

**CCBFC/PTCBS****Joint Task Group on the Model Codes  
Review and Development Process**

Report of the Second Meeting  
21, 22 October 1997  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

**Members present:**

Chair: Bruce Clemmensen  
Ann Borooah  
Mike Dwyer  
Chris Fillingham  
Serge Goulet  
Dick Miller  
Fred Nicholson

Ross Rettie  
Jack Robertson  
Ted Ross  
Chris Tye

IRC Staff:  
Richard Desserud

**Visitors:**

Easton Lexier- Past Chair, CCBFC  
Frank Cielen- Chair Manitoba Building  
Standards Board  
Joe Lesjak- Chair, Fire Code Committee,  
MBSB  
Dennis Beacham- Manitoba Labour  
Chuck Sanderson- Deputy Fire Commissioner,  
Manitoba  
Noël Kirouac- Director, Manitoba Building  
Officials Association  
Terry Mills- Human Resources Development  
Canada  
Tom Makey- Alberta Labour  
Dr. Russell Thomas- IRC

**REPORT OF THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MEETING**

The report of the first meeting was approved with some amendments. (The corrected version is now posted on the Task Group Web Site in both French and English).

Regarding participation by the fire services, it was reported that the CCFM/FC had been asked to nominate representatives, but these had not been provided yet. (Note: Subsequent to the meeting, the CCFM/FC advised that R. McCullough, Saskatchewan, and Tom Makey, Alberta, will be its nominations).

## **GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

There was discussion as to the desirability of the Task Group establishing guiding principles so as to focus discussions and ensure a common understanding. A draft list had been distributed for consideration (See Appendix A). It was decided that it was premature to try to come to agreement on such principles, but that they should be set aside as statements that could prompt input and discussion. Some of the statements should be added to the Task Group Communiqué (see next item)

## **COMMUNIQUÉ**

Task Group reviewed a Communiqué prepared as a result of discussions at the first meeting. It is intended that this paper be given wide distribution to provoke dialogue among code users and stakeholders, and to invite submissions from groups and individuals.. The final version of this Task Group Communiqué is attached as Appendix “B.” It is also posted on the Task Group Web Site in both French and English.

It was recommended that the Communiqué be distributed under joint CCBFC/PTCBS letterhead with the signatures of the respective Chairs. A draft list of those who should receive the paper was distributed. Members were asked to review the list and recommend any changes, additions or deletions.

## **NATIONAL/PROVINCIAL CODE DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PROCESSES**

Presentations were made on the code development and review processes that presently exist.

The CCBFC process is summarized by the Chart in Appendix C.

Processes for building code review used in B.C., Manitoba, Ontario, Alberta, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, are summarized in Appendix D.

It was reported that the situation in Québec was in flux since the provincial government is reconsidering previous decisions on reassigning the roles and responsibilities of industry, provincial government and municipalities.. It is expected that the situation will become clearer in the next few months.

In the general discussion was noted that there are different procedures for provincial fire code development and that information and that these should be obtained.

Some municipalities, notably Vancouver and Montreal, have separate process that may need to taken into account.

In order to facilitate comparison of various systems, it was agreed to prepare a table noting the following information for each jurisdiction and for each code (building, fire and plumbing).

- Ability of municipalities to change the codes
- Ability of municipalities to go beyond minimum requirements in the codes
- Ability to account for Standards Updates during code cycle
- Basis for change, new CCBFC Codes or last provincial codes
- Existence of Review boards with or without statutory status
- Existence of a materials acceptance process
- Common responsibility for the building, fire and plumbing codes?
- Special treatment for existing buildings in the building code?

- Decision makers (Cabinet, minister, council, )
- Existence/nature of formal stakeholder review

## **STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS**

The Task Group discussed perceived strengths and weaknesses of the various processes.

