1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 John Field, President, welcomed members to the meeting and drew attention to apologies for absence received.

2 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

2.1 The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11th February 2016 were approved as a correct record, subject to the amendment of 5.8 to read as follows:

“5.8 After further discussion, Cathie Simpson suggested that a line needed to be drawn on how we had arrived to the current position so that progress could be made. Words would always have different meanings to different people and the only way to know the true meaning of the words was when the words translated into actions. People will always have different interpretations of words and we cannot focus on the words alone. The Institution needs to move forward on this issue, and any changes implemented are to be reviewed in a year’s time. This will give members the opportunity to see whether our understanding of the words has delivered the expected outcomes. All points of view need to be engaged, and everyone needs to be prepared for a degree of compromise.”

2.2 Regarding CIBSE Design Quality Assessment Tools, it was noted that the Knowledge Programme Sub-Committee was considering this further.
3 UPDATE / RESPONSE TO ISSUES DISCUSSED AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND ON QUESTIONS RAISED

Governance Review Implementation

3.1 Nick Mead reported that since the last meeting, a number of pressures had prevented him from progressing this matter as quickly as he would have wished. He had concluded that the establishment of a number of working groups would be overly time-consuming, and would risk re-opening issues for debate and delaying progress. He had therefore proposed to the Board that a single group should be established to take forward the implementation of the findings of the review. There would also be a role for the Finance, Risk and Governance Sub-Committee to review the operation of the new arrangements.

3.2 Nick Mead stressed that this needed to be taken forward in line with the Strategy 2020 developments. He also noted that there had been debate amongst members about the decision not to circulate the full report. This had been taken on board, and it was proposed to seek the approval of the July meeting of the Board to allow the report to be issued to members who wished to see it. He stressed that there was no significant change to governance within the report, and no recommendations that would require the amendment of the Charter, By-Laws or Regulations.

3.3 It was pointed out that the Council Consultative Panel proposal had been questioned by some, however it was felt that it should be tried, and could be amended if necessary if it did not prove to be a positive development. He clarified that the proposed single working group would review the report ahead of its implementation and that FRAG would have an ongoing remit to oversee its implementation.

3.4 It was also explained that members from all parts of the Institution could feed in through the appropriate mechanisms to Council, which had the responsibility of representing the views of the members; for example through RLC if the issue was raised through a region. The role of the Council Consultative Panel was to manage the agenda, and would have the job of ensuring that the most important issues were prioritised for discussion at Council.

3.5 An update on Diversity Panel progress was requested. Nick Mead reported that he had had discussion with Gay Lawrence Race on a way forward, and that he hoped to have a paper for the July meeting of the Board.

3.6 Nick Mead confirmed that he hoped to have established the task force on governance implementation by the end of the current month.

Update from Regional Liaison Committee

3.7 John Field gave an update from the meeting of RLC held that morning, covering:

1) International dimension of technical guidance (including Scotland / NI due to different legislation)
2) Guidance for online systems for holding meetings, to allow all regions to access a common system
3) Issue of de-coupling of membership and EC registration – need to clarify issues and benefits.
4) Equipment / model kits for STEM involvement. There was much interest in the Dolls House project introduced by Cathie Simpson with Patrons’ support. There was scope for publicising these initiatives and their potential.
5) Regions Manual – a task force is working on this, and the view was that this needed to be completed quickly, and made simple and straightforward.
6) Perceived ceiling on membership grade level depending on registration – it was noted that there was always a route forward, and this needed to be publicised.
7) The new email system was being phased in, and results were positive with a much lower failure rate.
4 ISSUES RAISED FOR DISCUSSION BY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Operation of the Council Consultative Panel

4.1 John Field introduced Peter Wong, President Elect, who had chaired RLC that morning, and would have the role of chairing the Council Consultative Panel. Peter Wong informed members that he had reviewed the suggestions for the operation of the Council Consultative Panel. It was intended to have 3 members plus the chair, and six volunteers had come forward. Peter Wong proposed to try to work with all 6 volunteers to frame forthcoming agendas, to ensure they responded to the issues being raised by Council Members. He hoped Council would support this approach, and no objections were raised.

4.2 Peter Wong would welcome proposals for consideration at future meetings. At the current meeting, one specific item had been raised by George Adams which was discussed below.

