



engineering
new zealand
te ao rangahau

PRODUCER STATEMENT Q+A

ENGINEER SESSION

	QUESTION	ANSWER
1.	A design features report template for dams would be great!	Please contact me to provide the information to build one. Martin.pratchett@engineeringnz.org 027 603 3310
2.	Are the updated PS forms only available as part of the cognito form? are PDFs no longer available?	They will be available as PDF too.
3.	Are there API's available for these forms to integrate into our existing job/client management software?	No.
4.	Are these also intended to supersede the Auckland council forms on Glass Balustrades, AC2343	No, but a standard PS1 should accompany the AC2343
5.	Can the 'A' series be made on the same online form system? Couldn't see an option in the demo.	Yes, they will be.
6.	Can the admin fill in the start of the form then send a link to an engineer to fill out the rest?	Yes.
7.	Can the forms be changed once submitted? who does it get sent to once you click submit? is it just a PDF emailed to yourself?	It's sent to the email you enter, they can be edited.
8.	Can we add our practice name/log to form headers?	We are working on adding the option for you to add your logo to the DFR etc. Please don't add firm logos onto Producer statements, it needs to be clear to BCAs that they are receiving standard wording forms.
9.	can we avoid the schedule 1 if it is only a short list.	We do recommend that it is included even if it only contains a list of drawings.
10.	Can we get further clarification around how to issue 'fresh' PS1 and additions to the PS1.	Its fine to issue a fresh PS1 for a BC amendment but make it clear (on Schedule 1) that it is only for the

		amendment. However, only issue one PS4 and list the BC numbers for the original consent and the amendments.
11.	Can we have this form in a editable file for us to change to suit our specific requirements?	No, this is as editable as it gets. If BCAs start receiving non-standard forms, our concern is that they may start to insist on practitioners using the BCA's own form. Please send through any suggestions you have to make them more suitable for you.
12.	Can you adapt this so it aligns with Practice note 19 Pressure Vessels ?	Great idea. Note this would be a use for the A-Series
13.	can you clarify what is meant by independent on the PS4 guidance	It means that you are governed by ethics and your obligations to society at large above the whim/request of your client. It is a key attribute of a consulting engineer.
14.	Can you make sure there is VM1 and VM4 added to be ticked as we find engineers tick VM1 but forget to tick VM4 for foundations and we have to go back and ask	Yes, we'll work out a way to have it automatically tick.
15.	Can you please comment on what the test for "reasonable grounds" is ? thanks	Difficult to define precisely but generally it is that you have done what might be reasonably expected of a competent engineer.
16.	Clarification needs to be made to what 'Schedule 1' refers to - I'd suggest a name change here, as 'Schedule 1' generally refers to 'exempt building work' or even Schedule 1 of the Building Act. Perhaps use 'Scope of Design Work' or otherwise.	Good point, will review, thanks.
17.	Comment - the date on the bottom of the PS1/PS2/PS4 forms I have found on the ENZ website is "February 2020" - is this the latest, current version?? If not could you please update such date as appropriate :-)	Comment - the date on the bottom of the PS1/PS2/PS4 forms I have found on the ENZ website is "February 2020" - is this the latest, current version?? If not could you please update such date as appropriate :-)
18.	Could you please add a field for NZS 4219 Seismic Performance of engineering systems in Buildings? HVAC etc Thanks	Yes.
19.	'Design Details' is far too vague, as it indicates we have designed say ALL 'retaining walls', whereas we need to be explicit as to which retaining walls we may have designed. We must be very explicit, as lawyers love to have a go.	Indicate which walls you have designed on your retaining wall layout plan, as on form, and describe on Schedule.
20.	didnt address fire or services in his reply to geotech or fire	Good point, we are working with the SFPE on fire. Yet to identify people to help with services.

