



Meeting Notes

To: 9 attendees including
HSE

From: Paul Bussey

Date:
19/03/2013

Pages:
1/2

DIOHAS Meeting, Summary Notes 19/03/12

Response to Gavin Bye's 13th March Coniac Statement on "CDM Update"

1. The CDM-"Coordination" function cannot be provided fully by independent CDM-C's as the current regulation suggest due to the lack of capacity and resource for them to see the overall picture and detail of a developing design project.
2. Therefore the proposal to place the "CDM Coordinator" function (not role) in the hands of the "project preparation or design coordinator" makes sense as they need to coordinate all other design issues eg. Structure, services, BREEAM, Building Regulations, etc in a similar way.
3. This "function" however cannot be expected to be delivered without adequate fee resources for time and expertise.
4. The "function" could be delivered by designers with sufficient "CDM" training and experience or alternatively by employing in house or external "CDM-Consultants" to assist with the process (the APS would be an appropriate source of suitable consultants).
5. It is recognised that most architects and engineer designers do not have the skills and resources to provide the coordination function at present and steps are being made by CIC to provide "suitable, sufficient, proportionate and practicable training within the RIBA, RICS, and ICE and especially at University's across the country.
6. The CDM function needs to have a "proportionate" response and resource allocation related to the size and complexity of the project and needs to be delivered in a collaborative way by the team at review meetings with buy-in, contributions and responsibility taken by all Project Team members including Designers, Clients, Project Managers, Quantity Surveyors, CDM-Consultants and Contractor particularly due to the criminal implications in the case of an accident. This is the principle of SFARP in action and it cannot be delivered by one single "coordinator".
7. This is the intention of the collaborative approach that is necessary to make CDM work rather than reflecting the individual design, commercial, contractual and regulatory agendas of each of the participants.
8. To include small "Domestic" projects into the CDM arena makes eminent sense as this is a major area where there is a lack of safe and healthy practices in construction and to some degree in design. It is noted however, that simple "vernacular" house design and extensions are very much a "trade and contractor capability" issue and as such require a proportionality light CDM touch at design stages.
9. The proposal for the "threshold issue" that CDM applies when more than one "contractor" is employed on a site is welcomed as it meets the TMCS D requirements and does not cover small repair and maintenance projects carried out by one contractor. It is undoubtedly the interface between 2 or more contractors that are the major causes of controllable accidents except where inexperienced, inadequate or otherwise uninformed contractors are employed. This "white van man or cowboy factor" still needs to be resolved

Memorandum

Date:
19/03/201

Pages:
2/2

Subject: Error! Reference source not found.

without laying the blame on “89 year old Mrs Evans – domestic Client” or the design team. This issue reduces the number of notifications to the HSE but should increase the understanding that CDM applies to “all projects” NOT just those lasting longer than 30 days etc.

10. The description of the CDM “Design” Coordination role needs to be clearly explained and added to the Scope and Services of all professional appointment documents in order to cover non and under compliance and to highlight the measures necessary to clients and the funding required to deliver this.
11. The “Audit Trail” for 3rd party review of procedures needs to be agreed at a proportionate level and a suitable method of recording the “significant CDM issues”, and their options and outcomes needs to be agreed with the professions to ensure initial analyses and compliance and retrospective review. However the bureaucratic processes to achieve these must be proportionate and practical to the scale of the project.
12. The new Regulatory Package must reflect the scale and diversity of the “construction” industry from small maintenance and repair projects right up to multi-storey office blocks.
13. It must also be recognised that the requirements of Civil Engineering “construction” such as bridges, harbours, dams, power stations, factories etc, have a different emphasis on safety in design than the more “aesthetically” driven “Architectural” Sector.
14. This is reflected in the “design” aspirations but also the vastly differing forms of contract and procurement that exist in the industry.
15. The future and developing part that BIM will have to play in the design stages of projects is still evolving but it is the collaborative solutions of the team that are essential. NOT the simple recording of “hazards and risks” and their elimination rather it is the proportionate management of risks at both the design and construction stages that needs equal and balanced attention.
16. There is a need for a better understanding between the Architect, Project Team and the CDM-C on many projects as there is a lack of empathy and understanding on all sides. This will help to create a better “team ethos” to benefit the delivery of CDM related outcomes and help to get rid of the “Disconnects” in the industry especially at Design Stages.
17. ACOP – there were various views on the current ACOP but the need for better and simpler guidance were generally welcomed.

In summary, we feel that generally these proposals will assist with a greater and better CDM team environment and dynamic.