

## AS/NZS 3500 STANDARDS REVIEW – PART 1

### COMMENTS PAPER

Summary of Comments to the WS-014, Part 1 working group mark-up draft, for the revision of AS/NZS 3500.1 (2003).

Please Note: Any change to the draft (received 19/2/13) that was included in the ABCB Proposal and is not discussed in this paper should be taken as supported.

Section	ABCB Comments	WS-014 Comments
<u>Preface</u>	I have amended the reference to the PCA slightly to reflect its inclusion in the NCC Series.	No objection, reflected in the present draft.
<u>1.6(a):</u>	I have added the word ‘Series’ after ‘National Construction Code’ to reflect that there are requirements in both the BCA and the PCA.	No objection, reflected in the present draft.
<u>2.2</u>	Revert to PCA in the first paragraph.	Agree. This anomaly was previously identified by AL and highlighted in draft from Feb 2013 meeting. Changes made in the draft.

Section	ABCB Comments	WS-014 Comments
<u>2.2</u>	Also, need to clarify: “The Sub-Committee sees no reason to change the first paragraph and suggests that it its recommended to ABCB to change the PCA to match”. The ABCB did not propose any change regarding the first paragraph, only the second, and the first paragraph appears not to be in conflict with the PCA	Refer above comment. The committee is not recommending any change to the PCA, rather that the reference in this paragraph should be to the PCA, not the NCC. Agreed to ABCB and reflected in draft.
<u>2.2</u>	The Note under the second paragraph, about the WaterMark website, should also be deleted as it is out of date.	Would be far better to be able to provide the correct url for the WaterMark website. In any case, SA have provided a redirection from this url to the ABCB Product Certification webpage. WS-014 agreed to <a href="http://www.abcb.gov.au">www.abcb.gov.au</a> - 24 <sup>th</sup> June.
<u>2.7.2</u>	Delete reference to AS681.1, this is already a secondary reference and is a manufacturers standard.	Agree. Since the various parts of AS 681 are referenced in AS 1646, there is no need to also reference any of them in this Standard. (Reference to AS 681.1 was added by WS-014 at Feb 2013 meeting.) Changes are reflected in the draft.
<u>2.7.3</u>	Delete reference to ANSI AWWA C606, this needs to be justified before inclusion	Previous comment from ABCB would have left Standard with no information about shouldered or grooved joints. WS-014 must decide if any requirements are required for this type of joint. The reference is deleted, needs consideration from SC.
<u>3.2.3.1, and 3.2.3.2</u>	The suggestion about removing some of the wording is supported. The two clauses could be combined.	Deletion of words from Cl. 3.2.3.1 was previously suggested by me but rejected by WS-014. ABCB comment is only a suggestion. Needs more discussion in SC meeting.

Section	ABCB Comments	WS-014 Comments
<u>4.1 and</u>	Reinstate the word “drinking”.	Agree, word “drinking” should be inserted before “water” in the second line. Note: This is consistent with performance requirements of PCA. PCC should consider if permitting the contamination of reticulated non-drinking water supplies is consistent with the Objectives of Part B3 of the PCA. (The word “drinking” was deleted by WS-014 at Feb 2013 meeting.) 24 <sup>th</sup> June: Needs more discussion from SC.
<u>4.2.1</u>	Reinstate the word “drinking”.	Agreed, for consistency with Cl. 4.1. The correct wording would be: <i>All water supply systems shall be designed, installed, and maintained so as to prevent contaminants from being introduced into the drinking water supply system.</i> (The word “drinking” was deleted by the sub-committee. WS-014 at Feb 2013 meeting further deleted the words “into the water supply system”.) Changes made in draft.
<u>4.4.4</u>	Remove reference to Table 4.1 as it does not apply to this clause. Include Appendix E as note only as it is informative.	Clause 4.4.4 does not reference Table 4.1, but does include references to Figure 4.1 and Appendix E. If the proposed wording gives an implication that Appendix E is normative, then both references can appear in a Note. changes made: No reference to Table 4.1 in present draft.
<u>5.4.4:</u>	The deletion here goes too far, in that it makes the clause too generic. The ABCB proposal was to delete “owner or” so as to allow for the common possibility that a dwelling owner may not be the dwelling occupier, and as such, it would not be required to provide an isolation valve accessible to the	Agree to restore the words “by the individual dwelling occupier” (My notes from the Feb 2013 meeting do not indicate that the change made to the draft was agreed by WS-014). Changes made in draft- SC to review.

