



Inter-jurisdictional Regulatory Collaboration Committee

IRCC 15 Autumn 2003

Minutes of Meeting

Washington DC, USA. 6 November 2003

Present

Bob Bowen, IRCC, Canada **(BB)**
David Smith, CEBC, RICS, ODPM, UK **(DS)**
Javier Serra, MOD, Spain **(JS)**
Olav Berge, NOBTH, Norway **(OB)**
Brian Meacham, Arup **(BM)**
Wataru Gojo, NILIM, Japan **(WG)**
Tomoki Sera, MLIT, Japan **(TS)**
Wayne Bretherton, BIA, New Zealand **(WB)**

Richard Bukowski, NIST, USA **(RB)**
Milosh Puchovsky, NFPA, USA **(MP)**
Beth Tubbs, ICC, USA **(BT)**
Brian Ashe, ABCB, Australia **(BA)**

Apologies

Paul Everall, ODPM, UK **(PE)**
Brian Cashin, BIA, New Zealand **(BC)**

Rick Okawa, ICC, USA **(RO)**
Mike Balch, ABCB, Australia **(MB)**

Observers

Frangoise Szigeti, ICF, CIB 60, Canada **(FS)**
Richard Kuchnicki, ICC, USA **(RK)**
Mariana Llinares, IET, Spain **(ML)**
Pilar Linares, IET, Spain, **(PL)**
John Traw, Traw Associates, USA **(JT)**

Jose Posada, MOD, Spain **(JP)**
Mamoru Kohno, BRI, Japan **(MK)**
Shigetaka Takamiya, ABCB **(ST)**
Nico Scholten, TNO, Netherlands **(NS)**
Denis Bergeron, NRCC, Canada **(DB)**

List of Actions from IRCC 15

| ID | Action | Action by |
|-----------|--|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Review membership charter, and ensure correct charter is on IRCC web-site. | Secretariat |
| 2 | Weather tightness, moisture management and mould growth is a systemic issue and should not be considered in isolation. Should be placed in parking lot. | Secretariat |
| 3 | Australia scoping study on sustainability. URL address to be provided to IRCC members. | BA |
| 4 | URL link to Inter Agency Security Commission | BM |
| 5 | Retrospective application of codes to existing building to be placed in parking lot. Each member should provide a flow chart of system in each jurisdiction outlining the systems and the various triggers | Secretariat All IRCC members |
| 6 | Competing objectives of code requirements to be added to parking lot. | Secretariat |
| 7 | Those members with a 3 tier Government, should provide IRCC members with a case study showing how code is enforced and used. | All members with a 3 tier system |
| 8 | Current review of housing affordability in Australia to OB. | BA |
| 9 | Paper on QA systems to be forwarded to WB. | OB / BM |
| 10 | Forward draft of International Fire Safety Engineering Guidelines to DS for consideration. | BA |
| 11 | IRCC Document development. Report on what needs to be done. | RO |
| 12 | ABCB protocol document for reference documents to BB. | BA |
| 13 | Reference standards to be placed in parking lot. | Secretariat |
| 14 | One pager on Sustainability in Australia. (to start the process) | BA |
| 15 | Egress for people with a disability. Details of activities in each country to be sent to ABCB. | All IRCC members. |
| 16 | Information to be provided to OB on electronic approval systems in the USA. | BM and BT |
| 17 | Extension of IRCC membership to be put on agenda for next meeting. | Secretariat |
| 18 | Frequency of meetings to be put on agenda for next meeting. | Secretariat |
| 19 | Strategic direction of the IRCC to be put on agenda for next meeting. | Secretariat |
| 20 | Chairmanship of the IRCC to be put on agenda for next meeting. | Secretariat |
| 21 | Discussion on the next Summit should be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. | Secretariat |
| 22 | Setting dates for next meet in Canada. | BB |
| 23 | Proposing dates for the Autumn 2004 meeting in Japan. | TS |
| 24 | Develop calendar for IRCC members. Calendar to be updated by IRCC members, indicating key events. | Secretariat |

Opening remarks

BB opened the meeting and welcomed the members and visitors. He also provided an outline on the way the meeting takes place and discussion around the agenda. He outlined that it is a joint IRCC/TG37 meeting.