### **CCBFC**

#### **Weaknesses**

- Time delay to get a change through the process, cumbersome process
- Lack of responsiveness
- Belief that views of those outside the system won't be heard
- Only "Committee Approved" change proposals are published for review
- Perception as a closed shop, many don't feel part of the process
- Poor communication as to the CCBFC process
- Formal provincial/territorial involvement comes too late in the process
- Lack of "political accountability"
- Separate entity from provincial processes, can't account for local priorities
- Less organized groups find difficulty n using the system
- Does not account for regional/geographical physical conditions
- Ability to deal with issues close to its limit
- Focus on Ottawa

#### **Strengths**

- Strong Technical resources at NRC
- Remarkable national consistency in acceptance of results
- Linkages to National organizations and associations
- One window access nationally
- Due process is thorough reducing likelihood of error
- Technical focus- arm's length from political process
- Good coordination of all documents is possible
- Broad base input and consensus
- Philosophy tends to be non-adversarial
- Financial/administrative support from NRC
- Travel expenses paid
- NRC's reputation as an honest broker.

### **Provincial/Territorial systems**

#### **Weaknesses**

- Subject to political pressures
- Shortage of resources to deal with technical issues
- Hasty response to urgent issues may lead to error
- Different departments responsible for building, plumbing and fire codes
- Regional input only, lack of access to broader perspective
- Municipalities may not be part of the process, resulting in municipally-initiated variations

- Regional participation in the National process is discouraged since the focus may be on provincial issues only.

### **Strengths**

- Responsive to urgent issues
- Able to tailor process to local needs
- Easier buy-in by decision makers
- Regional stakeholders can participate at the front line
- Strong “political accountability”
- Provides an opportunity for broader harmonization of all construction regulations, not just those included in the National Codes
- Takes advantage of strong local resource pockets on specific issues.

In discussion the strengths and weaknesses, it was pointed out that the relationships between code developers, code adopters (provinces/territories) and code enforcers (primarily municipalities) needs to be understood.

### **AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCE**

The Task Group briefly discussed the information provided describing the creation of the Australian Uniform Building Regulations Coordinating Council. Similarities to the task at hand were noted and a progress report on success to date was requested.

Note: A site on the Internet describes the Australian system. It is located at:

<http://www.dist.gov.au/abcb/about.html>

### **REFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

A number of documents were included with the Agenda. The Task Group was requested to keep these for future reference. These included:

- Excerpts from the Strengths/weaknesses study by the CCBFC Strategic Planning Task Group
- Summary of the Survey Carried out for the CCBFC Strategic Planning Task Group
- Information on the Australian Building Code Process.
- 

### **AGENDA FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that at the next meeting the Task Group would begin to identify options and opportunities for improving the system. The US development system should also be revisited.

### **FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next meeting is scheduled for December 8 and 9 in Montreal. Future locations are detailed in the Communiqué. If possible meetings are to be on Sunday and Monday and will normally end at 3 p.m. the second day.

## Appendix A

**Joint Task Group on the Codes Review and Development Process**

## Discussion Statements

- There are benefits to Canada's economy and competitiveness in having a high degree of uniformity in regulations covering building plumbing and fire safety
- Provinces and Territories have jurisdiction over building, plumbing and fire safety regulations
- Political policy and enforcement issues are in the purview of the adopting authority
- Technical development and adoption are separate processes, but not mutually exclusive.
- There is a need for core model building, plumbing and fire codes
- Participation in model code development by authorities having jurisdiction does not imply that they must adopt the results.
- Model Codes will be based, to the greatest extent possible, on technical correctness only
- Model Code development will be as free as possible from undue influence from special interest groups
- All model documents will be available in both official languages.
- Decisions will be based on as broad a consensus as possible
- Participation in code development is to be open to all
- Input is to be balanced geographically
- Review and development is to be timely
- There will be due consideration of cost impact
- All technical changes will be subject to public review
- Duplication of efforts will be eliminated and public review will be coordinated
- Increases in the scopes of the model codes will only be undertaken when there is strong evidence of wide support in the code-affected community and among adopting authorities.
- Provincial/Territorial Authorities are involved in the decision-making process
- There is strong local participation in code development and review.

