

FEDERATION OF PILING SPECIALISTS

MINUTES OF A TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: Thursday 9th September 2021

Time: 10:00am

Location: Online via Webex

PRESENT:

Chris Barker (CB)	Arup
Christopher Cox (CC)	Atkins Global
David A. Hard (DH)	Bachy Soletanche
Owen Francis (OF)	BAM Ritchies
Andrew Bell (AB)	Cementation Skanska
Zoe Baldwin (ZB)	Cementation Skanska
Sebastian Draghici (SD)	Central Piling
David Preece (DP)	Expanded
Andy Martin (AM)	Foundation Piling
Chris Oram (CO)	Franki Foundations
Andrew Bond (ABO)	GeoCentrix
Ebenezer Adenmosun	GeoFirma
Devji Bhuva (DB)	GSS Piling
Chris Beynon	JRL Civil Engineering
Andrew Heathcote (AH)	Keller
James Hayward (JH)	Pile Designs
Jon Ball (JB)	Roger Bullivant
Mark Toye (MT)	Socotec

In the Chair: Mark Pennington (MP) BBGE

In Attendance: Ciaran Jennings (CJ) FPS Secretary
Melissa Bramley FPS Secretariat

N o	TOPIC	ACTIO N
1	Apologies for absence	
	Peter Illingworth (Pile Designs), Stephen Edmondson (Foundation Piling)	
2	Minutes of the last meeting	
	The minutes of the meeting held on the 27 th May 2021 were approved.	
3	Matters Arising	
	<p>ICE Specification for Ground Treatment CJ confirmed this had been passed to the AGS to lead, and they were going to discuss at their Geotechnical working group. CJ mentioned he would report back. Action: CJ to report back on the decision taken by the AGS</p> <p>FPS Audit CJ mentioned there had been an initial meeting looking at all of the audit schedules, and the focus had been on removing duplications. CJ confirmed Jon Ball and Devji Bhuva confirmed they were participating in the audit review, and the proposed revisions will be finalised and ready for review by the end of 2021. CJ stated new requirements will be in the environmental sustainability section, with carbon calculations required on all projects, and it was likely the EFFC Carbon Calculator would be required to be used. CJ predicted it will become a far greater client requirement to understand the amount of carbon emitted. ABe stated if everyone used the standard EFFC form, it would be far easier for clients.</p>	CJ

