

IRCC Minutes

San Diego, CA

October 28 and 29, 1999

1. **Welcome and Opening of Meeting** – Jon Traw welcomed everyone to the meeting. Introductions were made at the CIB TG 37 meeting.
2. **Record of IRCC 7, Australia.** The minutes from Gold Coast Australia were reviewed and a motion was made by Brian Meacham. The minutes carried.
3. **IRCC Web Page, Letterhead and organizational livery.** IT was noted that the issue is being addressed by ABCB and has been contracted out. The address is <http://www.ircc.gov.au>. Waiting on the contractors work. It was questioned whether we would post the members. It was decided to discuss later. Mike Balch noted he would send a copy of the letter head when the Website is ready. The site would be ready in 2 weeks.

Decided that A4 would be the primary paper size used by the committee. Discussed the format of documents in terms of word processing. It was discussed that perhaps RTF and following the CIB protocol which is to have at least a pdf format on the website. Discussed what should be released to everyone and what should have limited access. Decided to have a password system for certain documents.

4. **IRCC Membership (Euro Standards, ISO etc.).** Membership Charter to be distributed and discussed on Saturday. Mike Balch noted that he would like to encourage the participation from other groups to become aware of what IRCC is doing.

Discussed the membership charter at some length. Want to encourage new members but some were unsure as to how you become a member.

The committee reviewed the membership charter. It was decided to waive the written application for the acceptance of Javier Serra as a member of IRCC at the meeting since a consensus was able to be obtained at the meeting.

Discussed a different type of membership for expanding the participation of the committee.

Tony Rackliffe noted that in the previous version he had remembered seeing a section which specifically called out a liason with TG 37 and other organization. It was felt that such relationships are necessary. Bob Bowen suggested another bullet item in the charter where liasions are suggested. Some people may just want to know whats going on but not necessarily participate. Perhaps a reviewer or commenter membership classification to give them a level of input at an earlier stage than those not involved at all.

It was decided to keep the information circulation on the internet and let people know via E-mail.

New lanuage was added to the Membership Charter to reflect liasions such as TG 37 and two levels of membership. (GET LANGUAGE FROM JON). Some debate on the titles of the two membership types. There was discomfort with the term voting membership. Bob Bowen suggested “member” and “associate member.” This issue was debated for some time with some concern that if it is dealt with in too much detail we may miss valuable people. This issue was to followed up after the meeting. Brian Meacham wanted to make sure that there is enough information to use for the Lund Conference therefore this needs some resolution in the near future.

5. **Outcomes and comments on the SFPE Research Agenda Workshop.** Brian Meacham described the meeting held by SFPE which was to prioritized the research needs for the future. The main priorities were:

- **Fire Phenomena (was expected)**
- **Data (expected – wanted more appropriate data)**
- **Focus on Risk (this was an unexpected outcome)**

The risk assesment issue relates very much to this committee.

Jon Traw noted that initially he looked at the conference as US based but he found that it was more international in nature. The individual group he was in got into policy issues under a title called “infrastructure.” He noted the key elements of that discussion.

The infrastructure Items of Jon Traws group at the meeting were as follows:

1. **Science to back up requirements (for codes)**
2. **Lack of technical ability of AHS, Stakeholders**
3. **Lack of credibility and confidence to general community**
4. **Public attitude towrds risk**
5. **Lack of Resources for poolingh research data (independent instance)**
6. **Funding to research institutions, such as universities**
7. **Research on effective boundary condition control**
8. **How absolute are codes? Can you argue that since you are so close, you are within safety factors, and can accept a difference**
9. **How to argue (present case) in order to get the funding “deserved” (percentage wise)**
10. **Government not included (too little involved) to collect data, not to write code**

The process reinforced a common theme. The reports will be available next year.

Brian Meacham noted that the risk approach we are looking at is Risk informed and not a pure risk approach. The arguments are who sets the acceptable risk.

Brian noted that he would have copies of the report for the next meeting. February or March timeframe the report will probably be available.

Jon Traw noted that he would term it more of “informed decision” * **Also he wanted the SFPE report to be a part of the agenda for the next meeting.**

Mike Balch noted that a similar conference will be held in Sydney, Australia and that several ABCB reps will be there and can report on that event.

6. Consideration of progress of documents since IRCC 7.

Referred to Appendix B of the minutes for review action items.

Mandatory line document was sent out by Bob Bowen.

Related legislation – Tony had forwarded comments to Wayne Bretherton. Mike Balch will replace Wayne Bretherton.

Existing Buildings – Discussed paper presented by Beth Tubbs. The relationship between performance based codes and maintenance in terms of a function and maintaining something nice such as cleaning windows. Operational functions are different than the maintenance. Brian Meacham noted that SFPE has lumped them into a Operational and maintenance manual. Mike Balch noted they are getting away from using the term maintenance and using terms such as validation verification. Trying to tie to annual insurance. Olav Berge was interested to see if that performance-based codes would give greater awareness to owners of the issues that need addressing. Other legislation comes into play even more. We have dealt

with a certification program for existing building. Perhaps other issues need to be emphasized besides fire such as health and safety and planning (zoning – flood plane) Brian Meacham noted that we are looking at some type of renewable permit.

Jon noted that there are two issues. One being what we call it. The other is dealing with the issue whether it is necessary that system warrants more cradle to grave approach than regular.