## Appendix B

*Task Group studies the Building and Fire Codes  
Development and Review Process*

A Joint Task Group of the Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes (CCBFC) and the Provincial/Territorial Committee on Building Standards (PTCBS) has been formed. The role of this Task Group is twofold: to recommend strategies aimed at ensuring appropriate levels of national/provincial/territorial participation in a uniform building, plumbing and fire code development and review process; and to establish a coordinated code public review process that accommodates the needs of the CCBFC and the provinces/territories.

In Canada, regulations pertaining to the safety of the public in buildings is the responsibility of the provinces and territories. Since 1941, CCBFC (and its predecessors, the Associate Committees on the National Building and Fire Codes) has produced model building and fire codes, which it has offered as the basis for provincial, territorial and municipal regulation.

It is widely recognized that Canada's economy, and the construction industry in particular, benefits where there is uniformity in the country's building and fire code requirements. These benefits include:

- Consistent levels of health and safety for all Canadians.
- A larger domestic market with common requirements, which facilitates the movement of goods and services within Canada.
- Reduction in the duplication of effort, which allows for cost sharing of technical development.
- The promotion, on a pan-Canadian basis, of cost-effective, technically progressive solutions.
- Credibility for Canadian technologies in international markets as a result of acknowledgement in a national code system.
- Reduction in design and compliance verification costs for those working in multiple jurisdictions

The National Building, Plumbing and Fire Codes were created with such benefits in mind, and to a great extent have been successful in achieving them. Some jurisdictions, however, have established their own comprehensive provincial and municipal code review processes in order to consult with their stakeholders and to address regional issues. The Strategic Plan of the CCBFC recognizes that much can be done to improve the model code development and review process to better reflect the needs of provincial/territorial authorities and code users, and to eliminate the need for overlapping processes, thus reducing the burden these processes can impose on stakeholders.

This exercise may result in fundamental changes to the code development process in Canada.

The following questions will be among those addressed by the Task Group:

1. Acknowledging the constitutional prerogative of the provinces and territories to adopt whatever code they wish and considering differing provincial/territorial issues and priorities, how could a uniform code technical development and review process be achieved?
  - Designation of provincial/territorial authorities as the point of entry to the code development process?

- Improved liaisons between the CCBFC and provincial/territorial code development councils and committees?
  - Improved liaisons between the CCBFC and provincial/territorial code authorities?
  - Greater representation of provincial/territorial authorities on CCBFC committees?
  - Earlier involvement of provincial and territorial authorities in the CCBFC code development process?
  - Joint review of technical changes by provinces and territories prior to wider public review, or separate provincial public reviews funneled into a National review process?
  - Inclusion of all provincial/territorial amendments in a national review package?
  - Greater involvement of provincial and territorial in the process of selecting members for the CCBFC and its standing committees?
  - CCBFC decisions on code change made subject to a ratification by provincial/territorial authorities, such as used by some Canadian Standards Development Organizations?
  - A more frequent or continuous process instead of scheduled or periodic public reviews?
2. Considering geographical and economic realities, how could greater participation in a coordinated national/provincial/territorial code development and review process be achieved?
    - More code development originating at the provincial/territorial level?
    - More meetings held across Canada?
    - Enhancement of the present decision-making process used by the CCBFC (broad consensus, public review, balanced matrix, individuals as members)?
    - National conferences to discuss/decide code development as occurs in the USA?
    - Greater use of the Internet?
  3. How should the process deal with the possibility of contradictory policy and technical advice from stakeholder groups?
    - Require stakeholder groups to refer issues to the Provincial/Territorial Committee on Building Standards (PTCBS) first?
    - Create partnership agreements with provincial/territorial decision-making authorities specifying to whom the process will refer policy issues?
    - Create liaison agreements between the process and stakeholder groups, such as the Canadian Council of Fire Marshals and Fire Commissioners (CCFM/FC), the Canadian Advisory Council on Plumbing (CACP) and the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Subcommittee on Building Codes and Housing?
    - Establishing a dispute resolution mechanism?
  4. Are there characteristics of model building, plumbing and fire codes that need to be accounted for in a code development process?
    - Restrict the model building, plumbing and fire codes to a set of core minimum requirements and rely on provinces and territories to develop provisions for issues that do not have widespread application?
    - Base the model codes, to the greatest extent possible, on technical correctness only?
    - Give due consideration to cost impact?
    - Increase the scopes of the model codes only when there is strong evidence of wide support in the code-affected community and among adopting authorities?