	<p>Owen Francis asked if consideration had taken place on the inclusion of either digital or BIM competencies within the audit. CJ stated it was a really important point and should be considered. A discussion ensued on further requirements that could be investigated as part of the audit. JB stated he would look at information as a bit of a nudge and wondered whether a digitisation working party might be worth setting up, akin to the sustainability committee, or whether it should be incorporated into the Sustainability Committee.</p> <p>There was an agreement 'digital' should be mentioned within the audit, but not standardised, just highlighting that this would be the expectation in coming years. CJ stated he would raise the matter at the next meeting of the Executive Committee, taking place in September. CB stated the addition of some questions around an assessment criterion at a later stage would be worthwhile.</p> <p>Action: CJ to raise at the Executive Meeting in September</p> <p>Committee Chair</p> <p>CJ mentioned there had been a few nominations for the Vice Chair position and encouraged anyone who wished to take up the position to get in touch with either himself or Steve Hadley. CJ stated things were moving in the right direction, slowly.</p> <p>LABC Premier Guarantee</p> <p>CJ stated he had spoken to Steve Hadley who felt the issue was not necessarily a race to the bottom on cost issues, with house builders applying an historic standard, but felt it was an awareness issue that the standards had been updated. CJ wondered if working needed to take place on raising awareness of the current standards. MP stated at the meeting on 27th May, a discussion took place the possibility of running a CPD webinar, once a list of housebuilders and warranty providers had been collated. MP stated Julia Hill had sent a list of House Builders, and warranty providers. MP stated further information was required from the Committee.</p> <p>Action: MB to circulate email from 14th June to the Committee and look at getting information to the housebuilders.</p> <p>JB mentioned he had spoken to RBL's clients in NHF and felt an FPS Seminar on the differences on design and what they had to do and what they did not have to do, e.g. using static tests. JB stated there was a small competitive element on behalf of the housebuilders who were trying to be competitive with one another, but if the FPS, LABC, NHBC are only moving towards Eurocodes, it would give an advantage.</p> <p>ABo stated he had some success in persuading clients to when, or when not to use pile load tests, and said as a neutral party to point out the thought processes from a Designers point of view, as an individual who does not supply piling. Jon Ball agreed he would participate too. It was agreed to approach the housebuilders as a collective. Jon Ball asked if the link should be made to LABC and NHBC too. It was agreed a webinar should take place once the list had been compiled.</p>	<p>CJ</p> <p>MB</p>
4	<p>CIRIA – Update of 1970's Piling Guides</p>	
	<p>ABe confirmed Coffey had been confirmed as Lead Authors, alongside Cementation, Bauer Technologies and Aarsleff as co-authors. ABe said the project manager had been confirmed as Chris Presdee and the authoring team had completed the outlying draft which was then sent to and shared with the steering committee, which warranted over 70 comments, which were really constructive. ABe said the authoring and steer group met during the previous week and discussions took place on the key themes on the comments raised and a general agreement took place on the structure. ABe said the next task was to draft, with the first draft to be completed by the end of 2021, but there had been some delays on the initial programme due to some changes at CIRIA. ABe stated he would continue to keep the group updated.</p> <p>MP asked if ABe could share the key topics that were agreed on and ABe stated he would circulate a document. ABe stated the key themes for debate were how far reaching the document would be, for example – over land or over water, and the biggest issue was at which point the line was drawn between land and sea. ABe stated when people and plants were land based, but were perhaps moving over water onto a solid base or a pier, this should be included within the guide, however, as soon as plant and people moved to a marine environment, a further guide was required. ABe stated another area was timber piles, which whilst these were used in the UK but were relatively rare (mostly around the marine water environment) they would be included. ABe stated there was a question on whether</p>	

	<p>timber piles had a role in the future, and it was agreed they should be included. ABe stated the group have a far reaching global base in terms of the organisations represented too.</p> <p>MP asked if testing was covered, and ABe stated currently it was excluded. ABe stated the document must encourage sensible assessment of testing, and it would be a real missed opportunity if the merits of the right type of testing and instrumentation were not included, but it will not include the different types of testing and how to undertake them.</p> <p>CB said it was quite useful to capture lessons learnt when specifying tests, and ABe agreed stating the guide needs to assist in moving the understanding forwards, the industry in moving forwards, however the guide will not go into detail on how to undertake testing.</p> <p>CJ asked if there was a comprehensive overview with an objective assessment on the different testing methods available in the market. ABe stated there was an FPS guide, which he co-authored, plus the SPER wall and the manual on Geotechnical Engineering which has a whole chapter on pile testing.</p> <p>ABe stated the other key point of the guide was to highlight future areas of research and development, and an interesting point had been raised on including these points to help researchers gain funding.</p> <p>ABo stated Eurocode 5 for timber structures will have an annex on the use of timber piles and the second generation Euro 7 will mentioned the use of timber piles.</p> <p>CB wondered how the FPS Technical Committee will interact with the guide and asked if the guide will be circulated for this committee to review and input prior to the next meeting of the Committee on the 4th November. ABe stated he would double check the protocols and whether the document goes to the steering committees first. CB asked if there was a call out for case studies which could be required, and ABe stated he would definitely request these from the Technical Committee to ensure the industry has the opportunity to be involved.</p> <p>MP mentioned Chris Benyon and Andrew Heathcote were both missed off the invite to the meeting to discuss the guides. CJ stated it was agreed with CIRIA that with the funding there would be four representatives on the committee, and he would investigate what had occurred.</p> <p>Action: CJ to investigate with CIRIA, FPS representatives attendance at meetings</p> <p>ABe stated he would share the draft as soon as he was able, and he would get in contact with Chris Presdee to confirm Andrew Heathcote and Chris Benyon's attendance. ABe stated Chris Presdee is now working for Cementation Skanska, who was also continuing his role as CIRIA representative. Chris Barker confirmed he was a Member of the Committee.</p>	CJ
5	Improving Ground Investigation Data	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Guidance on Minimum Site investigation requirements for foundation design & GI Questionnaire results b. Promotion of SI Data c. Draft 1 – The Third Edition of the Yellow Book – circulation <p>JB mentioned the public comment for the yellow book had now closed and the comments were brought together in a meeting last week, and there were still some outstanding issues. JB stated it was agreed the appendix in at that stage was not the correct action to take, and there was a meeting taking place at the end of September to discuss further.</p> <p>JB stated the appendix was circulated earlier in the week, and time had been taken to discuss the benefits of having the appendix for piling, and the table covered a number of points for the past, present and future, trying to make the link with Eurocodes and setting how the national annex might go.</p> <p>JB mentioned the AGS were not too concerned about the data within, and this was the last time to input, with details required by next week at the latest.</p> <p>JB stated the hope was that as now it was going to be within the nationally approved standard to give ammunition when the SI data was less than ideal, and it was written with the intention that those who do not have awareness of what is required, the document will provide the information.</p> <p>Action: All to provide any further comments to JB by Wednesday</p> <p>ABo stated he had read the document briefly and had a question around whether the document was discussing investigation of pile foundations in geotechnical category 1. JB stated it was trying to discuss bearing piles and embedded retaining walls for all categories. ABo stated bearing piles would not be included in GC1, and he would like not to see any confusion around this and negligible risk.</p>	All

