

Inter-jurisdictional Collaboration Committee

11th Meeting

**12 - 13 April 2001
Gold Coast, Australia**

Summary Record Of Discussions

AGENDA

11th Meeting

Gold Coast, Australia

12 - 13 April 2001

Agenda item	Time	Subject	Page #
		Opening remarks	4
1		Record of IRCC 10 th meeting	4
2		Country updates	4
3		Research Program	11
4		Energy Efficiency Update	14
5		IRCC Document Developments	14
6		International Conference	15
7		IRCC 1 - 10 Action Outcomes	17
8		CIB World Congress/ABCB Building Tomorrow's Future Conference	18
9		ABCB BCA On-line Demonstration	18
10		Other Business	18
11		Next Meeting	20

ATTENDANCE IRCC 11

Brian Ashe (Day 1 only)	Australian Building Codes Board	Australia
Mike Balch	Australian Building Codes Board	Australia
Doug Beller	National Fire Protection Association	United States of America
Olav Berge	National Office of Building Technology and Administration	Norway
Bob Bowen	National Research Council	Canada
Wayne Bretherton	Australian Building Codes Board	Australia
Dick Bukowski	National Institute of Science and Technology	United States of America
Brian Cashin	Building Industry Authority	New Zealand
Ivan Donaldson (Day 1 only)	Australian Building Codes Board	Australia
Steve Durnford (Day 1 only)	Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, New South Wales	Australia
Paul Everall	Department of Environment, Transport and Regions	United Kingdom
Brian Meacham	Ove Arup and Partners	United States of America
John Kennedy (Day 1 only)	Australian Building Codes Board	Australia
Alan Nichols	BRANZ	New Zealand
Kenji Okazaki	Ministry of Land Infrastructure and Transport	Japan
Lam Pham	CSIRO	Australia
Tony Rackliffe	British Board of Agrément	United Kingdom
Javier Serra (Day 1 only)	Directorate General for Housing, Architecture and Planning, Ministry of Development	Spain
Jon Traw	International Conference of Building Officials	United States of America
Beth Tubbs	International Conference of Building Officials	United States of America

OPENING REMARKS

The Chairman, Mr Ivan Donaldson, welcomed members to the meeting.

The proposed Agenda was adopted as the basis of discussion with the following additional items added;

1. Indoor air quality (Bob Bowen)
2. Research opportunities (Mike Balch)
3. The relationship between IRCC and TG37 including the interface with W60 and the frameworks of the CIB committees (Jon Traw)

AGENDA ITEM 1 RECORD OF IRCC10 TOKYO, JAPAN

The minutes were confirmed as an accurate record of the 11th meeting of the IRCC in Tokyo, Japan.

No matters arose from the minutes of IRCC10

Jon Traw moved for minutes to be accepted. This was seconded by Tony Rackliffe.

AGENDA ITEM 2 COUNTRY UPDATES

United States of America

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)

Doug Beller outlined the process being used for the development of the NFPA Building and Life Safety Codes including:

- The structure and general chapter contents of the new building code.
- The technical committees formed to develop -
 - Basic goals and objectives
 - Performance requirements
 - General building code scope – human life and property and non-emergency and emergency movement of people covering safety, public welfare, health and usability

The building code is a dual track code where you can either use a performance-based or prescriptive path.

Times frames and dates for code development, public comment and release is August 2002.

Discussion during presentation:

Mike Balch queried what role public policy makers are playing in the development of the NFPA code. What are the time frames for public comment and is there a need for a cost benefit analysis (CBA)?

General discussion took place regarding the implications of a CBA and who had the responsibility to undertake such an assessment.

Some general discussion took place on scope, specific areas of the code, etc. From this discussion numerous issues that need to be discussed in detail were raised. Olav Berge and Bob Bowen proposed a need for a 'parking lot' for issues that need to be discussed in further detail.

Action: IRCC to place the following additional items in the 'parking lot' of issues that need to be addressed

New Parking Lot Items:

- *Voluntary standards*
- *Review objectives to see why certain items are under particular objectives*

National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST)

Dick Bukowski presented to the group and outlined:

- Expansion on NIST's website to include any data related to various areas of construction for research organisations
- Organising data for web site posting for high performance concrete
- NIST may need to look at mirror sites to enable easy down loading of material

Some general discussion took place including the need for an indexing system

Jon Traw raised the issue from a regulatory perspective about the need for collaborative efforts between research organisations so that duplicating does not occur. Bob Bowen then briefly outlined to the meeting the IRC/NRC's efforts to develop a search engine that would enable a smarter way of searching.

