Annex 10A - updated Final Report

Revision status:

Revised text following public consultation on the CIC Interim Report ('Raising the Bar') as published in August 2019, two public consultation conferences in September and October 2019 and the submission to the consultation which closed at the end of October 2019.

Consultation comments considered by WG10 at a meeting held on 8 January 2020 and changes/additions incorporated into the original text.

Chair: Prof Charles Egbu, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education
& Experience), University of East London (UEL),
President, Chartered Institute of Building

Secretary: Steven Thompson, Associate Director of the Built

Environment, RICS The lead contributors are listed in Annex A.

Executive Summary

568. WG10's task was to agree specific competence levels and provisions for accreditation/reaccreditation for project managers (PMs) working HRRBs.

569. This will involve the need to enhance the competency of PMs working on HRRB (and other complex) projects such that they are aware of their requirements, to put in place a system of accreditation and re- accreditation of PMs going forward and to require specific and focussed CPD on a regular basis.

Key Recommendations

Recommendation One: All Project Managers (PMs) who are to work on HRRB projects must be members of a recognised professional body (or equivalent).

Recommendation Two: The level of competence that is required of Project Managers should be 'Comprehensive' given that it would seem right to conclude that the 'level' or 'depth' of knowledge and application for PMs working on HRRB projects should be greater than 'understanding'.

Industry context

570. Various professional bodies (and others) currently have members who act as construction PMs within the UK industry and WG10 has drawn upon these sources as the basis of the PM competency framework as outlined in Annex 10B in the supporting documents. In addition to professional bodies, several national standards in PM competency previously published and all of these sources are set out below:

- Association for Project Management (APM)
- Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB)
- Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)
- Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE)
- International Competence Baseline (ICB)
- National Occupational Standards (NOS): Project Management
- Edexcel Level 5: NVQ in Construction Project Management

571. or the purposes of this framework, we have made use of the APM framework model of competency, although other sources have similar styles and formats.

572. Each of these organisations sets out competence frameworks for PMs and the resultant output has taken material from each of the investigated sources to arrive at the final framework. WG10 has drawn from other competence and accreditation models which are already in place

and which address particular knowledge or application in specific situations. The model example given is the scheme regulated by the ICE for those engineers who design and construct dams and reservoirs where a separate register is maintained. Details of this scheme are given in Annex 10E in the supporting documents.

Responding directly to questions arising from Dame Judith Hackitt's recommendations

573. There is a very real need to address the challenge to the industry provided by *Building a Safer Future* and WG10's work has resulted in the drafting of a PM competency framework with additional requirements particular to HRRBs added as set out in Annex 10B in the supporting documents. This also draws in reference points from the international arena.

574. In arriving at the list of competences, WG10 discussed a host of issues, including whether there was the need for a specific series of PM competences for HRRB projects, and whether there could be a separate 'bolt on' competence matrix produced for those PMs who wish to work on HRRBs or 'complex' buildings. In addition, issues were raised as to whether a PM working on a HRRB needs to have the relevant knowledge and skill to a deep level or just an awareness of who to go to be able to ask the right question(s) and to go on asking until satisfactory answers are received. The issues of whether a PM needs to be a "generalist" or a "technical specialist" or have "a reasonable level of technical specialism" was also discussed. WG10 was also mindful that a PM could work for a number of employers (client, contractor, consultant), and could be brought into a project at different stages of the project depending on the procurement route/type. In the same vein, WG10 noted the peculiarities of refurbishing HRRBs as opposed to new build and the extent to which this needs to be accommodated in the sets of competences needed for project managing HRRBs.

Detailed analysis of issues

575. **Issue 1:** establishment of the parameters around the use of the term, Project Manager (PM) for the purposes of this report, given that the term is present and is used in a whole variety of industry organisations to refer to the person (or organisation) who is responsible for the successful management (or oversight) of the Project, in whatever scope or form the project comprises.

