

DRAFT

**June 3, 1999**

**Joint CCBFC/PTCBS Task Group on the Code Review and  
Development Process.**

Report of the Ninth Meeting

27 October 1998

Toronto ON.

**Members present**

**Chair: Bruce Clemmensen**

Rick McCullough

Fred Nicholson

Ross Rettie

Jack Robertson

Ted Ross

Ann Borooah

Mike Dwyer

Serge Goulet

Chris Fillingham

Dick Miller

Krystyna Paterson

**Members absent:**

Tom Makey

Chris Tye

**IRC Staff:**

Bob Bowen

Richard Desserud

**Visitors:**

John Kenward- Canadian Home Builders  
Association

Don Johnston- Canadian Home Builders  
Association

Rod McPhee- Canadian Wood Council

Ali Arlani- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and  
Housing –Ontario

Allan Larden – Ontario Association of  
Architects

## DRAFT

### REPORT OF THE 8<sup>TH</sup> MEETING

The report of the eighth meeting was approved with minor changes. (The final version is posted on the Task Group Web Site)

#### CORRESPONDENCE

The Task Group reviewed correspondence received from the **Ordre des ingénieurs du Québec** (OIQ) in which the OIQ stated that they did not agree with the submission from the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers on the subject of Core Codes. Mr. Goulet reported that he had been in contact with members of the OIQ, and that the opposition was essentially based on a misunderstanding.

The Task Group reviewed correspondence received from the **Ontario Association of Architects** (OAA).

The OAA were concerned that the new system seemed lengthy and cumbersome, and expressed hope that some of the activities would be run in parallel.

The Task Group response was that at first glance, the new system might appear to be lengthier, however in essence, steps added to the process of code development would have to be done anyway during the adoption process. It is believed that the time for adoption should be cut down considerably. It is the intent that concurrent activities would occur when possible.

The OAA also suggested that

- built-in time defaults be included to ensure the process does not bog down.
- the financial impacts of proposals be made available to stakeholders, even where the decision-making body feels the cost is justified.
- the Term "balanced committees" be more clearly defined.

The Task Group agreed that these suggestions should be considered as operating procedures for the new system are written.

The Task Group reviewed correspondence received from the **Downtown Halifax Business Commission**.

The Commission raised concerns over difficulties in applying the NBC to infill and renovation projects in the inner city. The inflexibility of the code was cited as the reason.

The Task Group noted that this issue fell outside its terms of reference. It also noted that this issue had been brought to the attention of the Task Group several times before. The NBC allows for flexibility in application to existing buildings through the equivalents clause, and via the guidelines to the application of the code to existing buildings. However, It had been agreed previously that the Task Group final report will recommend that the CCBFC and the PTCBS revisit the question of whether there should be code requirements on this issue or to continue with the guideline approach.

#### “STRAW” CODE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL

## DRAFT

The Task Group reviewed a streamlined version of the model system which focussed on the four stages of the process. This model, together with the latest detailed straw model, will be included in the final report. The revised version, accounting for the Task Groups suggestion is included as Appendix A.

It was also suggested that since both diagrams give so much information, a simple flow chart for progression of a typical change should be prepared for the final report.

## FORMAT AND CONTENTS OF THE TASK GROUP FINAL REPORT

A draft final report was reviewed. While the contents were generally judged accurate, there were suggestions improvement, including:

- Add a few definitions (Model Code, Core Code, P/T changes to the Core Code, Non-Core Code Issues, Progeny Documents).
- Rearrange the report so that the proposed system comes at the beginning.
- Miscellaneous wording additions/improvements.

It was agreed that further consultation with stakeholders by the Task Group on the recommendations was not necessary. The new system could be put into place immediately, and tried out of the next stages in code development (Technical updating, consultation over scope, format and contents of the objective-based codes). The recommendations also did not appear to conflict with the input received in any significant way. Any further concerns raised would be taken into account during implementation

The matter of further formal consultation will be a matter for individual provinces and territories to decide upon.

The final version of the Task Group Report is posted on the Task Group Web Page at

[http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/tgs/review/index\\_E.shtml](http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/tgs/review/index_E.shtml) (English)

[http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/tgs/review/index\\_F.shtml](http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/tgs/review/index_F.shtml) (French)

## TASK GROUP PRESENTATION TO THE DEPUTY MINISTERS

A draft presentation was discussed. It was agreed that the Deputy Ministers should be asked to support moving ahead on the issues requiring a commitment from the provinces and territories. These are:

- Concept of “Core codes.
- One co-ordinated public review
- P/T participation at all stages
- P/T Advisory Committees
- Resolution of technical differences
- Principle of cost sharing

## ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked Task Group members for the extreme effort given and congratulated them on achieving consensus on what had seemed an insurmountable task. The meeting adjourned at 1730hr.

DRAFT

## Appendix A Proposed Code Development System Simplified Overview

### Stage 1- Point of Entry

- Changes are initiated by industry, public, regulatory authorities, special interest groups, technical committees and others.
- Submission can be made to any participating province/territory, or NRC.
- All core code proposals received by P/T must be submitted to NRC (comments optional).
- Non-core code issues are retained at P/T level.
- Initial assessment is made by NRC based on guidelines prepared by the CCBFC.
- All proposals are to be circulated to every P/T
- If the proposal is judged to be a scope/policy or a significant issue or if there is there sufficient P/T comment, the proposal is referred to the CCBFC.



### Stage 2- Technical Review

- Technical review of proposals would be done by balanced technical committees appointed by and reporting to the CCBFC.
- Membership appointment is to be by a fair and equitable process, including P/T assistance in recruiting and selection.
- Technical and Administrative Support provided by NRC.
- If technical committees judge a proposal to be a scope/policy issue or have major economic impact , it will forward the proposal to the CCBFC.



### Stage 3- Coordinated Public/Stakeholder Consultation

- All proposals are to be circulated to P/T prior to wide release. Major Issues raised by the P/T at this stage would be referred to the CCBFC.
- There will be a national consultation but individual P/T may choose to conduct their own or participate directly in the consultation in their jurisdictions.
- P/T-specific non-core changes for each P/T would be included in review packages for each respective P/T.
- Comments received by the P/T would be reviewed and forwarded to NRC with P/T comments.
- Comments received would be referred to the technical committees for action. All standing committee actions following public consultation would be circulated to the P/T, with any changes resulting from public comment clearly marked. The P/T reaction to the technical committee actions would be provided to the CCBFC.



### Stage 4- Decision and Adoption

- Decision on changes to core codes by the CCBFC
- Policy advice (scope, format, content, process) from P/T Advisory Committees.
- CCBFC members would be drawn from regulatory, industry and general interest sectors (balanced matrix, geographic balance).
- Matrix/Membership set by NRC, with P/T assistance in identifying candidates.
- CCBFC responsible for Matrix/Membership of technical committees.
- CCBFC responsible for core building, fire and plumbing codes.
- Adoption of core codes by the individual province/territory.