International Codes Council (ICC)

Beth Tubbs and Jon Traw presented to the group an update of the work being undertaken by the ICC in the development of the performance-based building code. A summary of the progress is as follows:

- Final draft of the code is now released with further a public hearing scheduled for late 2001. A final release date will be expected in 2002.
- A general outline of code structure and chapters was provided and the document will include both the code and commentary.
- Approximately 50 code changes have occurred since the last draft as a result of comments received.
- The further code developments include the undertaking of a 'bottom up' analysis as it will clearly explain the code's real intent and enable objectives and performance requirements to be properly defined. The ICC is presently exploring options for collaborative efforts with other code writing bodies to undertake this analysis.

Some general discussion took place about the code and its scope.

Jon Traw added that the code has been developed so that-

- the performance and prescriptive components can be properly separated;
- it addresses the role of qualitative and quantitative requirements. This is especially the case when addressing the role of prescriptive and performance-based standards within the code;
- it offers various levels of performance that enables the policy makers to choose upfront what is expected

Dick Bukowski commented on Jon Traw's comments on performance standards. Standards writing bodies are now recognising that there is a need for standards that will operate within a building regulatory framework. Dick Bukowski is now the US member on ISO TAG 8. This committee is beginning to develop a policy on how to deal with performance-based standards. The idea includes the development of a 'decision tree' that the ISO working group can use to identify if a performance-based standard is required. A guideline on how to develop a performance-based standard will also be prepared.

Bob Bowen commented that standards in the future will need reflect public policy so that they are suitable for building regulatory reference. Presently standards development in some instances is not adequately reflecting the public policy decisions made by regulators. This is part of the parking lot item 1 issue.

Paul Everall commented that a similar situation is happening in the UK and there is a need to ensure that standard writers so that they are suitable for both WTO free trade as well as regulatory purposes

Some general discussion took place about the role of ISO and the development of international standards. Olav Berge added some comments about the EU and CEN and their roles in standards development.

Mike Balch added that in Australia we have an involvement at a National level but there is no building regulatory input at an international level.

General agreement was reached that further discussion needs to take place for IRCC to seek some kind of recognition for input into the standards development process.

Jon Traw spoke to whiteboard comments as follows:

- Suite of prescriptive standards – ISO, CEN, etc.
- Suite of performance standards – new
- Need for dual track – addresses political sensitivities
- IRCC lay out need (document)
 - Due diligence responsibility of regulatory community
 - Specific examples
 - Framework ties

Bob Bowen commented on Jon Traw's strategy. The idea of developing a positive framework to fulfil the performance environment is a good thing. It is important to understand the different paths available for standard development and the needs for codes. Dick Bukowski also supported the proposal.

Action: Group to consider Jon Traw's proposal as part of 'parking lot' items

Canada

Bob Bowen provided an update to the group on the building regulatory reform being undertaken in Canada.

- Canada is now looking more closely at the need for cost benefit analyses when considering code amendments/changes and cost is now to be explicitly considered by NRC building code committees.
- Consultation is currently underway on objectives of the new objective-based code.
- Some provinces (Quebec) are moving all regulatory requirements to objective based approach
- Comment process on building code changes and developments are now being provided using the internet. This has gained a high degree of acceptance with committee members and public comments also now encouraged to be provided this way.
- Feedback received so far on the development of the new objective-based code are –
 - Broad acceptance of the objective based approach.
 - Supportive of the negative wording approach used. This process highlighted that some change to wording needs to occur to simplify the document
 - Accessibility issues were raised. The community has indicated that issues addressing access and facilities for persons with disabilities should be interspersed through out the code rather than located in a dedicated section or specified as a dedicated objective. The present Canadian code objectives are health, safety and accessibility.
- Issues raised for future consideration include
 - Property protection due to a large fire in Ottawa.
 - Pressure to retain acoustic and vibration requirements in future code
 - Development of future code in SGML to provide better flexibility
- The bottom up analysis on the existing NBC has now been completed. As analysis progressed it was evident a consistent approach was required. A manual was developed. This manual has now been used by provincial regulators for other bottom up analyses.
- To overcome problems with information management, NRC are introducing a new integrated management system that enables tracking of process stages, etc.