576. However, the context of the relevant section of *Building a Safer Future* (5.15) suggests that there was a discovery made by the review team between the publication of the interim and the final report, such that the position of the PM is considered to be one as a client-appointed consultant who is responsible for the management of the overall construction project, including the oversight of the other members of the consultant team (as they undertake their duties) and the review and management of the build phase of the project.

577. Whilst the PM is responsible for the oversight of the whole project and the work of others, there is no expectation that they will undertake any of the particular consultant functions themselves (unless they have specialist skills in this area). It could be that the PM is a member of the client's staff (if sufficient competency and experience exists already 'inhouse'). For the purposes of this report, it is assumed that consideration of the competency of PMs does not extend to other roles within the project, where the person (or firm) might be referred to as the Project Manager – these might include:

- The contractor's PM, responsible for the successful delivery of the project on site;

- Any sub-contractor's PM, responsible for the successful delivery of a portion of the project;

- The client's PM, where a consultant PM is also appointed; or
- Any consultant's PM, who might be responsible for the successful delivery of the design services within the consultant firm.

578. Whilst all of these will need to demonstrate competence in exercising their PM function, consideration of these is outside the scope of this report. It might be right to consider to adoption

of a common approach across all relevant professional bodies that represent PMs, such that the competency framework arrived at here in Appendix 10B could be used for all bodies.

579. **Issue 2:** The competence framework included within this report sets out the competences required for a client-appointed PM to undertake their duties on an HRRB project, although much of the framework content could apply equally to PM duties on any residential building or indeed across the whole of the construction industry, with whatever project function is under consideration.

580. The benefits of this competence framework can be derived for all involved in the commissioning, procurement, design, management and execution of HRRB projects, be it for the establishment of the initial baseline competence for individuals and firms at the point of project appointment, for setting education and qualification standards, for those embarking upon their career and for the ongoing accreditation of such standards over time.

581. **Issue 3:** The PM competence framework included within this report addresses the specific role of a client- appointed PM for work on an HRRB, although these competences could apply equally to other building types.

582. It should be recognised that the role of the PM on HRRB projects (or indeed on any type of project) is likely to stretch across the whole of the life-cycle of the project, which has been categorised by many by reference to the eight stages of the RIBA Plan of Work (PoW). Because WG10 believes that the role of the PM includes all of these stages (and more) we have not presented the PM competency framework in the context of the PoW, but rather by reference to the categories of competence that a PM must exhibit throughout the project.

583. In many project models, the PM can be the first appointment made by the client and the PM is then required to advise and recommend to the client upon the appointment of other members of the consultant team. Indeed, the PM may also be the sole person to advise and assist the client in the preparation of the Strategic Brief document.

584. In addition, and as well as being responsible for oversight of the complete construction project, the PM may also be responsible for post-completion 'client care', being the interface between the client and the consultant and contracting teams over the management and completion of defect rectification, the interface with any facilities management organisations appointed by the client and addressing ongoing performance issues with the completed building.

585. Notwithstanding the fact that we have not categorised the competence framework for a PM by reference to the PoW, we have nevertheless undertaken a piece of work that seeks to map the functions and duties required by a PM when working on a HRRB project (and also, as a sub-set, when that HRRB project is itself a refurbishment project within an existing building, rather than a new-build). This mapping exercise has been undertaken by reference to the structure of the PoW and is included at Annex 10C in the supporting documents – rather than being a competence framework, it is instead a checklist of the duties expected of a PM – and, clearly, the implications of the analysis is that if a PM is expected to undertake such duties, that they are required to be able to demonstrate their competence to do so and to continue to be able to so demonstrate.

Raising the bar: proposed approach

586. The essential features of any proposed approach that seeks to improve upon the *status quo* must include three key aspects, namely:

- Risk profile;

- Compliance; and

- Process.

587. And these must be underpinned by a fundamental need for a culture change such that behaviours are modelled on 'doing the right thing' rather than 'just getting over the

line' in respect of the 'rules'.

Enhancement of competence requirements

588. The enhanced competence requirements are set out elsewhere in this report and captured fully in Annex 10B in the supporting documents.

