

The tragic fire at Grenfell House is likely to have long term consequences for the construction industry. There are four current inquiries and reviews in place to establish the cause of the fire and why it led to so many fatalities.

We already know that industry has a significant problem confirming that installations meet the requirements of Building Regulations. The Edinburgh Schools Wall Collapse Report states that:

3.8.6 What is also significant about the Edinburgh situation is that highly professional and competent teams of structural engineers were unable to identify, through detailed visual inspections, the existence of serious defects in the construction of the walls they examined. This point is worthy of wider consideration by those who may have relied on visual inspections as a form of assurance that the underlying construction of walls are sound. Any such inadequacies in the construction of masonry panels, must therefore, be detected prior to walls being closed-up or there is no easy practical way of ensuring they have been built properly. This requires effective quality assurance and scrutiny during construction.

The closure of John Radcliffe Hospital also highlighted the issue in their report (*There is minimal information available on the 'as-built' fire strategy or the makeup of the walls*), and it is evident that at Grenfell there is considerable debate about what was actually installed.

The government Review of Building Regulations recommends greater scrutiny of installations to ensure compliance with Building Regulations.

Through the enquiries we are getting at FIS and other sources there is clearly confusion and debate at all levels in the industry about what a compliant system should encompass.

The initial meetings of the dry lining forum in London and Manchester gained a consensus that the routes to compliance should be adopted.

Product Process People (PPP)

The objective of this scheme is to develop a process whereby a contractor could prove that an installation met the specification, and the performance requirements. The system will record the specification, provide evidence of the product used is compliant with copies of the test report and the delivery note, record that the installation process used is in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and that the installation teams are competent (currently evidenced by CSCS cards).

The system will be developed in a digital format but technology agnostic allowing contractors to use a software package of their choice.

Next Steps

1. **PRODUCT** - Agree quality of evidence required to meet requirement e.g. copies of the specification, test reports and scanned or photographed delivery notes with site address and date
2. **PROCESS** – Agree means of establishing process used e.g. images of various stages of installation time dated and geographically located within a building against an uploaded drawing.
3. **PEOPLE** – CSCS cards either scanned or photographed of site teams

May 2018

4. Option for main contractor / clerk of works to sign off work stages
5. Establish software packages currently used by contractors and liaise with them to ensure the system can be used with these tools.
6. Liaise with others in the construction sector to ensure system meets their requirements
7. Trial system on sites, amend as required
8. Discuss with BSI how summary test reports can be produced in a constant manor.
9. Publish draft proposal for industry consultation
10. Note consultation responses and amend if required.
11. Launch system to the industry and publicise

Flow Chart

Product

Specification NBS

Test certificate/copy of test report /approved summary of test report

Changes? Value engineering- who authorised?

Revised Specification NBS

Test certificate/copy of test report /approved summary of test report

Discuss with ASFP (DPoW)- Fire testing Certification Group FTSG

May 2018

Process (Recording evidence in an acceptable and constant format)

Record of final , Specification NBS

Test certificate/copy of test report /approved summary of test report.

Might include DOP (CE) assembly and junction drawings.

Copy of material order

Copy of delivery note

Photographic evidence of the build process- especially relevant where materials are covered up

People Competency

Provide evidence of compliancy at each level

- Corporate – QA process BS EN ISO 9005? Certified? Registered installer scheme
- Managerial- recognised competency – CSCS – product trained- System trained Registered installer scheme
- Supervisory – 3 off
- Operator – 2 off

Iterative process from good practice to best practice

People Competency

What elements can be submitted in evidence?

- CSCS Card
- Relevant training to industry standard NOS, Minimum Technical Competency scheme.
- H&S training
- Registered installer
- Relevant experience

Minimum level of information required in a summary test report (fire) based on a dry wall partition

Suggested minimum content that a summary report should contain

Summary report number

Name of the company issuing the summary report (manufacturer / distributor)

Contact details address web site telephone, email

The system name / reference

Its performance Integrity and insulation in minutes

Limitations Height

The test standard BS 476:22 (year) and BS EN 1364-1 (year)

Where it was tested and the date of the test

The full test report number

If not a test then what the report is based on?

A detailed description of what was tested and how it was assembled.

A plan and section drawing showing the components clearly labelled with codes and dimensions.

In the case of a solid elevation this should include the following components.

- Head and base channel
- Fixings to the structural element
- Fixing channel if required
- Boards including thickness, edge detail type (not Standard) manufactured by
- Insulation
- Drywall screws
- Seals
- Intumescent products
- Jointing material/ treatment

May 2018