Scope for CIBSE guidance on the use of steam in district heating

4.3 George Adams introduced the item, referring to the much discussed performance gap which remained a long term issue for the industry and to developments in the use of modelling and training. George Adams had attended a discussion at which issues including the lack of design experience in control systems and a lack of rigour and discipline in the industry had been raised.

4.4 The underlying issue he wished to raise, therefore, was the need for rigour in the industry, and the need for engineers to think through their designs rather than simply relying on modelling. Modelling was useful to confirm engineering design decisions, but should not be relied on to provide the solution without critical examination. The relevance of steam systems in this context was in the improvement of rigour, and the views of Council members were sought on this issue.

4.5 Nick Mead referred to the Education and Industry group, which it was hoped to re-invigorate, and suggested that this might be a route to press for more rigour. However, George Adams felt that those who had been trained to design steam and control systems would understand the rigour involved, and the question was how to persuade the industry to understand the need for that rigour and discipline. He felt CIBSE had a leadership role in the need to re-introduce an emphasis on rigour in these areas.

4.7 Cathie Simpson referred to her experience in thermal models, and suggested that the industry confused performance simulation with compliance simulation. CIBSE was involved in the support of compliance, but the distinction between performance and compliance was not made clear. Similarly, the confusion of DECs and EPCs was not appreciated, and they should not be compared as this lacked rigour. The difference between compliance and performance needed to be made clear, and this would encourage a greater emphasis on rigour.

4.8 Members acknowledged the need for more discussion on rigour in the industry. It was suggested that there was a substantial issue on the contracting side with design requirements and standards not being followed properly, although other members took a different view. The need for projects to be monitored in practice, rather than designers working purely from their office, was also pointed out, and it was suggested that there was now a lack of knowledge on steam systems and water treatment which resulted in problems in practice. Steam systems continued to be widely used in district heating, and were an area that should not be neglected in training. It was also suggested that CIBSE needed to increase the rigour of its enforcement of CPD requirements.
4.13 It was agreed that CIBSE ought to take a lead in this area, and that CPD was part of the issue. George Adams hoped CIBSE could be a vehicle for case studies which considered not only successful projects, but could also share information about approaches and examples where things did not go well, without naming names. The example of Health and Safety was suggested as a potential approach that could be applied to engineering rigour. CIBSE might consider providing an example suite of documents to assist in this. Reference was made to the Probe studies undertaken in the 1990s, which were well recognised as ground breaking and could also provide an approach to tackle this issue.

4.16 In addition to a lack of basic skills training, it was also felt there were problems with performance being reduced from the levels originally proposed. It was suggested that the production of a set of standard cross-checking calculations might be of benefit. Hywel Davies stated that design calculation guidance was already available, though perhaps not well known, in a joint CIBSE/BSRIA guide, and it was noted that further BSRIA design guides were also relevant in providing design checks, examples, and potential failure points. These were not exhaustive and it was agreed they might be improved by collaboration between CIBSE and BSRIA.

5 SOCIETY CHAIRS

Institute of Local Exhaust Ventilation Engineers

5.1 John Field introduced Jane Bastow, who had taken over as Chair of ILEVE from Wally Gilder. Jane Bastow addressed Council, referring to the importance of air quality within industry and the high impact of occupational health issues on a large number of people in the UK.

5.2 Jane Bastow was keen to promote further co-operation with relevant external bodies, and stressed the emphasis within ILEVE on improved training. She found many resonances with the issues already discussed at Council.

Society of Façade Engineering

5.3 Graham Dodd reported on the work of the Society, drawing attention to the membership of the SFE steering committee. The main activity lay in running events for members, and he referred to two float glass plant tours that had been held, with two more planned. Evening events included ‘Façade of the Year’ prizes, awarded this year to Guy’s Hospital Tower refurbishment, Ryerson University Student Learning Centre in Toronto, and Bombay Sapphire Glasshouses.

5.4 He referred to the City Walk tours held by the Society, including one visit to Canary Wharf on the previous day. The AGM would be held in September, and the next Façade of the Year awards event would be held at the leading industry event ‘The Glass Supper.’ The purpose of the competition was to raise the profile of Façade engineering, to share knowledge, and build an international community.

5.5 Graham Dodd went on to describe educational developments, with the Bath MSc having closed this year. Efforts were being made to support the transfer and re-establishment of this course. Routes to Chartered Status for Façade Engineers were also under discussion.

