Quality: turning risk into opportunity
Welcome

Anne Scorey
UK Managing Director, BSI
Our purpose

By Royal Charter

Standards
- Market Development, Committee management

Information Solutions
- Policy, Engagement
- Sales, Membership, ICT Platforms

National Standards Body

Compliance support
- Assessment and Certification

Training

Advisory Services
BSI: Supporting businesses globally

- **80,000 clients**
- **172 countries**
- **3 regional hubs**
- **75 offices worldwide**
- **51% of Fortune 500**
- **75% of FTSE 100**
- **68% of Nikkei Index**
59,000 different areas of collective best practice - created by industry, for industry

From tram tracks…

… to Building Information Modelling

- Tea
- Information Security
- Connected and Autonomous Vehicles
- Robot Ethics / Artificial Intelligence
- Internet of Things
Building relevant solutions with industry

- Standard
- Stakeholder ‘community’
- Shaping of Kitemark Framework
- Global alignment
- Certificate
- Consensus
- Review comments
From digital innovation with BIM

- **December 2015**: BIM Verification for Design and Construction launch
- **April 2016**: UK Government target BIM Level 2
- **December 2016**: BIM Kitemark for Design and Construction launch
- **June 2017**: BIM Kitemark for Asset Management launch
- **June 2017**: BIM Kitemark for BIM Objects launch

**BIM Courses with BSI**
Our BIM courses cover every level from senior management overview through to hands-on practitioner. To find out more visit [bsigroup.com/training](http://bsigroup.com/training)
To the reduction of Carbon

PAS 2080 Verification is designed to help companies reduce the volume of carbon used throughout a project, benefits include:

- Reduces costs
- Encourages innovation
- Promotes sustainable practices
- Manages whole life carbon

"PAS 2080 provides a common framework and guidance for the whole value chain to tackle the carbon challenge. It is essential for clients, designers, contractors and suppliers to work together if we are going to drive to drive a low carbon future."

Adam Crossley, Director of Environment

SKANSKA
Organizational Resilience

Concept of different levels of ‘resilience’ maturity

Emerging as a principle in academic areas over last 15 years

BS 65000
World’s first Standard for Organizational Resilience

Designed by industry, for industry and backed by government

bsi 2000 2014 2017
Building communities
ConSIG Introduction

Jon Adshead
Quality: turning risk into opportunity

CQI Construction Special Interest Group
The Chartered Quality Institute (CQI) is a global professional body advancing the practice of quality management in all sectors.

The Construction Special Interest Group (ConSIG) has been established as a representative group for quality professionals within the construction industry to advance quality and improvement in the construction industry.
Introduction

The ConSIG vision is:

To advance quality and improvement in the construction industry.
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</tr>
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</tr>
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SESSION 1

Addressing RISK of errors through sharing of knowledge
Get It Right Initiative

Attitude, Culture, Leadership & Planning
The Cost of NOT Sharing Knowledge
CQI
25th September 2018

gtitright.uk.com  @GIRI_UK
Get it Right
or
Is it Right?
Wasted Spend on error

**Direct costs of error (5%)**
Resources used in correcting an error

**Indirect costs of error (7%)**
Resources used in follow on work and costs to other parties

**Unrecorded process waste (6%)**
Errors occur, are identified and corrected without being recorded

**Latent defects (3%)**
remain in place after client acceptance and any 'defects liability period' has passed
£22bn a year.
Root causes of error

- Inadequate planning (from task through to project level)
- Late design changes
- Poorly communicated design information
- Poor culture in relation to quality
- Poorly coordinated and incorrect design information
- Inadequate attention paid in the design to construction
- Excessive commercial (financial and time) pressures
- Poor interface management and design
- Ineffective communication between team members
- Inadequate supervisory skills
Matthew Syed
Black Box Thinking
Marginal Gains and the Secrets of High Performance
British Airways Flight 38 Beijing to London
January 2008
“Everything we know in aviation, every rule in the rule book, every procedure we have, we know because someone somewhere died. We have purchased at great cost, lessons literally bought with blood that we have to preserve as institutional knowledge and pass on to succeeding generations. We cannot have the moral failure of forgetting these lessons and have to relearn them”

*Captain Sullenberger US Airways Flight 1549 15th January 2009*
The UK Construction Industry needs to act and behave like the Aeronautical Industry
GIRI Aims and Objectives

1. A Skills Development Programme
2. A campaign to change and align attitudes
3. Improve management processes and systems
4. Improve construction technology and techniques
CITB Productivity Flexible Fund Works

- £314,176 of funding from CITB
- £158,176 Contribution in Kind from consortium members
- All works to be facilitated through GIRI over 18 months (six 3-month development sessions)
Webinars in the UK and Ireland with audiences also in the USA and Australia.