Spain

Javier Serra provided the group an update of progress in Spain on the development of the new performance-based building code.

- New Building Act passed in 1999 and in force from 2000.
- New Building Code needs to be in force by 2002. Budget sought to enable research to be undertaken and for code development.
- A comprehensive index and regulatory matrix has been developed for new code to highlight inconsistencies with existing code.
- Seeking collaboration with research institutes.
- 18 working groups have been formed and are presently working to develop the first draft by Autumn 2001. Web site contains updates.

- After development of draft code, consultation will occur via web. Amended draft will then be developed taking into account consultation. The consultation process is expected to be complete by end of 2001
- German, English and French versions of the documents will be available on Ministry website

Jon Traw asked what the scope of the new code will be. Javier Serra explained that the code will cover safety, health, amenity, etc. as well as gas installations. Access and facilities for persons with disabilities is covered at a provincial level and will not be in code. However, this maybe introduced in the future.

Javier Serra added that Building Research Institute of Spain is also keen to become involved in IRCC process.

Norway

Olav Berge provided an update to the meeting on the building regulatory reform being undertaken in Norway and of current issues being faced.

- Conflicts between building officials and designers has highlighted the need for further guidelines covering the documentation of performance based solutions
- Regulatory system is now being reviewed to consider the use of electronic communication methods including the possible use of lodgement and assessment of applications for building approval on line. A prototype has now been developed and is to be trialed with some municipalities. The central Government is to pass legislation soon requiring Local Governments to use the electronic approach
- There has been recent fires in homes for the aged (based on aging in place). This has raised a question why these buildings should not be sprinkler protected. This has resulted in a degree of bad coverage for performance-based regulations in media. This has occurred mainly due to a lack of understanding by public and media of performance based concepts.
- The National Office of Building Technology and Administration is working with local governments on auditing techniques. Due complexities involved in auditing some local governments have been working together.

Mike Balch asked about the building application process and asked if the process is being co-ordinated with the planning proces. Olav Berge confirmed that this is occurring and provided some further explanation about the use of electronic documents. He is looking to provide a demonstration of the (electronic) process at IRCC 12.

Doug Beller raised the issue of security of documents and the availability of information to the general public.

General discussion then took place concerning the process and how it will be used.

Brian Meacham commented on the political issues associated with risk and the aged care fires and briefly discussed the risk issues being used by the ICC and societal expectations.

Mike Balch commented that aged care is also an issue in Australia and that new draft provisions for the BCA have been developed and offered to place a copy of the research outcomes on the IRCC web site for members use.

Bob Bowen commented that this appears to be an issue that is being grappled with by all regulators and some general discussion took place about the aged care issue.

Action: Mike Balch to place ABCB aged care research on IRCC website 'new developments'

United Kingdom

Paul Overall outlined that the UK Building Regulations are functional-based regulations supported by 13 approved documents. 6 of these approved documents are currently under review. EC clearance will be required for future regulatory change effective from February 2002.

Other recent changes/developments include:

- Redevelopment of the energy efficiency approved document which is now available on the web site
- Approved document on drainage matters and heat producing appliances will be available in August 2001
- Consultation on new sound insulation requirements that ends 30 April. CBA/RIS forms part of the consultation process. RIS needs to be signed by Minister when placed before parliament
- Approved document on sound insulation to be expanded to address –
 - Internal sound within the same house/SOU. Between bedrooms, between bathrooms, etc.
 - External sound also being addressed.
 - Acoustics in schools
 - Pre-construction testing required. Subject to considerable industry opposition.
- Structural stability approved document is now under review.
- Ingress of water into buildings is also being considered.
- Impact of climate change being investigated.
- New fire safety provisions were introduced late 2000. New guide released for consultation between building control authorities and fire brigades.
- Accessibility currently under review. 2.5 years ago requirements were introduced for all new houses to be accessible.
- Electrical safety may be considered for future inclusion into the building regulations
- New Eurocodes have been developed and hence fire classifications need to be changed in the UK standard.
- Other technical matters being considered –
 - Building security
 - Glass conservatories - presently exempt from regulations
 - Commissioning of buildings

The number of building control officers in the UK is declining. Studies being undertaken for self-certification in low risk building areas so that building control officers can concentrate in high-risk areas.

Scotland carrying out major review of the prescriptive system that is presently being used.