The Task Group welcomes comments on the above, as well as suggestions on additional issues to be discussed, and any recommended solutions.

The intention is to complete this work by September 1998 so that the CCBFC and the provinces and territories can consider incorporating the results in the public review process contemplated for the 2001 Codes. The first two meetings occurred in September in Toronto and October in Winnipeg. Future meetings will be held in the locations shown below.

## Meeting Locations

- Meeting #3 – **Montreal**, Dec 8 & 9 1997
- Meeting #4 – **Toronto**, Feb 1 & 2 1998
- Meeting #5 – **Vancouver**, March 29 & 30, 1998
- Meeting #6 – **Halifax**, May 24 & 25, 1998
- Meeting #7 – **Edmonton**, September 13 & 14, 1998

The Task Group invites the submission of briefs from interested parties.

All meetings are open to the public. Information on future dates and locations will be available from the Canadian Codes Centre. Please advise the Canadian Codes Centre at 613-993-9960 of your intention to attend. The Task Group agendas, proceedings, papers, membership and schedule will also be available on the Internet at [http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/home\\_E.shtml](http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/home_E.shtml) and [http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/tgs/review/index\\_E.shtml](http://www.ccbfc.org/ccbfc/tgs/review/index_E.shtml)

All questions, comments and recommendations should be addressed to the Canadian Codes Centre, Institute for Research in Construction, National Research Council of Canada, Montreal Road, Ottawa, On. K1A 0R6.



## Appendix D

## Provincial/Territorial Code Development Processes

**The Code Development and Review Process  
In British Columbia**

October, 1997

In British Columbia, building regulations (the building and plumbing codes) are regulated under the Municipal Act. The Code is adopted by a regulation of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Minister responsible.

In January 1997, a new Building Policy Section was incorporated into a restructured Corporate Policy Section in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. (The Building Standards Branch was closed as of January 31, 1997.)

Within its mandate, the Building Policy Section is responsible for provincial building regulations. As part of its strategic direction, it has placed greater focus on managing codes. This includes supporting the national code system. At this time, the province intends to limit code development activities to issues that are unique to BC.

In the course of the reorganization that occurred at the beginning of 1997, the Building Policy Section consulted extensively with industry on the issue of adopting the next edition of the BC Building Code.

While the original recommendation of industry was to develop a new code process before adopting the next code, it was felt that this exercise would take too long and BC would likely end up significantly behind the rest of the country. It was finally agreed that there should be an interim process for the adoption of the next BC Building Code and that it should be based on the 1995 National Building Code with changes only to address unique BC circumstances.

The Province is now in the midst of this interim process to adopt the next BC Building Code (this includes the Plumbing Code). The word "interim" is emphasized. It is expected that the next edition of the BC Building Code will be adopted in the summer of 1998.

Once the 1998 code is in place, there will be discussion on a code review process for dealing with amendments and future editions of the BC Code. The recommendations of the Task Group on the Code Development and Review Process in Canada will be an important component in this discussion.

*Building Policy  
Corporate Policy Branch  
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing*

October 21st, 1997

### **Manitoba Code Review Process**

The Manitoba Building Standards Board is a body appointed by the Minister of Labour, presently Mr. Harold Gilleshammer, to advise the Province on matters pertaining to Building, Fire and Plumbing Codes, such as adoption of the National Codes and any amendments.