Seminars and Workshops

Social Media
Initial Recommendations

Getting the Design Right

Improving Value by Reducing Design Error
13 Key Recommendations

1. Culture
   Every project needs a clearly defined and consistent focus on outcomes and the project team to work seamlessly together, and adopt the process of back briefings at every stage. The right culture is a collaborative one.

2. Increased Investment
   Increased investment in design reduces project error.

3. Robust Approach
   A robust design approach should be adopted at the beginning of the project and involve key members of the project team.

4. Collaboration
   Every project will benefit from collaboration, and it is up to leaders across all disciplines to ensure collaboration takes place. The adoption of a partnering charter should be a key goal at the start of any project.

5. Plan
   Develop a comprehensive project-specific plan of work.

6. Brief
   The briefing process should be carried out comprehensively within an adequate timeframe, and involve the key members of the project team.

7. Information
   Correct and well-communicated design information is integral to successful communication between designers, clients, and contractors.

8. Stakeholder Management
   Successful stakeholder management will build and maintain support for a project provided that the outcomes are clearly explained to, and understood by, the stakeholders. Time invested in understanding stakeholder needs and the client’s sign-off and approval process is never wasted.

9. Milestones
   Carefully crafted and well-developed milestones are an important tool for encouraging performance and collaborative behavior within the project team.

10. Guiding the Design Team
    An independent Principal Consultant on the contract team is critical in ensuring that design-related communications are robust, co-ordinated, and well-managed.

11. Opening & Closing Down
    Opening-Up and Closing-Down project stages allow for all creative thinking to be carried out and completed in good time prior to the handover of all subsequent production information. This reduces the necessity for change and hence the opportunity for errors.

12. Contractor Input
    In reality all project design teams, regardless of the form of contract or procurement, would benefit from contractor advice. If this was encouraged, it is likely that errors would be reduced.

13. Handover
    The communication of design information should be relevant, convey the design intent and clearly presented to all necessary recipients.
Insufficient Investment in Design

There have been widespread reports of installed M&E work in stations and tunnels having to be ripped out and replaced because of incorrect or incomplete initial designs.

Building Magazine 13th September 2018
Technology Working Group: Harnessing technology to eliminate error

Offsite Manufacture
Standardisation
Improved Construction process
Error-minimising Construction Components
+ Automation
Application for Research Grant into the barriers in adopting Digital Engineering/BIM
Get It Right Initiative

Attitude, Culture, Leadership & Planning

Thank You

ggitright.uk.com  @GIRI_UK
Get It Right Initiative Ltd

- Sharing the information of my Company’s defects with its competitors is the only way to improve the Industry’s performance in reducing error? Y/N

- Investment in up front design reduces change and significantly reduces outturn project costs? Y/N

- We need to establish a working group to look at a cross industry way of measuring performance in delivering quality? Y/N

- Reducing the amount of change on projects by putting more effort into ensuring that what the customer has asked for is what the customer actually needs will significantly reduce error? Y/N
Stopping Building Failures
and
Building in Quality

Nigel Ostime
25.09.18
Stopping building failures
How a collaborative approach can improve quality and workmanship

Building in Quality
Joint Memorandum of Understanding
Stopping Building Failures

14 recommendations under three headings:

- Procuring for quality
- Harnessing innovation
- Building defect-free homes
Procuring for quality

1. Project set up
2. Procurement
3. Collaboration
4. Integrated Project Insurance
Procuring for quality

1. Project set up
2. Procurement
3. Collaboration
4. Integrated Project Insurance
Procuring for quality

1. Project set up
2. Procurement
3. Collaboration
4. Integrated Project Insurance
Harnessing innovation

5. Adoption of BIM
6. Adoption of DfMA
Harnessing innovation

5. Adoption of BIM
6. Adoption of DfMA
RIBA Plan of Work 2013
Designing for Manufacture and Assembly

Understanding offsite construction...