BB thanked NIST for providing facilities for the IRCC and the TG 37 meetings.

RB then outlined general logistics for the meeting.

This was followed by a general introduction of new members.

BB then outlined how the meeting takes place and the protocol of the meeting in regards to confidentiality and frankness of discussion.

Agenda Item 1 Additions to the agenda

BB requested additions to the agenda under other business.

- The chair appointment.
- Frequency of meetings.
- Under parking lot we should add quality management.

RB had arranged for an overview of the NIST program BEES. The other thing **DB** has suggested, depending on time, which we look at, is the durability apparatus.

BM has suggested that we continue discussions and have an evening session.

BM suggested that the meeting should also discuss the invitation to other countries to join the IRCC.

Agenda Item 2 Record of IRCC Madrid meeting

BB sought comments on the minutes of the last meeting.

BB asked the Secretariat to look at the membership charter and the need for it to be checked and to make sure that the correct charter was on the web site. **[ACTION]**

No matters arising from the minutes of IRCC Autumn meeting in Madrid.

The minutes were accepted.

Agenda Item 3 Country Updates

(In additions to the notes below, reference should also be made to the presentations by the country representatives)

BB commented that there is a need to make sure that we don't go over old news and that we address new issues that have arisen since the last meeting.

Canada

DB provided an overview – see Canada update.

On fire research in houses: **BA** asked a question around the housing fire research. **BB** then gave an overview of why this research work is being undertaken. Some general discussion took place around the research and tests such as residential sprinklers, etc.

On mould: **OB** asked if the mould research has included looking at what other research has been undertaken by others. **BB** responded as to what the research approach includes.

General discussion took place as to the health affects of mould and the issues that are being found. The risk associated with mould is one of the biggest issues being considered by Canada's Building Technology Transfer Forum (which is a committee of provincial and federal governments public works agencies who are responsible for government buildings and in some provinces schools).

BM commented that this issue should be looked at as a systemic issue and not in isolation. Item for inclusion in parking lot **[ACTION]**.

On sustainability: **BA** commented that the ABCB had looked at a scoping study on sustainability. **WB** added that NZ has also built on the back of this work to look at the inclusion of sustainability in the new Building Bill. **BA** to send link to scoping study. **[ACTION]**

On climate change: **BM** wondered what the scope of this project maybe. **OB** commented that Norway had done some work here and will provide coordinates of where to find this work. **BM** commented that there has also been some work done in the US.

On energy: **BB** commented on the problems with national model codes and the lack of commitment at provincial level to adopt. **OB** suggested that it might be worthwhile looking at the EU Directives for the arguments that have been used.

On security: A request is being considered to develop guidelines for security of buildings . This is being driven by Public Works and Government Services Canada and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with IRC as the possible executing agency to have the guideline developed. . Guideline will follow same format as the objective based code. First target will be office buildings, especially for Government buildings. This document will become part of the Government procurement system for acquiring buildings. The document would not be mandated but will be a compatible document with the building code. **BM** commented that the US Government has also done a lot of work in this area such as through the Inter Agency Security Commission. These documents are available publicly. **BM** to send coordinates of where to find documents **[ACTION]**.

United Kingdom

DS provided an overview. See presentation for details.

DS presented the outcomes from the recent 'Better Building Summit' in the UK. He discussed the influence of the EU Energy Directive on the built environment. **DS** commented on the problems of meeting the building air tightness requirements, and the requirement for training of the enforcer's particular in air tightness measurement. The ODPM have developed a FAQ section to there web-site to assist in education and training.

The relevant authorities are considering the possible effects of climate change to built environment. Considerations include subsidence risk, wind loading, and rain penetration.