Standing Committees similar to those at the national level report to the Board and provide advice concerning the technical content of the Codes, the impact and ramifications. Membership on the Board and its Standing Committees carry out an extensive review of the latest National Codes and proposals submitted by the building industry. The broad based committees which form the matrix include builders, consumers, designers and regulators, who scrutinize the Codes to ensure that Manitoba's need for high quality construction and fire standards are met. The Manitoba Codes are based on the National Codes. A major review of the NRC model is carried out by the standing committees when new codes become available. Work on the review often begins, using the pre-publication versions. The recommendations are brought forward to the executive level of the Board and approved by letter ballot by the Board. Policies and procedures modeled on the CCBFC policies are utilized to resolve issues. A final report is submitted to the Minister for his consideration. It includes any significant changes to the new Codes and any Manitoba amendments. It may also include the reason for the change and in some cases a cost analysis. Upon the satisfaction of the Minister, he guides the proposed Manitoba Building, Fire and Plumbing Codes to Cabinet for acceptance. Upon Cabinet approval, the Codes are published in the Manitoba Gazette with an effective date of 90 days after the Gazette publication.

It should be noted that the Manitoba Building Standards Board has been asked to try to limit the amount of amendments to the National Code if possible. We have been very successful in that many of the former amendments have been incorporated into the National Code. The amendments have been kept to a minimum to facilitate consistency with Canada's National Codes.

Regardless of what political stripe the individuals on committee are, it is important to note the team effort that is exhibited at these meetings dealing with the Code issues. Their common denominator appears to be Fire and Life Safety.

The importance of committees cannot be over exemplified. Only recently a problem was found to exist in Manitoba re: snow loads on roofs. A committee meeting was subsequently scheduled.

The first order of business was to have a bulletin produced and to be sent to all parties who may be involved and others who should have the seriousness of the problem brought to their attention. A Task Group was the next order of business to develop the long range strategy which will recommend what action be taken long term, as these are existing buildings. The new 1995 National Building Code addresses the issue in that the roof calculations were increased, solving the problem.

The system used by Manitoba has both strengths and weaknesses as any system involving people. Individuals volunteer their time and effort on various committees. There is a degree of absenteeism and dialogue of the missed meeting needs to be repeated, resulting in additional time spent on the subject matter. In some cases major players on committees are transferred or replaced and this

poses the serious problem to educate and bring the new individual up to speed; but more importantly, make them realize that the Codes are the minimum standard.

Strengthwise committee members, with the technical background together with other representing industry and regulatory , provide a good balanced pro-active team who can quickly address short term and long term solutions.

I hope this thumb-nail sketch gives you some ideas of what procedures are in place in our Province.

Attached is an organizational chart relative to the Manitoba Building Standards Board and the Code review process.

Frank Cielen  
Chairperson, Building Standards Board

## **Ontario Building Code Amendment Process**

### **Phase 1: Policy Development**

- Develop broad objectives for Code amendment cycle.

Components include:

- survey of emerging issues and priorities.
- obtaining direction from government on policy objectives
- consultations with key stakeholders (either formally or informally)

In 1996, Ontario released *Back to Basics*, a discussion paper that formed the basis of a formal consultation on the appropriate focus and guiding principles for the OBC. About 300 responses were received.

### **Phase 2: Evaluation of Proposals for Code Amendments**

- Review of proposed amendments for compatibility with broad objectives established in Phase 1.

Components include:

- Review amendment proposals from major sources (NBC changes; Code Commission rulings/authorizations; recommendations from Coroner, task forces and municipal, industry and individual stakeholders
- Initial staff review for compatibility with other Code provisions, effectiveness and enforceability.

### **Phase 3: Technical Consultation**

- Broad public consultation on proposed amendments

Components include:

- Drafting proposed amendments in appropriate Code format.
- Compiling in package and distributing broadly for stakeholder review and comment.

In 1996, about 2,000 packages of proposed amendments were distributed to stakeholders during 3 month review period.

## Phase 4: Code Committee Review

- Review of proposed changes and consultation responses by external technical experts representing range of major stakeholders.