Institute of Building Control has merged with the Royal Charter of Surveyors.

General discussion then took place about the developments in the UK.

Bob Bowen commented that security is an area that is presently addressed (in part) in Canada and these requirements may be removed from the new objective based code.

Public consultation is reflecting that the proposed deletion is most likely as the installation of locks on doors, etc. does not really increase security. Maybe a better way to go is education. PE noted BB comments.

Tony Rackliffe added comments about the conflicts that are occurring in the UK between security and egress.

Brian Cashin questioned if security around the outsides of buildings is addressed. Paul Overall commented that external areas are not considered by the building regulations.

Olav Berge queried why security is not considered analytically like other matters such as safety as security lends itself to standardisation and is purely a political decision.

Bob Bowen commented on the acoustics issue and advised that the NRC acoustics lab had carried out some research to address different levels of performance for various construction techniques. The result was a tool that enables the consumer to test acoustic levels on site for various building types, locations, etc. This enabled people to make objective/subjective decisions. Paul Overall commented that he would like to obtain a copy of these research outcomes.

Japan

Kenji Okazaki recent organisational changes that have occurred in Japan together with developments on the new Building Standard Law - Japan (BSL-J).

There has been a change in Ministry name from Ministry of Construction to Ministry of Land Infrastructure and Transport with 50,000 employees. As part of this restructure the Building Research Institute (BRI) has been divided into 2 – 40% government; 60% a new corporation

The BSL-J amendment was adopted in June 2000. Other areas of development include:

- Issuing new notifications for new, innovative and specific structures
- Unhealthy buildings with poor quality indoor environment being researched. Draft revision to BSL-J being developed
- Preparing revision of barrier free legislation – presently voluntary but looking at making it mandatory for some buildings
- Existing housing stock upgrades for seismic activity

General discussion then took place about the developments in Japan.

Paul Overall queried why the ministries were amalgamated? Kenji Okazaki responded that it was aimed at increasing efficiency.

Mike Balch queried which buildings that barrier free access was now going to become mandatory in? Kenji Okazaki commented that it will address public buildings only.

Jon Traw asked if the seismic upgrade requirements was to apply to all houses including post and beam construction? Kenji Okazaki responded that it is intended to address all houses including the traditional construction method that were constructed prior to current seismic construction requirements.

Javier Serra queried what types of buildings is the sick building syndrome occurring? Kenji Okazaki commented that it was mainly occurring in houses due to materials used. Whilst this is an issue normally expected in commercial buildings, it is becoming an issue in Japan for modern house construction. In traditional houses this was not an issue.

Dick Bukowski advised that NIST is developing from first principles a methodology for assessing indoor air quality.

New Zealand

Brian Cashin provided an update on New Zealand's activities:

The Building Industry Authority (BIA) has been dealing with issues related to legislative restructure. They are currently reviewing the Building Act however, the review is well behind schedule. Preliminary findings include no discussion or suggestion in changing the social goals/objectives.

Other matters under consideration include:

- Dealing with issues related to accessibility, etc. Which buildings do requirements apply? What is considered a 'public building'

Brian Cashin queried what others do in this regard. Ivan Donaldson/John Kennedy and Jon Traw provided feedback and comment outlining the various situations in their respective countries.

- New Zealand is having similar problems with moisture in buildings as being experienced in Canada
- Standards Australia/New Zealand is presently writing a new structural standard. Feedback received from the standards writing body is that the NZBC is too stringent in what is required as it is difficult on determining design methodologies within the standard

Lam Pham responded as he is a member of the AS/NZS committee on the background to the proposed standard changes.

Jon Traw also commented on general structural design principles and the role of structural engineers in design and a performance-based regulatory framework.

General discussion took place regarding qualitative and quantitative standards and their roles and general design principles.

Bob Bowen added that we need to look at what we mean by performance based standard.

Discussion took place around the role of performance-based standards and whether such standards can be referenced as an acceptable solution.

AGENDA ITEM 3 RESEARCH PROGRAM

Brain Ashe addressed the meeting and outlined the paper presented at the CIB conference. The paper discussed the ABCB proposal to manage and establish a research program and that research collaboration amongst the regulatory community is required so duplication does not occur. The paper also discussed long and short-term research – short term 1 – 2 years and long term 5 – 10 years.

Mike Balch commented that Bob Bowen, Jon Traw and he had discussed the issue of the IRCC developing a research program and would like to set aside some time to explore research areas.

