australian members about confirming dates

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at _____. (I was not there)