On sound insulation **DS** commented that the existing requirements are over 50 years old and the requirements are currently being revised. Napier University, Edinburgh has undertaken a major project to development 'Robust Details' (deemed to comply construction details) to be included in the approved document. **JS** also commented that as a result of a EU Directive members countries are currently developing provisions to limit external noise penetrating the external envelope.

The OPDM are currently considering the inclusion of 'Electrical Safety' in the building regulations.

Spain

JS provided an overview. See handout for details

JS commented on the development of the draft Building Code. Public comment has ended, and 2,600 comments were received. The majority of the comments related to the complexity of the hierarchy. As a result of the comments this area has been simplified. **BB** queried the consultation process in Spain, and whether it was necessary to issue of a second public comment.

The draft Building Code has considered all relevant EU directives, Eurocodes and reaction to fire tests. The draft Technical Documents have been translated to the official EU languages and are currently being considered by the EU.

Japan

TS provided an overview. See handout for details

TS commented on the recent indoor air quality requirements, detailing with Chlorpyrifos and Formaldehyde. The requirements control interior linings, ceiling cavities and require 24 hours ventilation of habitable areas.

TS explained the Ministerial Approval System for performance evaluation and evaluation bodies. He explained that evaluation bodies can now utilize test data by overseas test bodies to evaluate products and systems for use in Japan.

MLIT are currently focusing on the issue of improvement and the effective utilization of existing buildings. MLIT have reviewed international approaches to this topic.

Retrospective application of codes to existing buildings is to be added to parking lot. Each member should provide a flow chart of system in each jurisdiction outlining the systems and the various triggers **[ACTION]**

JS asked a question about the permanent ventilation requirements for habitable rooms.

Competing objectives of code requirements is to be added to the parking lot. **[ACTION]**

USA – NIST

During the IRCC meeting NIST staff gave a presentation of the environmental assessment software BEES and the durability assessment apparatus.

RB provided an overview. See handout for details

RB described the NIST work program on the collapse of WTC 1, 2 and 7. The program is basically fact finding. Project 1 (Analysis of Building and Fire Code and Practices) would be of particular interest to IRCC members. The outcomes of this program, once complete, will be provided to IRCC members for consideration. As a result of the administrative provision for the WTC buildings, this study is providing to be an interesting study into 'self certification'.

As a result of the WTC events, the US has established the 'National Construction Safety Team', which will react to any building disaster.

RB presented a proposal for the IRCC to fund FORUM members (national fire testing laboratories) in each of their respective countries. The 'Global Research Consortium' will undertake research of global interest. The first area will be into fire resistance testing. Each IRCC members will be requested to provide US\$100,000 over a two year period. National fire testing laboratories will approach the relevant IRCC member.

| |
|--|
| Meeting reconvened at 'One Washington Circle' at 19:00 |
|--|

USA - ICC

BT provided an overview. See handout for details.

BT circulated a folder containing details on the ICC. The ICC is now officially one company (almost 400 staff) since the amalgamation of ICBO, SBCCI, BOCA and ICC. New CEO appointed, James Lee Witt (ex. FEMA).

The ICC recently had code hearings in Nashville, TN which resulted in 1500 code changes. The ICC does not only develop a building code, it deals with the whole system, including education and training to limit the burden from local jurisdictions. ICC codes have been adopted, in some form, in most US States. Only one State has adopted the ICC Performance Code. It is proposed that a new building code will be developed every 3 years.

BM suggested that those with 3 tier government systems provide IRCC members with case studies showing how code is enforced / used. **[ACTION]**

USA – NFPA

MP provided an update on the performance code. 3 main NFPA documents - building code, life safety code, and fire code. All of these are performance based. Move to performance

based approach due to designers doing equivalent analysis in any case. All 3 documents now under review. 1000 requested changes for the building code; 600 for life safety code.

NFPA also have a code for the protection of cultural assets, that provides additional information that maybe required to protect property and contents. Primarily aimed at museums, heritage buildings, etc.