Use our FREE online assessment tool to benchmark your knowledge in DfMA, manufacturing, logistics and onsite assembly. Then access best in class learning resources to help you understand the world of offsite construction.
Building defect-free

7. Training for on-site inspection
8. Clerks of works
9. Technology to document quality
10. Selection criteria
11. Clarity of roles
12. Benchmarking
13. Licensing for operatives
14. Hold points
Key issues in the report

- Don’t start until you are ready
- Thorough briefing
- Understanding value
- Digital technology
- DfMA and MMC
- Build defect-free
Building in Quality

- a joint initiative by RIBA, CIOB and RICS
RIBA Client Liaison Group

Mission:

• To make the RIBA more outward facing
• To provide a forum to hear views directly from client bodies
• To provide a vehicle to feed ideas and initiatives from the Institute back to them

"Without measuring we can’t improve"
What clients told us – project overall

- Private domestic: 76%
- Contractors: 73%
- Commercial: 51%
What clients told us – design skills and ability to meet the brief
What clients told us – process management
Edinburgh Schools Inquiry and Hackitt Review

Building a Safer Future


February 2017
We hereby commit to work together to:

- Overcome cultural bias in the construction industry for better collaboration and greater transparency between members of the project team
- Give due prominence to the outcomes stated in the project brief
- Establish a way to identify and track risks to quality, cost and programme
- Encourage the involvement of end-users, purchasers and asset managers in the conception, design and specification of projects
- Promote progressive, long-term, integrated delivery and ownership structures
**Building in Quality – Quality Risk Tracker**

### Quality Tracker

**Overall Quality Statement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td>C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>C8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A
- Likelihood of Development Proceeding to Construction
  - A1: Land is in possession of commissioning client
  - A2: Client intends to deliver completed development
  - A3: Client intends to own and operate the completed building
  - A4: Clearly defined and users and target markets included in brief
  - A5: All potential project stakeholders identified and engaged
  - A6: Comprehensive design team appointed
  - A7: Comprehensive background information supporting feasibility work
  - A8: High confidence of obtaining planning approval
  - A9: Planning application submitted at which RIBA work stage?
  - A10: All significant Planning conditions have been discharged
  - A11: Clearly defined sustainability objectives
  - A12: Appropriate analysis carried out

### B
- Attitude to Maintenance & Longevity
  - B1: Checklist represents significant weighting in the assessment
  - B2: Owner of interest / Independent interests included in design
  - B3: Open process for contractor input
  - B4: Client and works manager fully supported by site team
  - B5: Good working relationship between Works team and installing team
  - B6: Full team added to design brief or site Commissioning team
  - B7: POE training conducted / POE protocol
  - B8: POE inspection and POE report
  - B9: POE feedback analysis
  - B10: Strategy refined where issues are identified
  - B11: Exercise conducted in projects learned from previous projects
  - B12: Issues identified and mitigated

### C
- Attitude to Programme
  - C1: Client’s budget can accommodate cost increases if trade value
  - C2: Project costs calculated accurately per sum and within budget
  - C3: Budget has been benchmarked against appropriate quality
  - C4: Adjustments Contract RMM2(5/3) or MFE clauses
  - C5: Ensures products and materials in specification

- A straightforward system for documenting and tracking risks to quality through the life of a construction project
- 6 quality risk variables:
  - Likelihood of development proceeding to construction
  - Attitude to maintenance and longevity
  - Attitude to cost certainty
  - Attitude to programme certainty
  - Likelihood of obtaining competitive tenders
  - Attitude to collaboration
Stopping building failures
How a collaborative approach can improve quality and workmanship

Building in Quality
Joint Memorandum of Understanding
Questions

- Have you used the online assessment tool to benchmark knowledge in DfMA? Y/N

- Have you read the Stopping Building Failures report issued by the Housing Forum? Y/N
Designing Buildings Wiki
The construction industry knowledge base
designingbuildings.co.uk
The Future of Electricity in Domestic Buildings

by Andrew Williams – BRE 26 November 2014.

