

## **Brief Notes of Liaison Meeting between FSD and Authorized Persons**

**Date** : 10 March 2011 (Thursday)  
**Time** : 1500 hours  
**Venue** : Conference Room, Fire Safety Command, FSD

### **Matters Discussed in the Meeting :**

#### **1. Registered Fire Engineer (RFE) Scheme**

Legal advice opined that amendments to the Fire Services Ordinance Cap. 95 and other related Ordinances / subsidiary legislation requiring certificate / certification by the DFS were necessary in order to give effect to the proposed RFE Scheme.

Regarding the liability to damages in the event that the work certified by the RFE was subsequently found to be not up to the standard by FSD, clauses stipulating the liability and penalty of RFE would be provided in the proposed amendments to the Fire Services Ordinance to avoid possible legal litigation brought about by negligence / malpractice of RFE.

In respect of the proposed paper vetting on the fire safety requirements formulated by RFE by FSD, it was a matter of practicability. From FSD's perspective, FSD's vetting and endorsement were essential to ensure (a) the consistency of the standard of fire safety provisions of licensed premises; (b) protection of the licensee from spending money on remedial works if the fire safety provisions proposed by RFE were later found to be insufficient; and (c) such arrangement was welcome by the licensing authorities in the previous consultation exercise.

Regarding SB's concern over the real benefit of the RFE Scheme on shortening the licensing process, feedbacks from the applicants revealed that there were cases in which they had to wait for the Fire Services Certificates before issuing of licences by the licensing authorities. The proposed RFE Scheme could definitely shorten the time required for the issuance of Fire Service Certificate and such applicants would be benefited by the Scheme.

Regarding SB's concern over FSD's audit inspection would be conducted after the licence was granted which might cause inconvenience to licensees in case the licence was revoked, FSD maintained the view that they should impose a check and balance mechanism through audit inspection. Such arrangement would not cause inconvenience to the licensees since they should have fully complied with the fire safety requirements and only sometimes minor discrepancies would be noted. Licence revocation would only be recommended when major discrepancies, which rendering the premises unsafe for the intended operation, were found during FSD's audit inspection. However, the chance of such occurrence was extremely remote, if not impossible, and the proposed workflow could facilitate business most without jeopardizing fire safety of licensed premises.

Based on the legal advice, FSD would send memo to SB to express the views on the Scheme. Subject to the concerns from SB to be cleared, the 2nd round trade consultation exercise would be conducted.

## 2. Inspection of Ventilating Systems in New Buildings

Up to the end of February 2011, a total of 8 new buildings were referred to FSD for inspection of fire dampers. However, only 7 out of the 8 projects were inspected as the remainder was subsequently withdrawn by BD. Besides, 1 project was found irrelevant to fire dampers of ventilating system.

The attitude of the AP/contractors towards the scheme was positive and for the complicated projects, they requested to have coordination meetings with the Ventilation Division for working out detailed arrangements before attending site inspections.

BD had already been informed of the inspection results and it was expected that they would liaise with the relevant APs for the arrangement of re-inspections after the defects were rectified. It was noted that the most common defect was the over-tilting of dampers, making them not able to move to the close position upon tripping of the fusible links. The scheme would continue for a few more months and thence BD would review the effectiveness of the scheme before deciding the way forward. The FAQ in FSD's website had listed out the requirements of fire dampers of ventilating system.

3. Review of Codes of Practice (CoP)

The 1st draft of the Codes had been circulated to all stakeholders for comment. As at the deadline on 14.2.2011, responses from 15 out of 19 stakeholders were received of which 105 and 9 comments were related to the FSI Code and the Inspection Code respectively. After consolidation, it was found that some of the comments were not related to the 1st draft and even some new comments were raised.

FSD was studying the comments and only those valid comments would be considered in this revision whilst others would be left for the next revision exercise.

4. BD's Code of Practice for Fire Safety Design for Buildings

Parts F and G of the draft Fire Safety Code were still being drawn up by BD.

5. Requirements of Drencher System on Refuge Floors

The provision of refuge roof should comply with the requirements as specified in the Code of Practice for the Provision of Means of Escape in case of Fire (the MOE Code). Should the refuge area of the main roof be covered by an upper roof, the covered area could no longer be regarded as a refuge roof but would be deemed to be a refuge floor. Under this circumstance, a drencher system should be provided for protection of the refuge floor in accordance with para. 4.40 of the Code of Practice on Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment (the FSI Code).