21.	Do all Council's throughout NZ accept Producer Statements including a PS2?	In theory yes but for some BCAs you must be on their own registers. Note also that BCAs are not obliged to rely/accept your PSs.
22.	Do not like 'Soils Report' - please change that to Geotechnical Report. thanks	There are two fields in the, soils report and geotechnical report. The concept is that a soils report would be done by a structural engineer, as opposed to a geotechnical report, by a geotechnical engineer.
23.	Do we need a PS4a form for inspecting works that didnt require a building consent?	Yes.
24.	Do you know if any organisation is completing a review of the PS 3 (Constructor) Certificate template ?	No, but we can look at it in the future.
25.	Do you need to have a company website?	That's for the Certificate of Building Work, put N/A if you don't have one.
26.	Does the PS1 & PS4 author need to be Chartered? Few councils just need the author to be on the author register for that particular council.	In the guidelines we state that being a Chartered Professional Engineer is a good benchmark for signing producer statements. This is likely to be in line with upcoming Occupational Regulation
27.	Fire Engineers don't look at wind loads, dead loads etc. but these are compulsory fields.	Good point, we'll change that.
28.	For a project if for example a PS1 has been issued (version a) and then the plans change and a new PS1 is required, the project address and job number stay the same but if there is no PS1(a), PS1(b) train then an incorrect/outdated PS1 could be presented to the BCA	This requires good QA to make sure up-to-date PS is issued to the BCA, same as QA is required to make sure correct revision of drawings are lodged. Note that sometimes a BCA will request a fresh PS1 if drawing changes have been made as a result of the RFI process. In this situation the date should be amended, the Schedule should be revised with an updated drawing register and Schedule should note that the the PS1 supersedes the previously dated one.
29.	For Building Code Clauses for alterations to building we almost never select a whole clause. eg our building code clauses would typically be C3.4 (a)(b)(c), C3.9, C4	Great, thanks. Contacting SFPE fire engineers to help with that.
30.	For large projects built in stages over time or consented in stages, is it possible to go back to the form we created to amend it for subsequent stages or revisions in the design? Or do we need to start a new form? Also can the PDF produced be ae editable form if some later changes need to be added into the PS ?	You could go back to the original PS1 and alter that.

31.	For scope of works - can we have both tick boxes and option to write our own text?	Yes, you can edit the boxes, they are pre-filled for convenience.
32.	Form has got very much longer than 1 page	That's because we have combined multiple forms to help you.
33.	From when this will be effective and current PDF documents will be stopped?	There is a two week consultation, relevant changes will be made and the new documents will go live once the changes are finished,
34.	Have BCAs been briefed on the use of PS4s - Tauranga City Council in particular have a nack for asking for a PS4 for the ground floor slab, and won't pass the floor until this has been issued. Where there are other super structure elements, a second PS4 then has to issued for these	That should not happen. Please let me know when this occurs. Reasonable practice from a BCA would be to require that a Site Report (CAN) is available on site for them to review.
35.	Hi Martin - Tony Fairclough here - great presentatin - thanks for advancing this project :-) FYI Im happy to help if you need another Geotechnical Engineers input/support	Thanks Tony!
36.	Hi Martin, 2 qs. 1. Can we identify Alternative Solutions together with B1/VM1 solutions on the same PS1? 2. You seem to be mixing B1/VM! (i.e. SED) with B1/AS/1 solutions. B1/AS1 solutions should not be subject to a producer statement as an engineer is not required, but at the discretion of the owner?	See webinar for Adams answer. Theoretically you do not need a producer statement for and AS. However, a BCA will likely ask for it.
37.	Hi, please let me know whether it is possible the user has a template form to load in similar jobs.	You could use a previous PS1 and alter it for new jobs.
38.	How can we access a blank producer statement i.e. not through the conginito platform?	They will be loaded onto the website for download and consultation shortly.
39.	how easy are these to re-edit eg - if we do one see a mistake - can we go back in and edit simply?	Yes, there's a link on the email that you receive with the PDF.
40.	How is the information entered on this web form stored and available (or not) to ENZ, TA's and others?	It's encrypted and stored with Cognito forms. No, Tas, ENZ and ACE do not store the material.
41.	I couldn't see in the PS4 form, but when signing a PS4 does it refer to construction monitoring levels or to specific items as listed in the consent conditions?	It works the same way as the current forms.
42.	Is there an intention to produce forms for services engineers?	We could, we need to know what you need that is different. Please contact me to let me know of some examples so we can build it.