Components include:

- Code Committees of 12 to 20 members are organized for each major part of the Code.
- Code Committees review proposals and consultation responses, and make recommendations on whether to accept, reject or modify proposed changes.

For 1997, seven Code Committees were appointed. Membership included stakeholders from the development industry, enforcement officials, manufacturers, standards organizations, consumers, environmentalists, and disabled access advocates.

## Phase 5: Final Approvals, Production and Education

- Final preparation of regulation for government review and approval, printing and distribution of new code, and province-wide technical seminars on amendments.

## THE ALBERTA BUILDING CODE REVIEW PROCESS

### Introduction

Editions of the Alberta Building Code are established by the Building Technical Council with the consent of the Minister and enacted into regulation by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Alberta Building Code (ABC) is based, in large measure, on the National Building Code of Canada (NBC). The ABC is essentially a set of minimum provisions regarding the safety of buildings with respect to public health, fire protection and structural adequacy. It also contains requirements that respond to social issues and to concerns of other government agencies. Reasons for updating the codes are a review of past failures, changes in materials, updating of standards, and the use of innovative construction practices.

Alberta's changes to the NBC are revisited with each new proposed edition of the NBC. The major sources of proposed ABC changes include bulletins published by Alberta Labour, input from industry, associations, municipalities, professional organizations, and other government departments or agencies. During the period that the ABC 90 was in force, only one ERRATA series was issued. Referenced standards were not updated on a yearly basis and relied on equivalency rulings for those updates. New climatic data was published with the NBC 95 that has not as yet been officially adopted in Alberta.

### Review of existing requirements

The Director of Building Standards fields many technical questions, providing director's rulings, director's interpretations and information bulletins. Many of these inquiries form the basis for change. To supplement this process many of the stakeholders are contacted and asked to identify problem areas. One of the groups specifically consulted are the building inspectors. Input from inspectors is normally fairly objective usually dealing with the logistics of enforcement. Designers, material suppliers and builders normally comment on specific requirements of the code. Government agencies who have programs housed in facilities with specific needs request their requirements be addressed.

The Building Technical Council has formed advisory groups for specific input on code related matters, these include the Barrier-Free Design Advisory Committee, the Residential Advisory Committee, and the Energy Codes Advisory Committee.

### Building Technical Council initiate the process

The Building Technical Council establishes broad ground rules for public review. Usually contentious issues will be set out in the review document. Work done by Advisory Committees is included.

### Notice of the public review

A public review is advertised through a mailing list of those who purchased the current building code. Notices are sent to specific associations, and are inserted in newspapers. For the ABC97 review approximately 450 review packages were requested which resulted in about 350 proposals for Council's consideration.

## **Preparation of the documents**

The National Building Code 1995 was modified in some areas at the direction of the Building, Technical Council. The NBC format was to be maintained, previous Alberta changes were carried over where appropriate, suggestions for change made by the Advisory Committees were incorporated, adjustments suggested by other government agencies were included. The suggested changes were sent to NRC as changes to the NBC 95. The resulting document was returned as the Proposed Alberta Building Code 97. Comments received were reviewed by Council. Changes agreed to by Council were made to the Proposed Alberta Building Code 97, sent NRC and returned as a draft of the Alberta Building Code 1997. This document will be reviewed by Council resulting in a final draft. The Building, Technical Council, having established the final content of a new edition of the ABC, returns the document to NRC for printing as the ABC 97 following approval by Order in Council passed by the Provincial Cabinet.