Jon Traw sought some clarification on how to establish some priorities and asked if there maybe a linkage between research needs and IRCC work agenda.

Some general discussion took place about research.

Mike Balch proposed that the matter be dedicated some time in Day 2 to discuss the matter in detail.

Bob Bowen commented that the IRCC needs to ensure that any research is subject to peer review. In addition, there is a need to develop a research framework, establish what regulators expect and to develop some guidance for researchers. Jon Traw agreed with Bob Bowen's proposal.

Dick Bukowski commented that research agenda, funding and management of research are all important issues that need to be discussed. He proceeded to address the group and discussed ways in which global/collaborative research can be undertaken. He suggested the following structure–

1. *Develop a global research agenda*

This needs to come from regulators.

Research topics needs to be determined. Best to focus on common research topics. Need to provide brief statement of problem and objective of topic and work product.

2. *Find some funding for the agenda*

Regulatory community needs to make case to own governments. Also need to seek support of local industries where global benefits will occur. Other options through World Bank, EU, etc. Need to use trade barrier as one of the main issues.

Possibly could look at CIB approach where a commission has been established to manage the funds provided by the EU for the PeBBu network.

3. *Open international request for proposals*

Ensure that the submission of proposals is open to everybody. Need to establish a working committee to assess the proposal. Ideally this group should consist of 2-3 experts and 1-2 regulators. Grade proposals in 4 areas –

- Use standard mechanism for review of proposal
- Research outcomes will be meaningful
- Capabilities of the organisation to undertake proposal
- Reasonableness of costs

4. *Manage the agenda to ensure that outcomes are achieved*

2 managers needed –

- Technical manager – looks at technical subject matter
- Financial manager – manages funds

Written quarterly reports to be provided from researchers to technical manager to enable funds to be released. Technical manager to sign off on progress report prior to financial manager paying funds.

Funding for research organisations is renewable yearly.

5. *Need to develop schedule*

Develop schedule and agenda over next 12 months

Funding set up over next 12 months

Needs to be ready to commence by IRCC conference in 2003

Comments on Research Proposal

General discussion took place about Dick Bukowski's proposal.

Mike Balch raised the concept of issues that are on local research agenda and the opportunity to jointly carry out research for common areas.

Bob Bowen thought that the setting up of such a foundation was very complex and difficult. IRCC has not been successful in developing a research agenda to date. Bob Bowen thinks we all need to work through each of our individual priorities in the first instance. Once determined, then it maybe possible to bring them to the table for discussion.

Brian Meacham suggested that one option is to establish a working group of IRCC members to identify issues that need to be researched.

Olav Berge added that we need to determine what research priorities are. IRCC members could table the present research being carried out in their specific countries and from here, areas of research could then look at. The issue of research management also needs to be considered.

Allan Nichols believes that research programs need to be a collaborative effort by regulators and researchers. The concept of a world agenda would be great but it would be difficult to manage and fund. Allan Nichols offered to pass around to members the BRANZ research program.

Paul Everall thought that Dick Bukowski's proposal was too ambitious. It would not be easily to move some of his research funds to such a foundation at this stage. Paul Everall also commented that whenever we are looking at undertaking some research, that IRCC members e-mail each other in the first instance to determine if any research work has been previously undertaken.

Jon Traw added that there needs to be a consultation amongst multiple parties. Maybe the role of the IRCC is not to set the research agenda but rather in the development of a methodology on how to set a research agenda within our specific countries. This could be the first step.

Mike Balch proposed that the members part of the website be used as a vehicle for displaying what each country is doing. Dick Bukowski is to place details of his proposal on the site.

Actions:

1. Relevant components of BRANZ research program to be circulated to members.
2. Members to contact each other whenever a new research topic is to be undertaken to determine any areas of similarities in research.
3. Website to be changed to include a page for members to display current research being undertaken in each country.
4. Dick Bukowski to forward his proposal to Mike Balch for posting on website.
5. Members to evaluate research proposals on website and to try and present a position at IRCC12. Mike Balch and Brian Meacham to review

AGENDA ITEM 4 ENERGY EFFICIENCY UPDATE

Mike Balch introduced John Kennedy to provide an Australian update on energy efficiency matters

John Kennedy addressed the meeting and outlined the ABCB approach to energy efficiency for introduction into the BCA.