New document due for release on fire risk assessment methods. Aimed at enforcement authorities and due for release in January 2004. Other potential project to commence work on fire loads for use by designers and another document to look at rail car fire loads. Other documents under development are fire fighter safety, building security and energy code.

NFPA have developed a drafting guide ('primer') for committee members and others on how to develop performance based codes and standards. These are freely available.

NFPA 5000 building code due for adoption in California in 2005. Other states have also now adopted the rehabilitation chapter out of NFPA5000 for dealing with existing buildings.

Legal case (Veck case) – filed a law suit claiming that if a State adopts a code it should be available free. This decision has been upheld in the courts. This is of concern to code developers in the US and has the potential to change how codes are developed in the US.

Norway

OB provided an overview. Government committee currently reviewing the Building and Planning Acts. The committee visited some of the IRCC countries, UK, Canada and Australia, to look at the various procedural rules. Committee's report has listed an issue with performance-based codes. The committee are also looking at introducing time limits in dealing with consents. The requirements penalise local government for every week that they exceed the time limit. This has resulted in local government only being concerned with the time limits and not necessarily the performance of their statutory functions. Committee is also reviewing the effectiveness of the QA process.

Major fire highlighted that there was poor handling by Local Government and Fire service resulting in public outcry. This resulted in the identification of a need for a more holistic approach towards building control. Holistic approach looked at fire engineering analysis. Issue is that the fire authorities did not possess the competence to analyse and understand the approach.

A review has recently been established to monitor building costs, most particularly for housing. **OB** requested input by other members if they have already conducted work in these areas. Especially on the costs that the code may impose. Information would need to address both housing costs and building costs at a national level.

BA commented on the current review on housing affordability in Australia. He will get information to **OB**. **[ACTION]**.

OB also provided an update on the web based lodging process. Issues of compatibility between planning and building drawings. Industry Foundation Class (IFC) system is being

looked at. Singapore also currently uses this procedure and Norway is talking to them about this. IFC is being used to assist in code assessment. **OB** suggested that Singapore should be invited to become a member of the IRCC.

BB asked a question on quality management. Has it been introduced? **OB** outlined that all Norwegian firms require their QA system to be approved by the local authority. NOBTA also provide an approval of the QA system. This central approval is really what matters.

WB commented that the QA process is also something that NZ is looking at for local government. **WB** asked **OB** if a copy of the system procedures could be provided. **BM** added that he and **OB** had been working on a paper on the system. **[ACTION]**

New Zealand

WB gave a presentation on the current situation in New Zealand. He outline the content of the two principle reports the 'Hunn report' which dealt with the weather tightness issue and the 'Scary report' which dealt with 'seismic safety'. As a result of the current review in New Zealand the BIA will be abolished (currently working in caretaker mode), and the Central Government, (Ministry of Economic Development) has taken over the running. The review has concluded that the 'pendulum may have swung too far'.

The review highlighted the following key areas:

- The need for product certification (proposal is to establish a Trans-Tasman system.
- A authority will be established to monitor Building Certifiers. Building Certifiers will be audited every 12 months.
- Need for a comprehensive education program, and the 'tooling-up' of the local authorities.
- The review will also result in an increased level of amenity.

OB commented that the QA process would take 4 years to set up. **DS** also added that education and training is a major issue in the UK.

BM commented that the issue is the same in the US and most of the issues that we are identifying are the same as those identified in the IRCC document (1998).

Australia

BA provided a verbal update on the current situation and develops in Australia. See handout for further details.

He outlined that the ABCB will be the subject of a 'Productivity Commission' review, into whether the ABCB should be funded beyond June 2005.

The performance-based building code has been in operation in Australia for over 6 years. Recent develops, in particular the Inquiry in the State of New South Wales, have resulted in the ABCB consider clarification of the system. This has included the clarification of the 'holistic approach' to performance and the need for the proper 'Documentation of Decisions'. This is an ongoing process.