5.6 Regarding Regional activities, the Society was seeking to support developments in Dubai and Hong Kong.
Society of Public Health Engineers

5.7 Steve Vaughan introduced the SoPHE report, noting that manufacturers, consultants and contractors were all involved in the Society. Membership growth had been positive, particularly amongst students, and efforts were being made to increase engagement. Over 400 people had attended events throughout the UK, and SoPHE regions operated in a number of CIBSE regions. Successful dinners were run in London and in the North, with strong attendance growth, supported by the Industrial Affiliates. New regional groupings in the Midlands, Oxfordshire and in the Middle East were being developed.

5.8 Technical presentations were a key activity, and strong guest speakers at member events were promoted to encourage membership. Manufacturers and test facilities trips had also been promoted, as well as technical discussion forums. The YEN had also been engaged, with YEN SoPHE networking and events having been established. This had generated positive feedback and further developments were being planned. The SoPHE Young Engineers Award was also mentioned, though it was noted that this would be relaunched as Water Aid no longer wished to partner the competition.

5.9 The Society wished to build on its Technical Bulletins, and were working with the CIBSE Marketing team to do this. These would be one or two page documents that would be of great benefit to the industry. The first bulletin would be on domestic water system sizing and appropriate standards.

5.10 Work was also being done on Technical Competence Modules, to assist engineers to assess their competence, and to progress a structured training path towards Chartered Status. The Society Newsletter was currently under review, with a planned relaunch in October 2016. A new Communications Chair, and an Editorial Technical Liaison Officer were in place to support this.

5.11 Steve Vaughan drew attention to the range of events that were planned by the Society over the coming months. In response to questions, he explained that Water Aid had withdrawn from the competition due to the cost to them, and they had now developed a related concept with considerable corporate support to enable them to raise additional funding. Carla Bartholomew welcomed the SoPHE YEN developments, and stressed that YEN had a range of regional centres, and hoped to amalgamate the SoPHE YEN into the overall YEN framework. This message would be passed on to all those involved.

Society of Light and Lighting

5.12 Jeff Shaw introduced the report of the SLL, referring to the International Year of Light, and the considerable success of Liz Peck and the SLL in promoting the industry’s work during the year. SLL was working to develop STEM initiatives to promote lighting in schools, and to encourage wider public consciousness. The need to educate the public, for example on issues such as LEDs, was noted, and he hoped to promote this debate during his year as President.

5.13 The Society continued to contribute publications to promote standards in lighting, and its guidance was widely used in the industry. The Masterclass series was continuing successfully, and the Society had ambitions to develop more overseas including in the Middle East. Membership was now close to 3,000, and SLL was one of the largest lighting bodies in the industry. He hoped to make much progress over the coming year, and was collaborating with the President Elect to promote a cohesive strategy for the Society over a number of years.

5.14 The emphasis on new technologies, and on identifying and explaining the issues, was welcomed, and SLL was very focussed on this need.
6 CHIEF EXECUTIVE’S REPORT

6.1 Stephen Matthews introduced the Chief Executive’s report, which tried to give a snapshot of the Institution’s activities. It could not be comprehensive, but reflected much positive activity. He noted that many professional institutions faced substantial challenges, with a significant overall decline in registration, and significant age-profile issues. CIBSE’s position relatively was very positive.

6.2 He referred to a review by John Perkins of the Engineering Professional in 2011 which had forecast a very large gap in the number of engineers required by 2020. The three largest Institutions, IET, ICE and IMechE, were very concerned by this situation, and had announced and funded an independent review into the profession, to be carried out by John Uff, a QC who was also a member of ICE and RAEng. CIBSE had been asked to present evidence by the end of the month, and initial findings would be published by the end of July for consideration later in the year by the three Institutions. It was noted that there had been much criticism of Engineering UK, who received a proportion of EC registration fees to promote the profession, and that there may also be criticism of Engineering Council. Stephen Matthews went on to say that CIBSE, along with other Institutions of similar size, were in a strong position to influence debate, and was seen positively by other Institutions.

6.3 Mariana Trusson referred to the membership survey, noting the high proportion of positive responses, but asking what the concerns of the minority had been. Carilyn Burman would provide additional information on this, and she also confirmed that the response rate was close to industry standards, although more response had been received in the past. The new CRM system would enable the survey to be made easier to complete, which it was hoped would improve response.