The group provided general comments and feedback.

AGENDA ITEM 5 IRCC DOCUMENT DEVELOPMENTS

Mike Balch opened discussion and requested feedback for future IRCC documents. He believed that the IRCC '98 document should be continued to be updated but we need to consider what type of resources and effort needs to occur. Alternatively we could put the document 'on the shelf' and start to develop new documents.

Paul Overall believed that new individual documents should be developed. Brian Meacham suggested that we should focus primarily on new papers but also go back and address the gaps within the existing document.

Brian Cashin suggested that the parts of the document should be taken and refined.

Jon Traw commented that-

1. Segmenting of document would be beneficial
2. There is a need to advise people when the new document is available
3. There is a need to replace existing IRCC document
4. We should aim to have updated segments of the document to be available at 2003 conference

Brian Meacham advised that the group needs to consider what products are to be available at 2003 conference – new document; revised segments?

Mike Balch believes that both the new document and revised/expanded papers should be available..

Doug Beller explained the document that has been included in agenda papers.

Some general discussion took place about IRCC papers and documents.

Action:

1. Members to review document in agenda papers and provide feedback direct to Doug Beller. Deadline for comments end of June 2001
2. Revised paper to be placed as an agenda item and considered at IRCC12
3. IRCC members to revise documents and segments so that they are available for the 2003 conference.

AGENDA ITEM 6 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mike Balch opened discussion and outlined the objective of the conference as to –

- Market the IRCC and lift its overall profile to building regulators, research community and the building industry generally.
- To address concerns over the research issue

Timing for conference was discussed. Mike Balch tabled options for North America possibly the US or Canada

Tony Rackliffe thought we could look at the EU. Mike Balch had some concerns with becoming involved in somebody else's forum.

Jon Traw commented on the recent San Diego conference involving researchers and regulators. This has shown that researchers are obviously interested in the regulatory arena. The organising of a conference needs great commitment and he is willing to offer this commitment if the group decides to hold the conference in the US. Jon Traw suggested that it be held in Clarke County. He has already held some preliminary discussions about possible activities and proposes that the conference be 5 days long involving a case study component in the centre. Proposal is for March/April 2003.

Brian Meacham proposed a question to the European members and sought comments on the feelings of other EU countries. Olav Berge responded that if the conference was held in Europe then it would open opportunities for other countries to attend but it would mean that further partnering would be needed and possibly result in the IRCC losing the lead in the partnership.

Mike Balch believed that this would defeat the purpose of the IRCC holding the conference.

Some general discussion took place about the conference.

Dick Bukowski offered some support with the conference organising.

Paul Overall agreed with the aims of the conference which Mike Balch outlined and this is why the IRCC would need to take the lead. However, if the conference was to be held in the EU, some form of partnering would be required. He proposed that one possible option is to sell the conference through the new consortium of European building control. This could serve as a support mechanism in the EU region.

Bob Bowen commented that we need to make a decision today about the conference location and timing. The conference needs to focus on how research would flow into a regulatory environment. Topical issues addressing emerging issues and how they can fit into the regulatory framework needs to occur. This is where the IRCC can offer the lead.

Bob Bowen generally supported the US location.

Jon Traw has spoken to CIB about possible sponsorship and what they would expect. CIB comments were that they seen IRCC's activities as an advantage to CIB. The PeBBu (thematic) network has provision for funding where it was considered valuable to the agenda of the network. CIB was open to the idea that they would be a sponsor and leaving the control to IRCC.

Jon Traw added that we need to look at streams and for leaders within IRCC membership to manage the streams.

Mike Balch suggested that the IRCC should explore opportunities with the new Consortium of European Building Control and the IRCC could possibly meet with them in Spain in Oct/Nov 2002. This would also be a combined meeting with CIB TG37

Brian Meacham had some concerns with future meeting schedule dates.

General discussion took place about dates, etc.

Mike Balch suggested that consideration be given to holding some meetings in non-member countries. Some general discussion then took place around this issue.

The following time and meeting locations were then discussed:

Oct 2001	Ottawa, Canada
June 2002
Oct 2002	Madrid, Spain
April 2003	Clarke County, USA (IRCC conference)
Oct 2003	London, UK
May 2004	Ottawa, Canada (CIB Congress)

Agreement was reached on all meeting locations except the meeting in early/mid 2002. This is to be locked in at next meeting.