BA also outlined the most recent developments in relation to Standards and the development of reference documents. He outlined that Standards Australia International (SAI) are to be 'floated' on the Australia stock exchange. The ABCB and SAI are currently negotiating a MOU. ABCB have adopted a more strategic approach to the development of reference documents, and public policy will be removed from Standards and placed into the Building Code. The ABCB are also developing a reference document for sprinkler systems, which will meet the performance levels required by the Building Code.

In the international area, the ABCB are active on a number of fronts. **WB** has been seconded to the BIA in New Zealand, to assist in the review and to further develop Trans-Tasman relations. The ABCB, ICC, BIA and NRC are working together to develop 'International Fire Safety Engineering Guidelines', for use in each of the jurisdictions. ABCB are also involved in the EU initiative PeBBu, and along with the Australian research organisation CSIRO, are involved in Aus PeBBu.

DS outlined that the UK may be interested in reviewing the International Fire Safety Engineering Guidelines, **BA** to forward draft for consideration. **[ACTION]**

Agenda Item 4 Global Policy Summit

General discussion

BB requested comments from members on their thoughts about the outcomes of the summit.

OB commented that the outcomes at the end branched on at the wrong level and questioned if it is the IRCC's role to solve the world's problems and the discussion ended up way too broad. He also commented that he has observed that the US still has major problems and that they really need a champion to take this forward. A lot of the issues raised were specifically US problems and not those of other parts of the world. These US problems should not be the basis of the future work of the IRCC.

JS commented that the issues raised at the summit have shown that there are much wider than that previously focused upon.

BA thought that the summit has shown to the IRCC that there is a need to show that the building code is only a part of the building control regime. **WB** agreed and added that the code is only a small part of a much bigger system.

MP thought the summit was good because it bought in the perspectives of others from outside those usually involved in performance based codes. He also is struggling with where the IRCC goes from here. He believes the next step is dealing with the policy above the performance based codes.

BB thought that the summit showed that there are very different ways that our information maybe used by others. The wider views shown by others about the role IRCC should be playing may not sit with the IRCC's views when moving forward. **BB** added that the IRCC has typically

been a 'self help' group and has been effective at achieving this. If we are going to move beyond this then we need to think where we are going and what we want to do. He also thought that some delegates believe that there is a specific performance based model that will solve everyone's problems. This is not necessarily the case. e.g. the need for a uniform set of definitions. Other observations were that everyone would like for this to happen again. When?, who?, where? Are all questions. **BB**'s stakeholders went back thinking that there is a possibility to do something equivalent in the Canadian perspective.

BM commented that whilst he agreed with **OB**, the US participation is for the same reason as Norway. To learn from others and progress performance based codes. The IRCC activities and bring people together assists progressing issues in the US. Parking lot issues should not just be a list but should be worked on by IRCC at its meetings.

JT commented that there is a need to go back to specifying dedicated deadlines for actions so that we can move forward. We did this earlier and made some progress on the work agenda. This may need to be thought about again. On the conference, **JT** thought the purpose of the summit was to gather together people and to see what came out and to identify potential issues that needed to be covered in a new version of the discussion document. He thought it was interesting that others with no concept of the IRCC went away with a view of what the IRCC is about. The information communicated at the summit was full of good stuff some of which fits in the IRCC agenda, some which is for TG37 and others that is not for us to address.

We need to advance a broader picture, resources may not be available. Support may be available from the UN or World Bank. This may go some way to funding future summits, etc. In regards to the summary of the summit, education did not get enough importance.

Agenda Item 5 IRCC Document Development

Discussion took place on the future of IRCC document development.

RO to provide a report on what needs to be done. Report to be circulated to IRCC members for comment. **[ACTION]**

BB suggested that if we do not move this forward by the next meeting then we should take it off our agenda.

Agenda Item 6 Reference Standards

BB commented that we might need to develop a guidance document on the policy process associated with standards referencing. **BA** offered to send **BB** a copy of the protocol document relating to the development of reference standards. Main issue is associated with policy statements within reference standards. **[ACTION]**

Parking lot item, unless a member decides there is a need to advance. **[ACTION]**

Agenda Item 7 Sustainability

BB commented that this is an action item from the Madrid meeting for Australia. This project is similar to the way that the code structure of each country was developed. This process involved one country developing a one page outline and circulate it to other members and request that a similar document be developed in a similar format.