In summary the following events were used in the process:

### Event 1

NBC Public Review first series review second series review

Event

Review of STANDATA

- o identification of needed changes

### Event 3

Review of Code Inquiries, concerns and suggested changes

- a identification of needed changes

### Event 4

Advisory Groups identification of changes Mechanical Advisory Committee Small Municipal Advisory Committee Large Municipal Advisory Committee MARS Residential Advisory Group Barrier-free Design Committee Day care Facilities Hairstyling Shops Swimming Pools Secondary Meat Processing Plant Abattoirs Food Establishments

Event 5

Review of Appeals to Council for Code Implications

- ft identification of needed changes

### Event 6

Identification of Code requirements specific to Alberta

### Event 7

Receipt of NCB 95

- printing/distribution to Council of NBC 95
- printing/distribution to Council on recommended Alberta changes
- establish review process

### Event

1st public review draft of new edition of the ABC

- review proposed changes with council
- preparation of documents
- SGML formatting
- printing distribution
- review with Council
- preparation of 2nd draft

### Event 9

Public Review

- printing
- advertising
- distribution
- working with associations to facilitate review

logging responses from public review process

sorting changes received

- printing for distribution to Council
  - review of public comments with Council
  - preparation of 3rd draft
  - review by Council
  - establishment of new edition by Council
  - review by SCC coordinating committee
  - review by the Social Policy Committee
- consideration by Cabinet  
implementation date

Event I0

Printing ABC

agreement with NRC

- identification of contractor
- review of galley proof
- printing ABC 97
- warehousing and distribution

Event I1

Post Review Activities

- o reply on submissions
- a input into NBC development process
- o seminar to explain changes

## **Code Adoption in Nova Scotia.**

Under our Act adoption of the Code and any errata or revisions is carried out by means of amendment to our Building Code Regulations. The Nova Scotia Building Advisory Committee conducts a review of all proposals for change in the Regulations. This is a standing committee appointed by the Minister, and is made up of construction and design industry representatives.

The first step is informal. The Committee was aware of proposed changes between the 1990 to 1995 Code. This year the Committee decided that it would be in the public interest to wait for a period of time after publication of the 1995 Code, to offer an opportunity for the public to review its contents. During this period several informal contacts were made to determine if there were concerns with the 1995 Code. For example, Community Services, Health, and the Office of the Fire Marshal were contacted regarding proposed changes for care facilities, and an amendment to the Code was proposed and recommended by the Committee. There was also review of the changes to requirements for horizontal and vertical clearances from ranges, and it was recommended by the Committee to amend the 1995 Code to retain the 1990 version until such time as the review of proposed amendments to the 1995 Code may be taken by the CCBFC.

The second step is formal. The Committee reviews all proposed changes to the Code (1990 to 1995) and proposed amendments, if any, and makes a recommendation to the Minister for adoption. The Minister then makes a formal public announcement that the Regulations are intended to be adopted and invites public comment. The Act requires a forty five day period of review and comment is invited on the proposed Regulations.

All submissions from the public are reviewed by the Committee. If there are no significant changes, the Committee makes a final recommendation for prescription of the Regulations to the Minister who upon acceptance of the recommendation signs the prescription and the new Regulations (or amendments) are published in The Royal Gazette. Under the Act they may take effect prior to the publication in the Gazette however we generally assure publication prior to the date of prescription.

## **Saskatchewan**

Following is the outline for Saskatchewan's adoption of the National Building Code of Canada (NBC).

NBC users are advised repeatedly in our "Building Officials Newsletter" about the national review process, including submission of proposed changes and availability of the proposed change documents for comment. NBC users are strongly encouraged to participate in the national review process.

Once the new NBC is issued by NRC, notice of intent to adopt it is put into our "Building Officials Newsletter" along with any amendments that need to be carried forward from the previous adoption. We ask for any NBC users that have concerns or questions to contact us. If particular concerns are raised, we ask for feedback on the specific concerns in the next issue of our "Building Officials Newsletter." All subsequent responses are considered, a solution is formulated and sent back to all respondents for final comment. If the solution is accepted, it is drafted into the regulations. If the solution is not accepted, further consultation is done until an acceptable solution is devised.

Once new regulations have been passed, the amendments are submitted to the national review process for consideration and the cycle begins again.

We use the "Building Officials Newsletter" as our communication vehicle because it is sent to approximately 900 individuals and groups in the province, including building officials, designers and design associations, construction industry associations, some municipalities, some builders, other provincial government staff, and other individuals who have some interest in building and accessibility standards. We do not publicize the new NBC any wider.