This paper reviews some of the key issues surrounding the supply, distribution and use of electricity in domestic buildings. Its primary aim is to consider the electricity system in a holistic, albeit simple, way and identify some of the inter-relationships and inevitable compromises that inherently arise. By adopting a "horizontal" system-wide review the hope is that the paper stimulates an integrated, system-wide debate surrounding how electricity in domestic buildings will evolve in the future. Only by doing this will electricity generation and consumption be harmonised with national targets and future consumer lifestyles.

This paper is in response to a number of potentially significant changes in the production and
4 million users a year

12 million page views a year

9,500 registered users

7,000 articles
UP.

DOWN.

Ignore the thicko's OP!
It's sideways!
The construction industry is becoming more complicated
Net stock of standards in the BSI Standards Catalogue, 1945 to 2014
Source: BSI British Standards Online (BSOL) database, Cebr analysis
Average years before standard withdrawal, by published year, 1945 to 2014, smoothed
Source: BSI British Standards Online (BSOL) database, Cebr calculations
The knowledge framework

- Legislation / regulations / policy.
- Case law / case studies.
- Standards.
- Contracts.
- Guidance.
- Research.
What the construction industry writes about
- There are significant differences between what the industry publishes and what practitioners need.
- Practitioners need more practical, easy-to-use guidance.
- Knowledge that is buried in long documents will not be used - even if it is critically important.
- History.
- Uses.
- Manufacture.
- Properties, shapes and sizes.
- Mortar and bonding.
- Site practice.
- Future developments.

- Selecting the right type of brick.
- Buying bricks.
- Selecting the right mortar.
- Laying out brickwork.
- Laying bricks.
- Problems with brickwork.
- Repairing brickwork.
Why this matters

- People are finding the wrong information.
- The right information is not being used.
- There is a lack of practical information.
- Practitioners are not properly supported.
- They are making avoidable mistakes.
Vision

- It should be easy to find out what knowledge exists.
- It should be easy to access that knowledge.
- It should be in a format that is easy to use.
Dr Gregor Harvie
Designing Buildings Wiki

web designingbuildings.co.uk
construction knowledge task group

email gregor.harvie@designingbuildings.co.uk
Questions

- Do you have easy access to all the knowledge you need? Y/N

- Has the way you work been influenced by new research this year? Y/N
SESSION 2

Standards as a RISK management framework
Standards as a Risk Management Framework

Andy Thurgood CMIOSH
Organizational Resilience
Core Principles

Plan Do Check Act

Process Approach

Risk Based Thinking

High Level Structure
ISO Directives - High Level Structure (Requirements)

- **4 Context of organization**
  - 4.1 Understanding context
  - 4.2 Needs and expectations of interested parties
  - 4.3 Scope
  - 4.4 XXX management system

- **5 Leadership**
  - 5.1 Leadership and commitment

- **6 Planning**
  - 6.1 Actions to address risks and opportunities
  - 6.2 XXX objectives and planning

- **7 Support**
  - 7.1 Resources
  - 7.2 Competence
  - 7.3 Awareness
  - 7.4 Communication
  - 7.5.1-3 Documented information

- **8 Operation**
  - 8.1 Operational planning and control

- **9 Performance Evaluation**
  - 9.1 Monitoring, measurement, analysis and evaluation
  - 9.2.1-2 Internal audit
  - 9.3 Management review

- **10 Improvement**
  - 10.1 Nonconformity and corrective action
  - 10.2 Continual improvement

Framework for a generic management system
MS/PDCA Model

- External and internal issues (4.1)
- Needs and expectations interested parties (4.2)
- Context of the organization (4)
- Scope of the Management System (4.3/4.4)

Leadership (5)

- Planning (6)
- Support (7) and Operation (8)
- Performance Evaluation (9)
- Improvement (10)

Intended outcomes of the Management System
Strategic Direction & Intended Outcomes

- Strategic Direction
  - Intended Outcomes Related to Strategic Direction
- Intended Outcomes of the XXXX Management System (1)
  - Leadership (5)
    - Context (4) Planning (6)
    - Operation (8)
    - Evaluation (9)
    - Improvement (10)
  - Support (7)
Question 1

Do you believe there is a disconnect between Top Management’s strategic direction, and existing Management System framework?