6. Sustainable Building Design of Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA)

The authority on the provision of EVA had been vested upon the Building Authority and this department was responsible for giving advice from a user's point of view. In order to meet the rising public concern over the sustainability of the built environment, application for exemption would be considered by both departments on a case by case basis.

Under the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and

Rescue (the MOA Code), an EVA should allow safe and unobstructed access and safe operation of a fire appliance having the following specifications:-

Gross weight – 30,000 kg

Turning circle – 26 m

Length – 12 m

Also, the width of an EVA in the form of a carriageway should be not less than 7.3 m. An EVA that was not in the form of a carriageway should be hard-paved, not less than 6 m wide and well demarcated on site. Turning facilities should be provided at all dead-end EVA.

7. Access to a Fireman's Lift at Ground Level

According to the MOA Code, the horizontal distance from the fire service access point to the doors of the fireman's lift should be not more than 18 m. The authority on the provision of EVA had been vested upon the Building Authority and this department was responsible for giving advice from a user's point of view.

8. Pressurization of Staircase

The staircases requiring pressurization should be designed and installed to prevent the ingress of smoke. The requirements of pressurization of staircase were set out in para. 5.21 of the FSI Code as well as the FSD Circular Letter No. 2/2006 and BS 5588 Part 5.

9. Local Application of the LPC Rules Incorporating BS EN 12845

Since 1.4.1995, FSD announced vide its Circular Letter No. 2/94 that the LPC Rules BS 5306 with local application was the standard of automatic sprinkler systems. According to the clauses for 'Positive head' and 'Suction head', the equivalent length of the suction pipe and fittings should be not more than 30 m to avoid air locks. Also, the sprinkler system in high-rise buildings over 30 m should comply with the requirements according to the design and commissioning stage of the building, i.e. of hazard group OH I, OH II or OH III.

In 2006, FSD promulgated vide its Circular Letter No. 3/2006 to adopt the LPC Rules incorporating BS EN 12845: 2003 with relevant local

application for automatic sprinkler systems with effect from 1.1.2007. However, it was not stated in the circular letter the extent of local application. During the past few years, it was found that the standard of some clauses stated in BS EN 12845: 2003 was a bit different from that of BS 5306.

To follow the same spirit of local application of BS 5306 in the case of BS EN 12845: 2003, it was necessary to clarify the following and circular letter would be issued accordingly after the further discussion and agreement of the FSSAG in the coming meeting: -

<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b><u>Clause/Para./ Page</u></b>	<b><u>Context</u></b>	<b><u>Replaced by</u></b>	<b><u>Reason</u></b>
1	Clause 10.6.2.2 Page 60	<b>Positive head</b> In positive head conditions, the diameter of the suction pipe shall be no less than 65mm. Furthermore, the diameter shall be such that a velocity of 1.8 m/s is not exceeded when the pump is operating at maximum demand flow.	<b>Positive head</b> In positive head conditions, the diameter of the suction pipe shall be no less than 65mm. Furthermore, the diameter shall be such that a velocity of 1.8 m/s is not exceeded when the pump is operating at maximum demand flow. <b>The equivalent length of the suction pipe and fittings shall be not more than 30m to avoid air locks.</b>	Follow local practice according to the LPC Rules BS 5306 : Part 2 : 1990
2	Clause 10.6.2.3 Page 60	<b>Suction lift</b> In suction lift conditions, the diameter of the suction pipe shall be no less than 80 mm. Furthermore, the diameter shall be such that a velocity of 1.5 m/s is not exceeded when the pump is operating at maximum demand flow.	<b>Suction lift</b> In suction lift conditions, the diameter of the suction pipe shall be no less than 80 mm. Furthermore, the diameter shall be such that a velocity of 1.5 m/s is not exceeded when the pump is operating at maximum demand flow. <b>The equivalent length of the suction pipe and fittings shall be not more than 30m to avoid air locks.</b>	Follow local practice according to the LPC Rules BS 5306 : Part 2 : 1990
3	Annex E Clause E.2.1 Page 149	<b>Hazard group</b> High rise sprinkler systems shall comply with the requirements for Ordinary Hazard Group III protection.	<b>Hazard group</b> High rise sprinkler systems shall comply with the requirements <b>according to Clause 6 (Classification of occupancies and fire hazards).</b>	Follow local practice according to FSD Circular Letter No. 2/94.

END