	<p>A discussion ensued on the how-to future proof the document. ABo stated the discussion within the project teams was that piling should be included in GC2. JB said the publishing of it was probably before the end of 2021. DB stated a lot depended on the ground condition.</p> <p>Chris Barker stated he felt the majority of categories would fall in category 2 and found it interesting that piles were in category 1.</p> <p>Jon Ball asked for any further comments by Wednesday and he would give some further thoughts to ABo's comments on categories.</p> <p>Chris Barker stated perhaps there would be an FPS Technical Note publicised following the publication of the Eurocode. JB stated the appendix was the only one that related to a discipline, the others relating to case studies. JB confirmed if comments could go via the FPS mailbox.</p> <p>CJ stated he had spoken to JB about the promotion and had spoken to Julian Lovell (AGS) who felt educating the client on a deeper level would be required, with the FPS and AGS holding a joint meeting to coordinate responses on various topics. CJ urged the committee to consider any further topics that could be beneficial to link with the AGS on.</p> <p>Action: All to consider further topics to work together with the AGS</p>	All
6.	Eurocodes & Execution Codes	
	<p>ABo stated there was not much to report on at the moment and there had been a change to the way the task groups had been formed, which had prompted a lot of movement of delegates around. ABo stated Parts 1-3 were all issued in May, and any changes now had to go through committees, with change requests needed to be submitted through national representatives.</p> <p>ABo said the enquiry draft would go out for national comment in October, through BSI and this will be the point at which the FPS should become engaged to ensure that changes requested previously have been made, and urged for an independent pair of eyes to review the draft. ABo stated there have been changes to the way the GI report is specified and the project team, led by David Norbury, and other project groups had a more laissez faire approach, with far less specification of what should be in the GI report, including some fundamental principles which ABo felt had been watered down. ABo felt there was a bad misstep and what he would like was a UK view, with a strong statement if they felt change was required in relation to the changes made. ABo felt the changes required will be quite extensive, and there wasn't much to do before the enquiry comes out.</p> <p>ABo stated the GIR changes had been objected and the responsibility for interpretation and the lack of value in Engineering Geology and passing the responsibility onto the Designer, and the UK need to be careful not to let the UK's way of doing things be compromised.</p> <p>ABo stated the group wished to leave an informative annex in part 2, and he was objecting the watering down of the body code and it was this bit that contractually was wrong, but there was an informative annex which detailed how to write a report and what he needed to know what was to include within the report.</p> <p>ABo stated they should be assessing ground properties based on the data and the current code distinguishes between derived values and the characteristic values and there was a clear distinction between evaluating the data and turning it into geotechnical parameters and choosing what value to choose for the design. CB stated he would advocate the designer should select the design parameters.</p> <p>A discussion then ensued on derived parameters, and this was clearly an area that needed to be looked at in October. MP asked if it would be too late to discuss the draft at the meeting on 4th November. ABo stated once the enquiry draft was issued, he was happy to prepare a briefing to discuss the options and concerns, ABo felt if this could be done fairly quickly following the publication of the draft.</p> <p>ABo stated he could not guarantee the date of the publication, and once this was firmed up, he would communicate the dates.</p> <p>CO asked if there was a way of seeing David Norbury's draft prior to the publication of the enquiry draft. ABo stated he would hope to share this, and he would circulate this within the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>Action: ABo to circulate in the next fortnight</p>	