Section	ABCB Comments	WS-014 Comments
	‘owner’, in particular.	
<u>5.9.2 to 5.9.4</u>	[Question]: Has David Cox (WSAA) made any progress on the draft wording adapted from WSAA Code to replace these clauses, as it will be important to the Standard, and will also need to comply with the NCC Protocol etc.	SC to discuss.
<u>5.15</u>	Delete new wording and revert to original text.	According to previous ABCB comments, the previous wording was unacceptable because it include a reference to “a suitably qualified engineer”. Simply deleting this reference does not tell the plumber how to achieve an acceptable result. Changes made in the draft on 24 <sup>th</sup> June.
<u>5.18</u>	I have inserted the words “where provided” before “for future connection”. This is just an editorial clarification.	Agree. Changes reflected in draft.
<u>6.1 (NOTE 2):</u>	The note needs to refer to NCC Series. For fire fighting water services, Volume One tells you when and Volume Three tells you how.	Agree, 24th June: WS-014 decided to delete all after NZBC.
<u>8.9: (paragraph 1)</u>	This has not been agreed and needs to be reverted to original text pending impact analysis of the proposed change.	Agree, Changes reflected in draft. 24th June: WS-014 decided to revert back to previous wording "Except if installed in domestic or residential buildings, all....".

Section	ABCB Comments	WS-014 Comments
<u>8.9(d):</u>	Recommend deletion of this requirement pending further discussion and impact analysis.	This requirement has existed since the 1998 edition of the Standard. Deletion would constitute a change and therefore require an impact analysis. 24 <sup>th</sup> June: WS-014 retained the warning sign after discussion with ABCB.
<u>9A.3</u>	Reinstate and change in accordance with original ABCB comment regarding ‘boundary’ and ‘point of connection’.	WS-014 to review reasons for deleting Clause. SC to suggest discuss.
<u>10.3.1</u>	Relocation to the PCA has been proposed for PCA 2014. WS-014 will be kept informed of progress. Retain pending confirmation.	No comment. Agreed and reflected in draft.
<u>10.4.1</u>	Remove this statement pending proper proposal and justification.	WS-014 has expressed the view that a requirement of this nature is essential to ensure that the plumbing system will continue to operate satisfactorily. WS-014 needs to prepare a justification for the change. 10.4.1 Compatibility of Cisterns & Urinals – was deleted.
<u>10.4.2</u>	Relocation to the PCA has been proposed for PCA 2014. WS-014 will be kept informed of progress. Retain pending confirmation	No comment. Changes reflected in the draft.
<u>10.4.5(a):</u>	Reinstate pending further justification.	Previous ABCB comment proposed that the reference to the manufacturer be removed. This has been done. Is it now proposed that this change be reversed? WS-014 should also consider removing the reference to “manufacturer’s specification” in the first sentence of Cl. 10.4.5.- Reflected in drat

Section	ABCB Comments	WS-014 Comments
<u>Table 14.1:</u>	Any progress from Philip Nicholls? If not, I would support abandoning this change, as it was not part of the ABCB proposal. It could be revisited as a technical amendment later on.	Agree, reflected in draft.
<u>15.5:</u>	The suggested new note is not supported as the need for it is not clear.	Agree, reflected in draft.
<u>Appendix A.</u>	I have amended the references to NCC Volumes (PCA and BCA).	Agreed, reflected in draft.