Brian Cashin noted that the warranty of fitness is really only used for things such as lifts.

Bob Bowen noted that not all issues need to be cradle to grave.

Brian Meacham noted that

6 Levels of Essential Criteria. HE felt that it was more to provide an account of information. This information may be helpful with regard to existing buildings.

Jon Traw noted that we need to reference as many other documents as possible. He noted to the committee members that if they see other references to provide to the committee

Mandatory Line. Everyone can provide information on this issue. Paul Everall determined the European structures and will forward to Bob Bowen.

Multiple Levels. Brian Meacham provided a simplified diagram but still needed to provide the associated verbiage. Jon Traw wanted to see not only discussion of each but the relational between each. There was debate over which diagram to use – either the complex or simplified version. Olav felt that the triangle was easier to work with. The mandatory line is flexible but all components are contained within. Bob Bowen felt that the more complex one invokes a clearer picture of the process.

Transition Process. Bob Somerville was no longer in the same department. He had worked upon the document and forwarded it to Mike Balch. Mike is to complete and forward the document.

Italian and French systems. Tony noted that he would rather wait till we publish because the system will change and will be outdated if the information is retrieved now. Discussed at some length the concern that regulations change so often that it is difficult to capture.

The committee discussed the fact that we are looking at an overall framework that does not necessarily become unusable because of changes over time in different countries in their legislative systems. Therefore, even if things change it still serves as a tool in understanding other systems.

Brian Meacham suggested that perhaps we simply talk about the type of systems that exist and not focus on the countries as much. Brian will provide the references to the documents that may be of assistance.

Quality Systems. Olav Berge noted that time needs to be set aside for quality systems development. Jon Traw noted that he would like ICBO to be involved. Beth Tubbs was to be added to the list. Olav Berge and Mike Balch to keep working on this issue.

TradeIssues. Bob Bowen presented a document and noted that to provide him with feedback.

Framework.

7.0 Work Plan. Want to have a work product by CIB meeting in 2001. Brian Cashin thought that we had decided to have additional papers. It was noted that ICBO was willing to republish the document. Brian Meacham remembers that the current document would be streamlined and the more detailed items would come as papers. Mike Balch agreed with Brian.

Framework document and supporting subset documents that go into more detail. Example one on Education.

Looking at simply publishing the framework document by the April Meeting.

April 2-7, 2001 CIB Meeting

Framework Document

- Framework Basic Descriptions
- Not including country experiences

- Supporting Element Documents
 - Electronic Journal
 - Individual Sponsered papers can be either
 - Formality with IRCC
 - No formality but needed

IRCC (mutually supportive activities with CIB)

- Broad Framework
 - Market Boundary
- Support Framework
- Public Policy
- Trade

Decision to investigate or omplement PBC has been made..

Support or PBC

(document audience)

- advisor or implementer?

Possible Order of Topics

1. Market Boundary
4. Technology
5. Education
3. Public Policy
2. Support Framework
6. Process Management

Country Specific removed will reduce by 1/3 and remove fire from technology

Looking at Support for type document not

Under technology the subject of Fire may come out since it is discipline specific.

Bob Bowen noted that we need to look at what the policy makers want to look at. For instance Technology is probably not the first subject we should start with. We will not get public policy makers to read in the current order. Who is the audience?

Are we promoting performance based codes or are we supporting performance based codes. The audience are those who make decisions about regulatory issues. They may already have considered. Bob Bowen feels we are not selling performance based codes and are simply providing support.

The benefit is really the interaction of people

WORK PLAN

- February 2000 we need to decide on the format of the document (Bob Bowen looking at a December release of outline)

- June 2000 meeting in Norway review and discussion of content

- Nov IRCC meeting final draft completed (fine tuning)

- Final Draft December 1, 2000 to Publications

- Document Available March 15, 2001

????????? - This list needs to be addressed one way or the other. I believe it is on hold until the main document has been sorted out.

| Assignments for June 2000 | Name |
|--|--|
| Existing Buildings | Beth Tubbs |
| Multiple Levels of Performance | Brian Meacham |
| Quality Systems | Olav Berge, Mike Balch and Beth Tubbs |
| Document Restructuring etc – get as much resolved prior to the next meeting. (possibly extended outline) | Bob Bowen to prepare |
| Minutes | Beth Tubbs |
| Mandatory Line | Bob Bowen to receive such information from all committee members necessary as to how the regulatory system |
| Related Legislation | Mike Balch and Tony Rackliffe |
| Risk/Criteria Linkage | Brian Meacham |
| Trade Issues | Members to provide feedback to |
| | |
| | |
| | |

9. **IRCC Participation at Conference in Lund.** Program has been set for LUND but no papers have been submitted for IRCC. The revised framework could be discussed. Jon Traw noted that we should accept the slot for the paper that is available. Mike Balch to provide feedback to SFPE for the paper in Lund.

10. Draft IRCC Meeting Schedule

June 19 – TG 37 (Oslo, Norway)

June 20 – IRCC (Oslo, Norway)

June 21 – IRCC (Oslo, Norway)

November – TG37 and IRCC (Toyko or Scuba) Decide on dates in the near future

September/ October 2001 TG 37 and IRCC in the UK

11. **Late Items and other Business.** There was discussion having a booth at the IRCC world congress

12. **Summation of Meeting including actions arising.**

13. **Meeting Close.** The meeting was adjourned at