	<p>MP mentioned the meeting on B/526/03 Ground investigation and ground testing and whether anyone from the FPS attended meeting. CJ wondered if checking in with the AGS Chair on the Ground Investigation group might be worth it. MT stated he attended the group on behalf of the BDA, and the group discussed anything standards related. MP wondered if the work completed on the yellow book would be discussed, and MT stated the discussions go into the minutiae of interests but it could be useful if there was an agenda that needed to be pushed via the ISO / BSI. MT stated he would feedback from the meetings</p> <p>David Hard stated he circulated the Part D, relating to concrete for GeoTechnics within a view a in mind of bringing it up to date with the And he had two comments back, which had been submitted back as the UK comments. DH stated the document is being re-written and it was u</p> <p>And getting this brough back in line with the tremie guide and at the moment the task group does not have a UK representative and he was not a concrete expert but he would need back up from individuals who understand concrete, and the UK needed to be careful, and stated the document would be re=circulated again for comments in the future. ABe asked what the time commitment was on the group, and DH stated he was going to investigate. CJ mentioned it might be worth DH speaking to Chris Harnan who may have an insight into the best way to reserve the UK's position.</p> <p>DH asked if everyone had a further look at the document. MP stated the document was key and everyone should look at this again.</p>	
7.	Technical note on base of pile reinforcement	
	Owen stated he needs to action the comments received ready for publication and would do so in the coming week.	MB
8.	ICE Manual of Geotechnical Engineering Guidance Update	
	ABe stated this was progressing still, and an initial draft had been completed but he was waiting to see if it was progressing	
9.	Any other business	
	<p>Zoe Baldwin stated the Level 7 Apprenticeship was ready to go, complete with a funding band, with the first intake to take place in September 2022. Zoe mentioned she would circulate details to the Technical Committee and MD's. Zoe stated the Universities participating were currently: Strathclyde; Birmingham; Leeds & Portsmouth, and Imperial had requested further information.</p> <p>MP stated the qualification should be publicised as much as possible. ZB stated Portsmouth were also looking at a Level 6 qualification which will probably be more Engineering Geology related, and the Level 6 in Civil Engineering could still be applicable, which would enable individuals to gain the IEng qualification before progressing to the Level 7 qualification. Ebenezer asked if it would be possible for Zoe to run a presentation on the programme and the process.</p> <p>ZB urged everyone to get in touch if they had comments or suggestions.</p> <p>CJ mentioned the Early Careers Group were looking at outreach programmes, and mentioned the link with the Ground Forum Mentoring scheme and stated it would be useful to connect in with the universities</p> <p>ABe stated there was a lot of concern around the cost of degrees when visiting schools as a STEM Ambassador. ABe stated he believed the Early Careers group should look at how to promote the scheme.</p> <p>Action: Add to agenda for 4th November to ZB to present, and ask ZB to present at the next quarterly meeting, taking place on 15th October</p>	
10	Further Meetings	
	<p>Further 2021 Meetings (10am-12pm):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th November (online) 	