• Yes
• No
• Don’t Know
Process Approach

A Coherent System:

Understanding requirements
Intended results
Processes adding value
Processes providing effective performance
Improvements (through evaluation) of data/information
PDCA (process) methodology

Consistent, predictable results
Meeting requirements
Customer satisfaction

Activities understood and managed as interrelated processes

(Interactions)

(Inputs)

(Outputs)
Question 2

Given the significance of process approach, do you believe that your business is adequately process mapped, and understands it’s interactions?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t Know
Risk-Based Thinking

- Risk – the effect of uncertainty
- Effect – deviation from the expected, positive or negative
- Risk based-thinking – consideration of risk when defining the rigour and degree of formality required
## Inputs to Risk & Opportunities – Internal & External Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td>Management System stagnation, arising from responsibilities &amp; authorities</td>
<td>Brexit, and availability of migrant labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Budget to adequately resource the Management System</td>
<td>Clients requiring higher levels of compliance and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Relationships with workers</td>
<td>Aligning cultures with the supply chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technological</strong></td>
<td>Asset maintenance and management of life cycle</td>
<td>New technologies, requiring new competencies, BIM standardisation, Internet of Things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td>The knowledge to track and interpret legislation</td>
<td>Changes in legislation, governance in the digital age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>Suitability &amp; adequacy of the workplace</td>
<td>Site based conflict with other trades impacting on activities, products and services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Inputs to Risk & Opportunities – Interested Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interested Parties</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers, including Management</strong></td>
<td>Good reputation/culture.  Formal recognized training for all workers. Safe and healthy working conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective consultation and participation arrangements.  Workers taking responsibility for their work, quality,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safety and the environment.  Workers who pro-actively report deficiencies in Management System arrangements and offer up improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owners, Shareholders, Executive Board, Parent Organization</strong></td>
<td>Financial benefit, legal compliance/avoidance of fines, reputational/brand gain – corporate social responsibility (CSR), enhanced corporate governance (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal and Regulatory Authorities</strong></td>
<td>Identification, application and monitoring of applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for Management System activities under the Organisation's control/influence.  Prompt responses to investigations and enquiries, prompt reporting of applicable incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractors/ Suppliers</strong></td>
<td>Clear statement of requirements in tenders/contracts.  Adherence to agreements.  Level playing field for all requirements.  Reasonably demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of Management System conformance/legal compliance.  Value for money.  Maintained levels of contract SLAs.  Socially and ethically responsible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context to Controls…

Context
Planning
Operational Controls
Performance Evaluation

Improvement
Question 3

Reflecting on the challenges arising from performance evaluation, internal assurance, and acting upon actions arising, how effective do you consider your organisation in delivering timely improvement?

• Effective
• Mostly Effective
• Partially Effective
• Ineffective
Questions?
SESSION 3

The consequence of not managing quality RISK
Cost of Quality

Dan Keeling
Channel Tunnel, HS1 and Crossrail
Chair, Cost of Quality Working Group

Helen Soulou
Head of Quality at Heathrow Airport
Member, Cost of Quality Working Group
High Speed 1-Lesson Learned

• During installation of M&E equipment we had one quality engineer full time visiting sites and talking to electricians, comms installers over the importance of correct terminations particularly earthing straps. Railways fail safe so loose connections cause service disruptions

• Result HM audit office report in 2012 stated line had performed well with only 0.43% of services being delayed due to infrastructure issues

• Quality must be built in. Testing and Commissioning only show it works at the time of testing
Quality Costs – Risks and Opportunities

- Risk - Almost all major failures have quality as a root cause.
- Opportunity – this cannot be defined adequately without decent data.

We have so many cost, programme, safety, and environmental key performance indicators but we really do not know what is the cost to an operator/owner of quality issues.
Quality Risk factors

- Design particularly loading errors, safety factors
- Poor specifications
- Document Control
- Incorrect purchase information, failure to check incoming goods
- Poor quality control
- Poor records
Approach to project

The Working group examined the complexity of the task. The cost of Non-Conformance Reports has been studied extensively and the costs were measured differently by contractors, different forms of contract were used and defects percentages varied widely across the industry.

More importantly, consequential costs were undermeasured and durability concerns overlooked.