43.	Is there any updated standard format for expectations around a contractor's PS3? These vary greatly depending on the contractor supplying these.	Not yet, we may look at a project with someone like Master Builders to produce a PS3.
44.	Is there going to be an option for PS4's to be observed by engineers if the plans are followed, however if there are variations to be approved and signed off by a suitable qualified design engineer.	I believe that's how PS4s are supposed to work now. Note that the Building Act requires that significant changes are the subject of a BC amendment.
45.	Is this just doubling up on the DFR?	No. The DFR complements the PS1
46.	It looked as though the only options for signatory's qualifications was BE and BE(Hons). If the signatory has become chartered through the knowledge assessment route, they will likely have an alternative qualification.	There is an option where another qualification can be entered
47.	It would be good if MBIE/ACE/ENZ could develop and publish a standard glossary of terms/designations to achieve alignment through this set and other important industry documents (such as Standards (many of which are currently under review). Such terms would include things such as "Design Engineer", "Design Firm", "Design Review Engineer", "Design Review Firm", "Construction Review Engineer", "Construction Review Firm", etc. Could ACE/ENZ add this to their "to-do" list??	We have not had this come up as a problem before, if there is a widespread issue we will address it, but not otherwise.
48.	Legal Description of the site always do not follow the Lot xx DP yyyy format. Is there a plan to accommodate this to the data entry?	Can do, thanks.
49.	Number of data in form - it is the numbers in the drawings/calcs rather than the design features summary - so duplication doesn't really help	Thanks, the documents are there for you to use to reduce RFIs.
50.	Once you have completed a PS1, can you recall it and say only change a date or must you complete all fields again.	Yes, you can go back and edit your own PS1 and reprint it.
51.	Please adapt the forms to allow for Section 112 ANARPS to means of escape C&F clauses (where compliance with the building code clauses are not achieved in full)	Can do, thanks.
52.	Presumably the original Producer Statement forms will still be acceptable as the new form doesn't fit for geotech or fire. Was this discussed at the BCA presentation?	The new forms are fine for geotech and fire, they just aren't optimised yet.

53.	Soil parameter not always relevant but we should say source	Good point, will make optional.
54.	Some building works are exempted from Building Consent. However, clients still require PS1 for their own records to ensure the design carried out or reviewed by a CPEng. Is there any alternative form for the exempted works that still requires CPEng sign-off?	The PS1A series being launched. See Adams talk.
55.	The default wording in the PS1 \first page shown suggests "part only" - some councils have taken issue with this recently (Napier as an example) - has this been resolved or discussed by BCA's?	Yes, we have addressed it. Let me know if you have issues. https://www.engineeringnz.org/news-insights/producer-statements-all-or-part-only/
56.	To save time is there much capability in the online form to save personal/company details or standard wording that we typically use on similar projects?	A lot of the information is stored on your browser. You can find out how to change it https://support.google.com/chrome/answer/142893?hl=en&co=GENIE.Platform%3DDesktop
57.	The DFR and construction monitoring schedule seems targetted to residential. Is this correct?	Yes. Residential covers 75% of work done in NZ so I've addressed that.
58.	The fields are (again) too small - I regularly have no room to fill out complicated Lot & DP references, address details, designer details etc, and my current PSx's invariably all refer to an attached Schedule. Again you include 'Building Code' clauses - but we cannot sign off on B2. Why can't this again just be a referncce to a Schedule, where we explain what we are designing to and how we achieve it.	The fields are flexible, you can fill in as much as you like. The producer statements do refer to the schedule. You can sign off B2, but we don't recommend it.
59.	The form seems to have a lot of information that can be included. What is the driver bewhind it? Wouldnt it be better to refer Design Features report or Design Report?	The information flows through to the DFR etc. We can potentially make it so the schedule refers to the DFR etc. I will look into it.
60.	The PS2 questionnaire asked for the qualification of the "designer" as a compulsory field, this is not a very useful information, and also this information is not shown in the final print out. Could you please have as few "compulsory fields" as possible - especially for information that will not be shown in the statement?	Good idea, thanks.
61.	Theres a lot for stormwater too!	Good point, thanks. Infrastructure beyond property boundary should be covered by A-Series, not standard PSs

62.	what happens when the Council doesn't want to provide a particular inspection?	The engineer must do it.
63.	what is the expectation on the level of site observation of precast panels poured in manufacturers factories	CM2 or CM3
64.	When will the new forms go live? Will the old ones still be relevant for a period?	They're available now, I suspect many BCAs will accept them. You can still use the old versions, they will be replaced after the submission period and we have made any changes required.
65.	Why are we re-entering snow loads, wind loads, roof loads, floor loads - when these should already be explicitly stated in the calcs + drawings?	Because many engineers don't put them in a place that's easy to access for checkers. We are providing a DFR for engineers to use because many don't, but it is good practice to do so and will reduce the number of RFIs received.
66.	Why wouldn't you use a desktop application where you can save and load files locally and save time remaking forms for near identical jobs?	If you have that and it works for you then that's great. This is a system we have come up with that's available for all members of Engineering new Zealand at no additional cost.
67.	Will calculations still be supplied or does this supersede calculations as all information entered onto form?	Definitely supply calculations.
68.		