Mike Balch asked Jon Traw what he needed to take away with him so he can begin to organise the conference. Jon Traw suggested that we need to consider a theme and identify a small working group to begin to look at general arrangements. He added that he would advocate the use of a combination of approaches to conference presentations.

General discussion took place regarding the conference.

Mike Balch suggested that parallel streaming should not be the first option explored.

Paul Everall believed interaction should be encouraged.

Beth Tubbs suggested the option for facilitated activities.

Working group consisting of Dick Bukowski, Jon Traw, Bob Bowen, Paul Everall and Mike Balch was formed to look at the initial concepts.

Jon Traw suggested that the theme should be discussed now so that the working group can take that away and move forward.

The program committee will consist of all IRCC members. Sponsorship representation to be considered for membership where necessary.

Brian Meacham suggested that the organising committee be drawn from regional areas so that each IRCC membership region is represented. The organising committee members agreed to were:

- Doug Beller
- Olav Berge
- Bob Bowen
- Wayne Bretherton
- Paul Everall (maybe David Smith)
- Kenji Okazaki
- Brian Meacham
- Beth Tubbs

Need to look at seed funding and sponsorship. Jon Traw believes sponsorship needs to come from a more global perspective if possible.

Conference theme discussion then took place. Key words like ‘building’, ‘innovation’, ‘systems’, ‘opportunities’, ‘future’, ‘built environment’, etc. were discussed. The title needs to be catchy but broad. Jon Traw to take these words away and seek some input from his marketing personnel.

Action:

1. Consider options for early/mid 2002 meeting location to be finalised at IRCC12
2. General agreement was reached for conference location and that we communicate with the EU organisations on conference. Conference length will be 5 days in total with site visits/case studies in the middle.
3. Working group (Dick Bukowski, Jon Traw, Bob Bowen, Paul Everall and Mike Balch) to develop initial concepts and streams and seek comment from organising committee
4. Jon Traw to develop title and circulate it to members for comment/agreement

AGENDA ITEM 7

IRCC 1-10 ACTION OUTCOMES

The meeting reviewed IRCC10 work plan and the tasks listed.

Bob Bowen commented that the first page of country systems for Canada was a generic comment and is not part of the Canadian system but is to be placed at the beginning of the page.

Brian Meacham needs to provide greater detail for the model risk framework for further IRCC use. Brian advised that this is similar to the papers presented in Melbourne and Wellington.

Parking lot matrix discussed. Matrix to be updated and circulated with minutes.

Terminology paper needed. Jon Traw and Tony Rackliffe to develop.

Action:

1. Revise country system part of web site so that first page of Canadian approach is a generic document that applies to all countries.
2. Add terminology paper to work program for Jon Traw and Tony Rackliffe
3. Update work plan as part of minutes and circulate to members
4. Mike Balch/Wayne Bretherton to review Brian Meacham’s IRCC10 paper and Wellington paper covering multiple levels of performance.
5. Update parking lot matrix as part of minutes and circulate to members
6. Paul Everall to send Mike Balch example Regulatory Impact Statement for posting on website

AGENDA ITEM 8**CIB WORLD CONGRESS/ABCB BUILDING TOMORROWS
FUTURE CONFERENCE OUTCOMES**

General discussion took place amongst members.

AGENDA ITEM 9**ABCB BCA ON LINE DEMONSTRATION**

Not demonstrated due to time constraints.

AGENDA ITEM 10**OTHER BUSINESS****Item 10a - Membership Charter**

Jon Traw raised some concerns regarding the membership charter and the future directions of the IRCC. IRCC started as a regulators committee to develop a model framework for performance based regulatory. He raised concerns with other organisations using the IRCC work as the basis of their own without recognition. Jon Traw would like the membership charter revisited for these reasons to see where membership currently lies and to consider its future direction. He sees membership should primarily be limited to regulatory based organisations however, sees no reason why other organisation representation can occur from time to time where necessary.