6.4 Regarding member engagement, Stephen Matthews pointed out the value of Council as a key opportunity for members to be listened to and to have their say and input. There had been challenges, and the Institution continued to see challenges in terms of technology and the developing profile of the membership. He referred to the commitment of the Trustees, whilst noting that not everything went to plan, and stressed the importance of a positive attitude. In terms of regional funding, he felt there was scope for additional support if the case could be made for positive developments. Regarding ad-hoc proposals, it was felt that Council provided an opportunity to raise suggestions, and that Stephen Matthews could be contacted directly.

6.5 Regarding the reasons for the positive external view of CIBSE, Stephen Matthews referred to its relevance in respect of climate change and the associated focus on energy. The skills and knowledge of building services engineers in the modern world was recognised, with the large increase in the proportion of the global population living in cities. It was pointed out that many in the industry were not members of CIBSE, and that it was important to get the message about good engineering to the rest of the industry, and the value of participating in CIBSE to achieve it. The number of qualified CIBSE members was small in the context of the industry, particularly world-wide, and the Fellows network was suggested as an opportunity to promote the value of participation. Stephen Matthews suggested that a debate be organised on this topic, and it was suggested that all Council members might be asked to take views from their constituencies ahead of the next meeting of Council. The need to promote the message of what engineering was about was stressed, and the lack of good careers advice was pointed out. The Class of Your Own initiative was widely supported, and it was stressed that this was an opportunity for the industry to work together in delivering influence in schools.

6.6 The question of whether the Institution wanted more corporate members, or members of any grade, was noted; Stephen Matthews pointed out that CIBSE had around 50,000 people associated with it through groups and contacts, but Engineering Council registration remained an important benchmark and within some companies it was not possible to
progress beyond a certain level without chartered status. Regarding the availability of information for those speaking in schools, Stephen Matthews referred to the STEMNET resources that were available to help with this, and to which a link could be provided.

7 NEW INITIATIVES

BIM Developments

7.1 Rowan Crowley introduced Carl Collins, who outlined a number of BIM developments within the Institution. He described the development of digital engineering within the industry, noting the need to work more smartly with data. CIBSE was collaborating with outside bodies, and was seeking to help inform the industry as there was much confusion. He drew attention to the definition of digital engineering, and to the way in which CIBSE data and algorithms could be built in and used in a more intelligent way. The CIBSE BIM Steering Group had been meeting for 5 or 6 years, during which time the situation had been very fluid and changeable. It was now at the point where guidance could be provided to members. PDTs had been developed, providing a consistent format that could be used across different manufacturers; 50 were published so far by CIBSE and others were using the CIBSE PDTs.

7.2 Publications, Training, Certification and Applications were all being developed at present. Publication guidance would include PQQs and a range of other issues, which together should address the entirety of a BIM level 2 project requirement. Regarding training, seminars were planned on BIM basics, to be held around the regions; e-learning with publication and guidance as a package; and classroom learning, on what it means to be a digital engineer. Regarding Certification, work was in progress covering people, companies and software, and it was noted that software providers were very interested in CIBSE validation for their software.

7.3 For the future, the potential for applications based on CIBSE data was being considered. Council members were invited to take a copy of the sample guidance note handout, and comments and feedback would be welcome. Les Copeland reiterated the points made, and stressed the importance of CIBSE taking a lead, as others would develop these approaches and the Institution would otherwise lose the opportunity to lead and to ensure high technical standards.

7.4 Hywel Davies confirmed that UK government had shown no enthusiasm to adopt EPBD standards in the UK, although it was noted that this might change in future. Jane Bastow noted that many in the LEV industry were not well informed on these issues and the requirements of level 2 BIM. It was noted that the proposed seminar content was in draft and it was hoped it could be available by the end of the year; the possibility of adapting it for individual societies was suggested, and it was noted that each area under the CIBSE umbrella would be covered. Existing seminars giving general information on BIM were being run by others with input from software companies, but CIBSE was not keen only to cover BIM level 2; it was hoped to add additional relevance by including more material. There was a danger that people may attend short events that provided a part of the picture, whereas CIBSE wanted to ensure people had the full information. This would be considered further, however, along with the need to promote and explain the message about digital engineering.

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8.1 There was no other business.

9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

9.1 It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 14th October 2016 at the ICE, 1 Great George Street, London.