

PRODUCER STATEMENT Q+A

BCA SESSION

	QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	As a 'checker' I would appreciate not having to hunt around in the Engineering calculations to ascertain the applicable importance level of the building. It would be ideal if this information could be consistently noted on submitted PS1's.	Great idea. The PS1 is not the place for it, but we will put it in the Design Features Report.
2.	CM level specified by engineers are not generally consistent. Please make them to give attention to specifying correct CM level as per the guidance document.	Agreed, the current monitoring guidance can allow for varied interpretations, we are updating it.
3.	How does shortening the form reduce fraud ? the document still doesn't have a register number on it or some other way to verify its authenticity	It's now an automated form, it makes it easier to detect and changes more obvious.
4.	How reasonable is it for the consultant to increase their quote significantly for increasing PI insurance from \$500k to \$2m up on client's request? For eg, one of the consultants asked for \$30k increase in their quote just for increasing their PI insurance from \$500k to \$2m for peer review PS2.	Cost of PI insurance has increased steadily over the last few years and availability has decreased. Most engineering firms find that their insurance companies are very reluctant to increase their cover. Note also that once a level of insurance has been agreed between a consultant and a client, that level must be maintained for the life of the project plus 10 years.
5.	How will engineers cover liquefaction where required due to upcoming changes.	Engineers should work within their capabilities. For example, a structural engineer could reasonably do a non-complex foundation design in a low-risk liquefaction zone. As discussed in the webinar, there is a role for BCAs to play particularly for non-complex residential work. Ideally, BCAs should have access to liquefaction vulnerability maps. Then

		they can raise a flag when consents are applied for in that zone. Such issues should come up on a LIM. For complex/commercial work, there is likely to be specific geotechnical input.
6.	Hutt city council insist on \$500k - seems \$200k should be updated in light of construction cost increases in the past 10 years.	This value is standard and unrelated to construction costs. It's primary purpose is to confirm that the engineering firm is professional and does have PI cover. As discussed in the webinar, this is a different value to the limit of liability that a consultant will have agreed with their client. The two numbers are additive.
7.	If engineer assumes good ground to NZS3604, who is responsible to confirm this assumption on site???	An engineer should state the reason for their assumptions. If they are assuming Good Ground they should provide a reason. That may be the performance of an existing structure on the site, or a suitably detailed soils report. Engineering New Zealand is working on good practice examples. When there is no SED of foundations, good ground determination is covered by Section 3 on NZS3604. A Licenced Building Practitioner (builder) should be able to carry out the prescribed tests. We would also expect a BCO to understand the requirements and be familiar with the ground within their jurisdiction. When there is SED of foundations then the Structural or Geotechnical engineer should carry out appropriate construction monitoring to satisfy themselves that the assumed ground conditions do exist and include site report with PS4.
8.	On larger projects you end up having hundreds of site reports, RFIs, CANs - are you saying we should we issuing all of these? would a schedule not be sufficient?	Yes. Construction monitoring reports should be bundled and issued with a PS4. Accompanying documents in the 1000s of pages are not uncommon on commercial projects.
9.	People sign off PS1 in Auckland do not even need to be CPEng, as long as they are registered in Auckland Council Producer Statement register. Is it going to be changed that only CPEng can sign off PS1 and PS2?	As per our guidance document, we consider that a having a recognised competence as a Chartered Professional Engineer is a good bar. In the future, it is likely that

		engineers will need to be licensed to undertake certain work. As discussed in the webinar, some BCA's may be happy to accept PSs from non-CPEngs if they know their work and the engineers work within a limited field of work. It may be appropriate to use the AC producer statement in this situation.
10.	Proprietary systems e.g. sheds, glass barrier, canopy design etc, Should the structural engineer/CPENG provide IPENZ format PS1 covering their design	Not directly. The producer statements must come from the CPEng employed by the supplier of the proprietary system.
11.	Site verification is one of the items to be filled in PS1. if the ground conditions are outside the scope. How does the PS1 author ensure that correct Geo report or correct site finding are captured.	Reference the information with name of geotech company, date of report, report number, on the schedule that is now included.
12.	So DFR includes wind speeds? How about seismic and liquefaction loads/risks?	Yes.
13.	Sometimes we see engineers signing Producer Statements on behalf of multiple companies. This may indicate a clash with their PI insurance policy as PI terms generally require the CPEng to be a full-time staff of the design firm. Will the new PS procedure be able to deal with this problem?	See webinar, ideally an engineer should only issue a PS1 for their own work and let other systems stand on their own producer statements.
14.	the standardisation of forms etc. is good, thanks. are these forms now required for all EngNZ engineers? there are many and varied ways of providing information. if it's not required, then it's basically a nice to have, with engineers making up their own mind if they use it.	If the information is not easily available, then RFI it. We have devised this system for all engineers to be able to quickly and easily use it. It would be good practice for BCAs to encourage engineers to use the standard forms, including DFRs etc.
15.	What are the limitations of peer review PS2 of design work carried out by PS1 author. Are they expected to review all design calculations as well? Please also clarify whether geotechnical design should be also covered in peer review PS2	The design is defined by what is consented, i.e. the drawings and specifications, not the calculations. Some reviewing engineers decline to look at the calcs and instead prefer to do a parallel check of compliance.
16.	What is the approximate % of liability of designer PS1 and peer reviewer PS2 in terms of PI insurance liability in case of design failure?	No set percentage, will be determined by the courts who are likely to consider the relevant experience of the two practitioners.
17.	What work is being done to align the system with newer technology? - for example when using design models in place of paper documents	I don't understand why the system won't work with design models. It's only used to provide an information flow, the model information should be documented regardless.

18.	When do you expect the engineers to use these new documents. Please ensure all structural engineers are individually informed of the new documents.	Engineers will be able to use them immediately. We are communicating with as many engineers as possible via various channels, but I cannot see them all individually. It would be helpful for BCAs to encourage engineers to use the standard forms, including DFRs etc.
19.	When the market is booming there are more and more companies without CPEng or even without an engineer started to undertake engineering work. They use the signatures of CPEng from other firms either aware or unaware by the CPEng. How this issue is to be considered?	It is fine for an engineer to sign off another's work, provided that they have reviewed it. We have put the job number on the PS forms in order to help prevent fraud. By doing so the engineer can link their producer statement to their internal filing system, making it reasonably secure.
20.	When will these examples be available to bcas ?	As soon as the webinar goes online. I will send out PDFs and put them on the website too.
21.	Why doesn't the local authorities just release all responsibility of inspections to the engineers. Make the council only responsible for planner issues.	Outside the scope of this webinar
22.	Would EngNZ consider options of keeping an online register that populates information on producer statements issued by Engineers? BCA's can check these which will also avoid fraudulent PS1 issue.	Outside the scope of this webinar.