We decided to restrict our scope to quality issues post handover to give us a chance.
Cost of Quality

What is Quality?
Quality = Meeting the Client / Customer Requirements
Right First time

What is Cost of Quality?
The costs incurred through activities to ensure the Client / Customer Requirements are met, or because they are not met

Prevention
Appraisal
Failure

CofQ model first discussed in the 1950s
Used in manufacturing and service industries

Internal
External
## Cost of Quality Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention Costs</strong></td>
<td>Action taken to prevent or avoid quality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisal Costs</strong></td>
<td>Measuring and monitoring activities related to quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failure Costs</strong></td>
<td>Respond to &amp; resolve non-conformities &amp; defects during delivery up to handover to Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failure Costs</strong></td>
<td>Respond to &amp; resolve non-conformities &amp; defects present in operation following handover impacting the Client/User</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## External Failure Cost categories analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality cost elements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Safety Costs for Operators and Occupants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asset Availability &amp; Functionality Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Energy Use Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintenance Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Environmental Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Additional operational training Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Early Obsolescence Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reputation/ brand, indirect consequential losses Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples against Model

(sourced through public data)

• Safety Costs - Grenfell and other tower blocks

• Asset availability costs - numerous examples ranging from 0.3% to 130% of project costs;
  – Functionality cost – Water treatment plant 50%
  – Rectification costs – Office Block 24%

• Maintenance costs - rail project 21%;
  Latent defect costs - Car Park. Claim 1.3% of project cost

• Environmental cost - Nuclear plant 1100%
Examples against Model

- Operational readiness – Airport 1%
- Early Obsolescence – District Hospital
- Reputation/Brand – Stadium 18%

Insurance – Housing Block – claim 580% of project cost (£8.6m)

Good examples

HS1, Terminal 5, Anglian Water

There is still work to be done here in classifying issues/costs
Project quality and performance has effects that go way beyond the end of the project and into the operational life of the asset.

The effects of poor project quality have an impact into all aspects of Operations:

- creating inherent safety risks,
- increased maintenance costs,
- asset availability costs when assets are not utilised as planned
- environmental implications and related costs
- rework and early obsolescence costs leading to new projects to deal with unresolved quality issues and latent defects
- reputational and brand image costs that are very hard to estimate,
- increased insurance costs
Cost of Quality research findings

• Focus on quality during project delivery will not only improve the project during construction but will also deliver efficiencies in operations that are way better than the ones originally anticipated

• The performance of the project and its delivery strategy should not be based only on the time, cost and quality but also on the operational performance of the asset(s)

• Client, architect, designer, contractor, sub-contractor should work as a system. Because of the misalignment of their goals, the whole system is fragmented leading to operational failure

• In cases, procurement strategies, frameworks and contractual arrangements set by Clients lead to a fragmented construction industry where the different parts of the system have different goals and improvement of the system is almost impossible
Cost of Quality research findings

- There was “blindness” of the senior leadership teams of both Clients and contractors around the operational impacts of the non-focus on quality
- Incentives for continuous improvement of the whole system are non-existent
- Contractors are sometimes set to fail because of early decisions. In cases, the Client choices early in the process can influence quality more than the contractor on site can ever influence
- Architects and designers feel no “pain” from quality issues, either on-site and more importantly in operations, as they are usually far removed from the project when it goes into delivery
Cost of Quality research findings

- The **delivery model** plays an important role in the **motivation of the supplier** to **solve errors** as they happen in the project, to be open and honest about them, or hide them and **leave them for later** (they are somebody else’s problem anyway!)

- **Procurement and contractual models** sometimes contradict the **culture for quality** that the client wants to achieve. E.g. milestone payments, commercial incentives, retention money are creating incentives that are opposing the open and honest approach that continuous improvement requires.