Mike Balch then asked for comments from each member:

- Brian Meacham believes that the IRCC should be limited to the regulatory community. If the IRCC is not limited to the regulatory community then it could not have maximum impact and would dilute the focus. Brian supports Jon Traw's proposal
- Kenji Okazaki also agrees that members should represent the regulators.
- Brian Cashin agrees with Jon Traw's comments
- Doug Beller also agrees with the proposal although, the broader the perspective, the better the outcomes.
- Paul Everall sees this forum as a very useful arena for regulators to discuss issues.
- Dick Bukowski sees the key aspect of the IRCC is to get together and share experiences.
- Mike Balch also agrees with the tabled proposal but recognises the input of others to the work program so far.
- Beth Tubbs sees the IRCC as very important to enable regulators to focus and the inclusion of others may detract from this.
- Tony Rackliffe sees his attendance as by default prior to the UK joining. This will probably be his last meeting and would like to be maintained as a corresponding member.
- Olav Berge believes that membership really needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis.
- Bob Bowen sees that membership should be the lead regulatory body of specific countries. There is no other forum where this occurs. He has also seen an issue with being quoted out of context by non-members who have attended meetings.

There was clear consensus within the group that the IRCC membership should be the peak regulatory body of specific countries.

General discussion then took place about the implications of a revised membership charter.

Mike Balch queried what happens to current members who will not meet new membership requirements?

Jon Traw also raised the issue of multiple memberships from an organisation.

Tony Rackliffe wondered how the European Consortium of Building Control fits in?

Mike Balch commented that the relationship would be similar to TG37.

Paul Everall believes that the membership charter doesn't need a lot of change as the emphasis is already on what the group has agreed.

Brian Meacham agreed with Paul Everall's comments. He also doesn't think that multiple levels of membership are a good idea as this may affect focus.

Mike Balch sought comment from other members that the decision on membership may affect.

Dick Bukowski commented that the reason that he is here is so that NIST can understand what the research needs of the regulators are and so that NIST can shape their research program to meet industry needs.

Discussion took place about multiple levels of membership.

Bob Bowen believes that those members that strictly do not meet membership requirements and are not actively involved in the work program should not be attending meetings.

The members that are affected by Jon Traw's proposals are Brian Meacham, Dick Bukowski and Tony Rackliffe.

Jon Traw asked for comments from each of these members.

Brian Meacham would like to participate but would not like to see the IRCC change the rules to allow him to participate. His continued involvement could be achieved by links and invited participation on specific issues. Jon Traw queried if Brian Meacham needs some form of formal membership to enable participation from his organisation. Brian advised that this is not necessary. This could be achieved by the IRCC writing to his organisation and requesting participation. This would have far more importance than membership.

Dick Bukowski would describe his situation similar to Brian Meacham's. NIST doesn't have a strong interest in building codes but does have strong interests in standards and trade. He has been able to demonstrate to his management what the needs and wants of the regulatory community are. This enables them to develop research to meet these needs.

Mike Balch queried what the IRCC needs to do to enable Dick Bukowski/NIST involvement.

Bob Bowen added that it is important that members be allowed to bring guests along.

Beth Tubbs thinks the where joint meetings occur, IRCC and TG 37 have only one specific overlap day.

Mike Balch suggested that the relationship between IRCC and TG 37 needs to be revisited.

Discussion then took place concerning the general relationship between IRCC and other groups.

Mike Balch suggested that the only words that need to be deleted from the charter is the 'and or application'. In addition, the section concerning meetings to be amended so as to enable members to bring along guests.

Jon Traw posed a motion to give permission to the secretariat to delete these words.

The motion was carried.

Action:

1. Mike Balch to amend charter to reflect agreement reached.
2. Brian Meacham and Dick Bukowski to advise Mike Balch who the IRCC is to contact to seek their participation.
3. Mike Balch to write to Brian Meacham's and Dick Bukowski's organisations seeking their participation

Item 10b - TG37 and W60 Updates

Beth Tubbs outlined to the group the outcomes of the CIB World Congress meetings of TG37 and W60 and tabled some documents detailing performance system model framework and linkages.

Issues discussed at the meetings include:

- Standards linkages
- Overall structure of performance based systems.
 - Explain how it works
 - Study of performance requirement and interaction with performance criteria and verification methods
- Communication of concepts
 - Expectations and perceptions – designers vs politicians vs community
- Decision support
 - Tools
 - Methodologies,
 - Etc.

Work plan:

- Following up the 4 papers as presented at CIB conference
- New paper explaining the general structure
- Presentation of papers at both Melbourne conference (2002), IRCC conference (2003) and next CIB world congress (2004)

General discussion took place about the TG37 general work program.

AGENDA ITEM 11 DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

Next meeting in Ottawa, Canada, October 2001. Date to be confirmed.