A country needs to take lead to do this for the sustainability issue. **BA** offered that Australia could do this. **[ACTION]**

Agenda Item 8 Egress for People with a Disability

General discussion took place on this issue. **BA** commented that Australia is about to embark on research in this area and if any members had any data or information could they forward it to the ABCB **[ACTION]**

Agenda Item 9 Parking Lot Items

Leaky buildings

BA commented on how Australia is monitoring trends in building complaints to determine if this is occurring. At the moment there is no evidence.

BB has suggested that this be discussed in detail at Spring meeting to give presentation on outcomes of the moisture management project.

Electronic Approvals System

Members to identify if electronic systems are available in their respective countries and advise **OB**.

BM and **BT** provided some feedback to **OB** on a couple of possible web sites in USA. **[ACTION]**

Agenda Item 10 – IRCC Autumn meeting, Madrid, Spain – Action outcomes

This agenda item has been covered under the other agenda items.

Agenda Item 11 Other Business

Frequency of meetings

DS believed that TG 37 and IRCC meetings do not sit comfortably together. TG 37 is more

technical. He believed that the IRCC had agreed that a joint meeting would be held once a year.

BM prefers a meeting every 6 months, for two full days. He also suggested that a 'ad hoc' meeting can be arranged at any time.

DS suggested that the host country should present a detailed case study.

BM suggested that the extension of IRCC membership needs to be considered. It was agreed that this should be considered at the next meeting (Spring 2004). **[ACTION]**

BB concluded this discussion, and suggested that this issue be discussed at the next meeting. **[ACTION]**. The discussion is lending towards two meetings per year.

Future Chair

BB outlined that the period of his Chairmanship was nearing an end. **BB** was not sure whether his view about the future direction of the IRCC was shared by the IRCC members. It was suggested that the strategic direction of the IRCC should be discussed in detail at the next meeting. **[ACTION]**

The IRCC participants suggested, and **BB** agreed to extending his Chairmanship for another 12 months, to be revised at the next meeting. **[ACTION]**

Considering the significant items for discussion at the next meeting, it was agreed that the next meeting should be a three day meeting. **[ACTION]**

Next Summit

General discussion took place on the timing of the next Summit. It was considered that 18 months from now was too soon.

BM offered to produce the outcomes from the Global Summit by the end of 2003.

The location of the next Summit was discussed. The EU was discussed as a possible location. Australia was also discussed as a possible location, perhaps around the same time as the next ABCB conference (June 2005).

It was agreed that this matter should be discussed in more detail at the next IRCC meeting. **[ACTION]**

Presentation of paper on the Global Summit

General discussion took place on the presentation of a paper on the Global Summit. **BB** received a requested by the Building Regulations and Innovation Journal. **BB** to check out this journal. It was suggested that a paper should be presented at the CIB World Congress in Canada.

Each member agreed to go back to their jurisdiction and spread to word about the Global

Summit.

Agenda Item 12 Next meeting

General discussion took place. The meeting agreed that the next meeting should be held in conjunction with the CIB World Congress to be held in Toronto, Canada (2-7 May 2004). **BB** would look into the actual dates for the IRCC meeting, perhaps on the Thursday / Friday prior to the CIB World Congress. **[ACTION]**

The meeting agreed that the Autumn 2004 meeting should be held in Japan. It is proposed to hold the meeting at the end of October / beginning of November. The availability of some IRCC members during this time may be a problem. It was suggested that TS consider a suitable time **[ACTION]**.

The meeting suggested that the Secretariat should develop a calendar on the IRCC web-site, which would show the major meeting of each of the IRCC members, to aid the arrangement of meeting dates. **[ACTION]**.

The meeting agreed that the Spring 2005 meeting should be in London, England.