BUILDING PERFORMANCE

AGENDA

Building Code Technical Risk Advisory Group (BCTRAG)

Location: MBIE – 15 Stout Street. Room G.17. Wellington

Meeting Date and Time: Wednesday June 5th 9.30am – 2.30pm

Chair: Chief Engineer

Attendee list: See page three of this document

Agenda.

Item	Agenda Item	In the hands of	Time
	Welcome coffee		9:15 - 9:30
1.	**Introductions**	Chief Engineer	9.30 - 9.45
2.	**Business Update**	Dave Robson	9.45 - 10.15
3.	**Strategic discussion: "good ground' in the Building Code**	Jenni Tipler	10.15 – 10.45
4.	**Prioritising risk submissions for discussion at the meeting.**	Chief Engineer	10.45- 11.05
5.	**Open Forum: Discuss Risk Submissions** ***Summary of the submissions is below, The risk submission forms and support have been sent as attachments to the invitation*** **Risk 1** **Risk 2**	Chief Engineer	11:05 - 12.15 *11.05 – 11.35* *11.35 – 12.15*
Lunch			

Item	Agenda Item	In the hands of	Time
5. Cont	**Open Forum: Discuss Risk Submissions** **Risk 3** **Risk 4** **Risk 5**	Chief Engineer	**12.45 - 1.45** *12.45 – 1.15* *1.15 – 1.45* *1.45-2.10*
6.	**Open Forum: General issues**	Chief Engineer	**2.10 - 2.20**
7.	**Next Steps**	Chief Engineer	**2.20 – 2.30**
8.	**Close**	Chief Engineer	**2.30**

Attendees

Organisation	Attendee
NZ Society for Earthquake Engineering	David Whittaker
Structural Engineering Society	Paul Campbell
NZ Geotechnical Society	Ross Roberts
Society for Fire Protection Engineers	Michael James
Building Officials Institute NZ	Jayson Ellis
GNS Science	Matt Gerstenberger
BRANZ	Lynda Amitrano
NZCIC	Paul O'Brien
Fire and Emergency NZ	James Firestone
NZIA	Bruce Curtain
Engineering New Zealand	Tania Williams
Engineering New Zealand	Eleanor Laban
BCA	Ian McCauley
BCA	Bryce Keogh
BCA	Neil McLeod
MBIE	Dave Robson
MBIE	Chief Engineer (Chair)
MBIE	Jenni Tipler
MBIE	Helen McGregor
MBIE	Richard London
MBIE	Jonna Morris

Risk Summary

Risk submission reference	Risk Title	MBIE summary interpretation/reframing of the submission.	Technical risk question for discussion.
1	Post event Business Continuity Planning, functionality, damage control and building reparability	Building performance settings in the B1 Acceptable Solutions and Verification methods do not meet the performance objective of Clause B1 to provide a low probability of loss of amenity. This is because buildings are allowed to be designed to sustain significant damage during earthquakes that may be uneconomic to repair. Building demolition is costly to repair, causes significant business interruption, generates large quantities of waste and is environmentally unsustainable.	Does the Building code adequately set performance criteria for loss of amenity after an earthquake?
2	Data is not being collected regarding performance to allow compliance assessments and identify areas of best practice and concern	There is an opportunity to increase our understanding of building performance, improve building code settings (by relaxing requirements for buildings found to over-perform and increase requirements for buildings found to under-perform) and learn from events such as earthquakes, by collecting and monitoring quantitative data on building performance.	Is collecting and monitoring quantitative data on building performance and incorporating the results into the building code required? Or is this an aspect of building design that is 'beyond the minimum' and outside of regulatory requirements.
3	Participation in the AS4678 review project for the Australian standard "Earth Retaining Structures	Due to the current compliance pathway (B1/VM4) being outdated. There is a risk that the performance of earth retaining structures may be variable and/or poor.	Do the Building Codes existing Earth Retaining Structure guidelines adequately represent the performance requirements in the building code? If not, what is the risk?
4	Circumventing Building Consents	An emerging risk of some new/innovative housing and building stock that is not being adequately regulated by the Building Act and Building Code to ensure the safety and wellbeing of the occupants and subsequent users.	1. Current settings in the Building Code don't support sector compliance, construction methods or product innovation 2. Are emerging building typologies and new innovations being used to avoid BC consent

Risk submission reference	Risk Title	MBIE summary interpretation/reframing of the submission.	Technical risk question for discussion.
5	Building categorisation (uses and typology)	There are a number of issues in the Building Regulatory system that relate to the way buildings are categorised. For example: - The Building Code currently refers to building type definitions (Clause A1) to determine the application performance criteria. - The Act refers to 'intended uses' for the Building Code applicability and 'specified uses' when referring to the 'change the use' regulations. The two definitions of use above conflict, are out of date, and ambiguous. This is complicated further when compliance documents and other areas of the regulatory system further define building types and use - such as 'risk groups' for fire categorisation, and 'lawfully established use' in the building forms regulations.	1. Does having these inconsistent definitions of "building use" create perverse regulatory outcomes? 2. Are they creating more or less risk, or inconsistency?