- Learning from previous projects, errors and non-conformities, or defects is **not used as a continuous improvement opportunity**. In the cases where projects are learning from the past the **benefit** to the project is **huge**.
Common root causes
(leading to operational failure)

• inadequate site surveys

• design and product selection

• contractual arrangements and the tender process

• lack of appropriate expertise at many levels within all the organisations involved

• lack of a rigorous quality and continuous improvement culture in the construction industry

• time and budget pressures
What we have learned so far
(in monetary terms)

**Cost of Quality**
- **Prevention**
  - Investment Cost Unknown
- **Appraisal**
  - Investment Cost Unknown
- **Failure**
  - Internal – before handover
    - £75m-£188m pa*
  - External – after handover
    - £2.25m-£1.25b pa**

Figures are based on an annual spend of £750m
* Based on the Get It Right Initiative research
** Based on the UCL CofQ research
What we have learned so far
(in monetary terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure Costs</th>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Percentage of project budget</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Costs per annum for a £750m spend (in million £)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Total cost of error</td>
<td>10.00% 25.00%</td>
<td>GIRI</td>
<td>£75  £188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Asset availability &amp; functionality cost</td>
<td>0.30% 50.00%</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>£2  £375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance costs</td>
<td>20.00% 45.00%</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>£150 £338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reputation/brand costs</td>
<td>18.00% 167.00%</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>£135 £1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rectification/new project costs</td>
<td>10.00% 24.00%</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>£75  £180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Way forward

• Continue to obtain data
• Assess further projects
• Obtain data from insurance industry
• Assess whether we can use BIM to aid in developing Cost of Quality metrics
• Produce booklet on cost of quality issues
Dame Judith Hackitt has said she was “truly shocked” by standards in the construction industry when researching her report, *Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety*, published earlier this year.

She said,

"We need to get to a point where people those who construct a building are as responsible for those who use it over the next ten or 20 years as they are employee safety. What we are calling for is collaboration and joined-up thinking across the built environment sector, not self-interested groups protecting their own turf, something I have seen a lot of."

- Is this reasonable? Y/N
- Is this achievable? Y/N
Weightmans
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Letters of Intent

- Purports to record, in broad terms, an intention between parties to enter into a formal contract
- Primary use is to get a contractor on site fast
  - The issuance of a letter of intent allows initial work to proceed before the formal contract is finalised and/or executed or while the negotiations are ongoing
- “Statements of Intent” or Legally Binding?
  - Comfort Letter
  - Instruction to commit / spend money
  - Letter creating a binding contract
- Should letters of intent be used? See The Trustees of Ampleforth College v Turner & Townsend Consulting (2012)
- What should a well crafted letter of intent include?
- What happens if the letter of intent is silent on quality, time and cost?

- Decision given by the Supreme Court
- Overturned the CoA decision – who had rejected a “fitness for purpose” approach
- The contract stipulated, within the technical requirements, that the ‘design of the foundations shall ensure a lifetime of 20 years’ (‘the 20–year term’)
- **But also** required compliance with an international standard for the design of offshore wind turbines (‘J101’), which included an erroneous variable used in determining axial load capacity – this error was not known within the industry
- Lord Neuberger interpreted the J101 standard to be a minimum requirement (in accordance with s. 3.1 of the contract), and held that the correct analysis of the purported inconsistency was that the more rigorous or demanding standard must prevail. This meant that MTH had to ensure a 20–year design lifespan.

**Risks?** See also 125 OBS (Nominees1 v Lend Lease Construction (Europe) (2017)
Contractual Documents: Contd.

- **SSE Generation Ltd v Hochtief (2018)**
  - Hochtief were appointed under an NEC2 engineering and construction contract for the design and construction of a tunnel as part of an hydro electric scheme.
  - Shortly after Practical Completion there was a tunnel collapse.
  - The Works Information provided the tunnel to have a design life of 75 years.
  - Clause 2 stated that Hochtief’s liability for defects “…due to his design, that are not listed on the defects certificate, is limited so far as he used reasonable skill and care and complied with the Works Information.”
  - The term “design” was defined to mean (i) works not in accordance with the Works Information, or (ii) part of the works designed by Hochtief that was not in accordance with its own design.
  - Option M went on to exclude Hochtief’s liability for “…defects in the works due to his design, so far as he proves that he used reasonable skill and care...”.
  - However, clause 80.1 provided that SSE assumed the risk of loss and damage caused by a defect occurring before the defect certificate was issued and caused by a defect that existed at takeover.
Contractual Documents: Contd.