589. The core competencies that a PM is required to demonstrate are three-fold, namely:

- **Knowledge** (knowing about the subject in question);

- **Application** (the applying of the acquired knowledge to the specific project, combined with the gaining of relevant experience); and

- **Behaviours** (the manner in which the PM acts when undertaking that function – this is of particular relevance to the role of the PM, when they are required to exhibit 'softer skills' so as to 'get the best out of people').

590. In the assessment of these core competences, consideration needs to be given to the 'level' or 'depth' of competence that needs to be exhibited. All of the professional bodies represented on WG10 (and other bodies not so represented) have similar systems in place that seek to 'test' the depth of knowledge and application that candidates for membership must demonstrate – indeed, some subjects or topics are considered more important than others and are accordingly 'tested' to a greater depth.

591. Overall, there is a scale of competence that could be applied to the role of the PM working on HRRBs (which might be considered as needing to be to a higher level than other types of buildings). We had originally taken one typical model as an illustration (from APM), but have now adopted the common alignment of terms across all WGs, namely:

- Awareness;

- Appreciation;

- Understanding; and

- Comprehensive

592. We recommend that 'comprehensive' be the level of competence that is required of PMs in this field, as considered in Annex 10B in the supporting documents. It would seem right to conclude that the 'level' or 'depth' of knowledge and application for PMs working on HRRB projects should be greater than 'understanding'. It might also be helpful to align the descriptions of the levels of the competencies between the various WGs that represent other construction professional disciplines (such as WG1, 7, 8 and 11) such that there is a common system going forward.

593. Separately, WG10 recommends that all PMs who are to work on HRRB projects must be members of a recognised professional body (or equivalent), although we acknowledge that this might meet with some resistance from those qualified by experience or who are already members of a credible industry certification scheme. In addition, there would need to be a structured and aligned 'route to membership' such that we would avoid the risk of one body having a qualification route which was perceived to be 'easier' than the others.
594. As acknowledged within Annexes 10B and 10C in the supporting documents, there needs to be an awareness that c.90% of all HRRB projects are refurbishment rather than new-build and accordingly, the competence of PMs needs to be more finely attuned to the particular needs and challenges of this type of project.

Accreditation/reaccreditation

595. WG10 recommends, going forward, that the professional bodies involved in the training

and accreditation of PMs who wish to work on HRRB projects seek to have their own in-house systems, which focus on the particular area of HRRB competencies, accredited by a third-party organisation (and UKAS has been suggested as one possible solution).

596. To ensure that accreditation is operated as smoothly as possible, it would be good to have the proposed accreditation system validated in advance by the chosen third-party organisation, this to ensure that the quality of the source material as well as a check on the quality of the checking process itself. Consideration would need to be given to the policing of any such system and what penalties should be put in place.

597. Whilst the requirement for members to remain competent and up-to-date should be an ongoing process, it is recommended by WG10 that re-accreditation takes place at regular intervals throughout the career of PMs working within on HRRB projects.

598. This could take the form of demonstrating continuing competency along the lines of that which is outlined elsewhere in this paper but without the knowledge acquisition which it would be assumed is being gathered on a continuous basis. It is considered that reaccreditation could be a 'lighter touch, with perhaps only a requirement to exhibit the 'log book' at the relevant time.

599. It feels like that cycle of re-accreditation should be initially no more than at three-year intervals although there might be a case for extending this to five years as time develops. Consideration would also need to be given to what would be applied in the case of a PM not being involved in any HRRB project over the relevant period.

Continuing Professional Development (**CPD)**

600. All of the professional bodies represented on WG10 (and many other bodies not so represented) already have a system in place which requires qualified members to ensure that they keep up to date with knowledge and application in areas of practice relevant to the PM function. The specifics of each different system differ in the detail, but the common features include the setting a defined minimum number of hours of study (either private study or attending organised events) and the recording of such CPD hours, so that compliance can be verified.

601. What is not currently mandated is a requirement that the PM undertakes focused CPD relevant to his/her particular area of practice – the PM is typically free to gather CPD hours on any subject, however closely linked (or not) to their current area of practice.

