

## FSE Dialogue Session on 17 Mar 2017 (Friday)

S/No	Agenda for discussion	Summary of discussion
01	<b><u>Update on PB regulatory system</u></b>	<p><b><u>Presentation</u></b> LTC Tong HH shared with the Fire Safety Engineers (FSEs) on the number of registered FSEs and the number of performance-based (PB) submissions up to Dec 2016. See <u>Annex A</u>.</p> <p><b><u>Feedback/Comment/Queries from participants</u></b> Nil.</p>
02	<b><u>Update on CPE program</u></b>	<p><b><u>Presentation</u></b> LTC Tong HH shared on approved continuing professional education (CPE) courses and conferences for year 2016 and 2017. He requested participants to continue to attend suitable training courses and highlight any new courses to SCDF for inclusion into the list of approved CPE courses. He also emphasised the consequences for FSE who failed to attain the required CPE quota. See <u>Annex A</u>.</p> <p><b><u>Feedback/Comment/Queries from participants</u></b></p> <p><i>Number of courses</i></p> <p>Some FSEs requested that the number of CPE hours required for each cycle be lowered to less than 48. Reasons cited include lack of suitable courses (eg courses relevant for FSEs who are architects), as well as some repetitive courses in which the contents are largely similar to those organised in previous years. Some FSEs also suggested for SCDF to organise refresher courses to enable FSEs to attain the required CPE hours. Other FSEs also suggested for SCDF to consider expanding the list of approved courses beyond those related to fire safety engineering. Such an approach is similar to PE’s board approach of recognising CPE courses beyond the specialized domain (such as that for geotechnical PE), as there may not be many such specialized courses available.</p> <p>LTC Tong went through the list of courses with the participants and showed that the number of approved courses and CPE hours awarded are more than enough to help FSEs fulfill the CPE quota. LTC Tong also shared that professional institutions such as SFPE and IFE can also help to organise more suitable local courses for FSEs, and he can help to facilitate such courses where appropriate. He then reminded FSEs to make the time to attend such CPE courses.</p>

S/No	Agenda for discussion	Summary of discussion
		<p>D/FSSD added that it is important that FSEs fulfill the CPE quota as this CPE program is intended to upkeep FSEs technical competency. To maintain high standards of FSEs' competency, he stressed that only relevant courses brought to SCDF's attention will be included into the list of CPE program.</p> <p>SCDF is heartened that IFE will be organising courses to help FSE achieve sufficient training hours. SCDF will also review its evaluation criteria to allow more fire safety-related courses to be included as approved CPE courses once they are brought to SCDF's attention by the FSEs.</p>
03	<p><b><u>Introduction to FSE portal</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Presentation</u></b> LTC Tong HH shared with the Fire Safety Engineers (FSEs) on the upcoming FSE portal. This portal will be introduced to provide better service to the FSE in tracking their CPE training hours and searching for approved CPE courses. See <u>Annex A</u>.</p> <p><b><u>Feedback/Comment/Queries from participants</u></b> Nil.</p>
04	<p><b><u>Sharing on markup drawings, quality of reports, and guidance on common fire engineering design issues/parameters</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Presentation</u></b> Mr Nicholas Lee shared with the Fire Safety Engineers (FSEs) on how FSEs can improve on their markup drawings, and highlighted common mistakes made by FSEs in their submissions to SCDF. See <u>Annex B</u>. He reminded FSEs that submissions that contain unacceptable errors and are of poor quality will be rejected by SCDF, or deferred for review until rectifications are made by FSEs to improve the submitted documents/plans.</p> <p>He stressed that it is not the role of SCDF's officers to help check and improve the quality of FSEs submission. He also added that it is important for submissions to be of high quality so that processing time will be not unnecessarily delayed because of repeated clarifications, especially when number of PB waiver submissions has increased despite the number of PB processing officers remaining unchanged.</p> <p><b><u>Feedback/Comment/Queries from participants</u></b> Some FSEs enquired on how they can check on the processing timeline and the number of PB projects in the queue at any point in time. Mr Nicholas Lee shared that the queuing time is highly variable, and it is strongly dependent on the number of projects submitted, and how fast FSEs can get back to SCDF on their clarifications. It is highly impractical for SCDF to update and keep track of the queuing status as it may vary on a daily basis.</p>

S/No	Agenda for discussion	Summary of discussion
		D/FSSD reminded FSEs to ensure that their submissions are of a high quality so as to minimise turnaround time for processing of projects.
05	<b><u>Q&amp;A Session</u></b>	<p><b><u>Q1</u></b> Some FSEs asked whether technical memos submissions are still accepted by SCDF.</p> <p><b><u>SCDF reply to Q1</u></b> LTC Tong replied that only FEDB and FER are considered formal SCDF submissions and therefore, technical memos are not accepted as SCDF submissions. Nonetheless, technical memos can be used to supplement any amended FEDB or amended FER submissions.</p> <p><b><u>Q2</u></b> Some FSEs enquired whether submitted fire engineering reports can be retrieved and purchased from SCDF.</p> <p><b><u>SCDF reply to Q2</u></b> The submitted fire engineering reports can be purchased from SCDF over the counter upon payment of the necessary administrative charges, but this can be done only with the premise owner's and/or FSE's authorisation.</p> <p><b><u>Q3</u></b> An FSE suggested that currently, QPs can make fire safety plan submissions to SCDF but not FSEs. This may be perceived by young engineers who aspire to be FSEs to form the impression that a QP status is more useful and prestigious compared to that of an FSE. Therefore, they do not perceive the prospects of an FSE to be as bright as that of a QP. He wanted to seek opinions from the authorities and the participants on this view.</p> <p><b><u>Discussion on Q3</u></b> Participants cited the existing regulations prohibiting submissions to the various authorities. In order to elevate the status of FSEs, these regulations must be amended. The need for an FSE to be also considered a QP can also be studied. Whether FSEs should then come under the administration of MHA or MND will also need to be reviewed in a holistic manner.</p> <p>Mr Heng explained that an FSE's role is confined to fire safety engineering design. As there are FSEs who are not QPs, they may not have the expertise to submit the relevant plans e.g. building plans involving</p>

<b>S/No</b>	<b>Agenda for discussion</b>	<b>Summary of discussion</b>
		architectural fire safety works or fire protection plans involving design of automatic sprinkler system. In this respect, the plans of fire safety works are still to be submitted by QPs of relevant discipline and where the design involves fire safety engineering, FSEs will give their endorsement on the plans with relevant supporting documents as in current practice.

Drafted by: LTC Tong Hong Haey (Senior consultant/PBP, FSSD)

Amended by: Mr Heng Chai Liang (Senior Assistant Director, FSSD)

Cleared by: SAC Christopher Tan (Director FSSD)

Date: 07 Apr 2017