- Who was liable of the cost of carrying out the required remedial works?
  - SSE claimed that the loss was caused by a defect and that Hochtief were liable. The Works Information required the works to have a design life of 75 years.
  - Hochtief argued:
    - It had carried out the work strictly in accordance with the contract.
    - SSE had assumed the risk.
    - Option M absolved them from liability as there had been no lack of care and skill on their part.

- Hochtief successful at trial but the decision reversed on appeal (by 2 to 1).
- Risks: Distinction between design and design implementation? Needs careful consideration.
Contractual Documents: Contd.

- **Decision of the Court of Appeal:**
  - Hochtief was liable for over the £100 million, being the cost of the remedial works.
  - The tunnel collapse was caused by a defect: i.e. the tunnel had insufficient support and the tunnel did not have a design life of 75 years.
  - That defect had existed prior to practical completion.
  - A warranty that work would have a design life of 75 years did not equate to a warranty that it would last 75 years, merely that it would last 75 years without major refurbishment or significant expenditure.
  - Option M did not absolve Hochtief as the defect arose from the implementation of design, not the design itself.

- **Problems with the decision?**
No oral modification clauses

- Contracts frequently require variations to be made in writing before a contractor has an entitlement to payment.
- In the past, terms largely ignored. It wasn’t difficult to argue that either an employer had waived the requirement of writing, or that he was estopped from relying upon that requirement.
- However in Rock Advertising Ltd v MWB Business Exchange Centre Exchange Centres (2018) the court has upheld a no oral modification clause.
- The court will be slow to find that the term is either waived or that the employer is estopped from relying upon that limitation.
- Contractors should be ensure a proper paper trail before variations are actioned. This will ensure risks to a contractor for non-payment, and the consequent risks to a project caused by non-payment can be avoided.
Limitation Clauses

- Types of limitation clauses
  - Totally exclude or partially limit liability for certain events / types of loss
  - Limit recoverability to a certain financial amount
  - Time Bars: require claims to be made in certain timeframes
  - Net contribution clauses: reduces liability by reference to contribution by others

- General philosophy – save for consumer contracts, the law permits parties to agree on the contractual terms together

- Certain types of loss and damage cannot be excluded – i.e. death and personal injury

- In commercial contracts there are rules for incorporation and for interpretation; the law is more restrictive on total exclusions of liability and more relaxed on contracts which purport to impose a financial limit on recoverability and/or certain heads of loss.

- Excluding quality requirements, contrast:
  - Saint Gobain Building Distribution Ltd (T/A International Decorative Surfaces) v Hillmead Joinery (Swindon) Ltd WITH
  - Shepherd Homes Ltd v Encia Remediation Ltd
Collaborative Working & BIM – Insurance

- BIM permits modelling / mock ups / collaboration across the design team.
- Has its own Quality Assurance Regime and Checks
- Utilisation of Advanced Technologies ahead of construction taking place can assist
- BIM risks
  - BIM has the potential to blur traditional responsibilities, making risk allocation more difficult.
  - BIM inherently brings IT/cyber risk. The greater the electronic data and the more parties using it.
  - Collaborative working makes it harder to safeguard intellectual property rights over shared data.
  - The more uses the BIM model is put to, the greater the risk. Where the BIM model is used for life cycle purposes, liability could extend long after completion.
Project Bank Accounts

- Ring fenced bank accounts whose sole purpose is to act as a channel for payment on construction projects to ensure that key members of the supply chain are paid on the contractually agreed dates.
- The employer maintains adequate funds in the account to cover work in progress and other project commitments.
- Payments are made directly from the account to key members of the supply chain.
- Related to Quality – YES
  - If all the supply chain get paid on time; there will be less payment related failures, meaning the supply chain will be consistent and continuous.
Construction (Retention Deposit Schemes) Bill 2017–2019

- Private Members Bill introduced 9 January 2018.
- Scheduled for Second Reading on 26 October 2018.
  - Very early stages; thereafter Committee, Report, Third Reading and House of Lords Stages.
- Seeks to impose a mandatory deposit scheme for cash retentions in the construction industry, similar to the tenancy deposit scheme currently used in the property rental sector.
- Whilst Private Member Bills rarely pass into law, this type of scheme is central to the government's ongoing review of retentions.
- Risks:
  - Increased accounting burden.
  - Reduced autonomy over such funds.
  - Fiduciary duties?
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