602. It is WG10's recommendation that PMs who are working, or in the future to be working on HRRB projects, will be required to undertake focused (and perhaps mandatory) CPD sessions on relevant subjects (such as fire and/or life safety). Clearly, there will need to be a focus by CPD content providers on producing material that is relevant and topical on both the subject itself and focused to the needs and requirements of the relevant professional discipline.

603. WG10 has considered that this CPD requirement for HRRB projects could be satisfied by the design of a suitable training module (with end-of-course 'testing' or an examination), which might include some or all of these various components, such as:

- Knowledge acquisition (and a demonstration of learning outcomes, perhaps by reflection);

- A log of suitable and relevant project experience over a defined time-period;

- Preparation of a case study to illustrate one particular aspect of relevant project work; And

- Interview with questions on knowledge, experience and case study material

604. Once the assessment of the module is complete and the candidate has demonstrated competence in the particular subject, then a suitable supplementary qualification is awarded, and the individual candidate is able to work on HRRB projects. The foregoing describes a system that would need to be put in place to upskill the current qualified PM community to ensure that they are suitably competent to work on HRRB projects going forward, whereas over time the relevant

module content would itself become part of competence assessment at the entry point to the PM profession. The outline design of how such a system might look like and be operated is set out in Annex 10D in the supporting documents, although careful consideration needs to be given to the detailed design and the specific content of the system requirements, such that it is realistic, given the scale of task (initially and) nationally over a short timeframe and within the resources of the larger firms, with considerable staff numbers falling within the remit of the system.

Programme for delivery and primary authorities

605. WG10 recommends that the revised system for PMs working on HRRB projects should be implemented as soon as possible and without necessarily waiting for the passage of primary and/or secondary legislation in this field.

606. However, it would be sensible, given the cross-industry impact of change within one specific discipline, if the change were introduced together and at the same time, to avoid confusion and waste. Having recommended this, WG10 is mindful of the number of matters to be introduced at the same time and it may be wiser to consider a phased approach, albeit that undue delay should be avoided, if possible. Whilst each professional body involved in the qualification and accreditation of PMs could undertake the necessary changes on their own, it would be good if this could be done in collaboration. WG10 considers that a common 'Best Practice Guide' would be a very helpful addition.

607. In any programme for delivery, an account needs to be taken of the fact that any new regulatory framework introduced by Government will need time to be implemented and for industry to develop their competence to deliver against any scheme requirements and this period should not be underestimated. In the period before the full implementation of the new regulatory framework and the consequential and related accreditation of individuals and firms to work in this area, there is the potential for there to be supply chain shortages with the resultant adverse impact upon project delivery and building costs.

Barriers to delivery

608. There could be the tendency to consider that the various professional bodies might consider that there is no need to change, given that their current competence models are sound – this might serve to discourage an acknowledgement of the need for change. In addition, the adoption of a common set of descriptions for the level of competency required (as set out in paragraph 592 above) might equally be a challenge. The reaction of the various professional bodies is key to this approach, together with the opportunity to work with universities, firms and organisations, Government and procurement bodies. Clearly, this culture must change through a 'hearts-and-minds' revolution.

609. Consideration would need to be given to the potential costs of the implementation of fresh training provision and whether Government support might be forthcoming. It is considered that without Government financial support, there will be a considerable cost and time burden that will fall upon firms, particularly those with many qualified staff. Further there would need to be an examination of the relationship between cost and consequent benefit.

Acknowledgements

The assistance of all those named in Annex A is gratefully acknowledged for having given freely of their time and for sharing details of the relevant material from their own representative organisations.

List of Annexes

(not included here)

Annex 10B: Project Managers competence framework (HRRBs)

Annex 10C: Competence requirements for Project Managers (working

on HRRBs) Annex 10D: Possible competence

assessment/reassessment model

Annex 10E: Dams and Reservoirs model

Annexes 10B to 10E are in the compilation of supporting documents, which is Appendix A to this report.