

Case Title	Description	Case Number	Customer Owner	Created On	Response (if recorded)
A5.2.1	To Whom it may concern, I'm writing to request clarification on the wording in section A5.2(1)-'Subject to A5.4, A5.5 and A5.6....' Does 'subject to' mean that these sections must be assessed for relevance, and then applied where necessary; or that showing compliance is conditional upon meeting the requirements of those sections without exception? Thank you for your assistance, s22	CAS-20261-K0X8R3	s22	14/10/2022 14:05	Note of Call -  "Confirmed that when looking at evidence of suitability under A5.2 that subject to A5.4, A5.5 and A5.6 means if those apply then that's the evidence of suitability you must use (i.e. can't use A5.2) and only if those don't apply then you use what's in A5.2."
A5.2 Evidence of suitability Volumes One and Two	Hi NCC, What would be interpretation of below clause of A 5.2 of NCC 2019 (1) Subject to A5.4, A5.5 and A5.6, evidence to support that the use of a material, product, form of construction or design meets a Performance Requirement or a Deemed-to-Satisfy Provision may be in the form of any one, or any combination of the following:  Can somebody propose a performance solution for a building element which needs to comply FRL requirements of A 5.4? In my understanding, A5.2 evidence of suitability cannot be proposed for any building element which needs to comply with DTS provisions. I would like you pass an opinion on my understanding.	CAS-20509-Z9T1X2	s22	15/11/2022 8:11	Note of Call - Rang 2.22pm Thurs 1/12. Advised that whether you apply Part A5 depends on whether you use a Deemed-to-Satisfy Solution or a Performance Solution.  If it's a DTS solution, yes you follow Part A5 and it directs you to A5.4 and Schedule 5 but depending on what option under Schedule 5 you use determines whether you use a report from an ATL - if tested or minor difference to text - or if go back to A5.2, because just meet nominated requirements/standards in Schedule 5)  If you use a Performance Solution, Part A5 is one of several assessment methods you could use (you don't have to use it). However, regardless of the assessment method, you would need to meet the relevant documentation requirements of A2.2. contact made... yes, read to the letter you need to test every configuration.... we're looking to improve that
A5.2.1 Evidence of Suitability	Dear ABCB, We are seeking clarification of the intent of Clause A5.2 (1) which uses the words "subject to A5.4/A5.5/A5.6". Clauses A5.4/5.5/5.6 require testing, as opposed to the other types of evidence of suitability listed in A5.2 (1) (a) to (d) which offer alternative pathways for compliance. Interpretations in the market of the words "subject to" are excluding all pathways within (a) to (d) and only permitting evidence from A5.4/5.5/5.6 in the form of a test report. This approach requires testing of every single product variant (thickness variants of insulation batts for instance) regardless of similar (proven) fire behaviour and represents a burden on industry when the performance of products can be adequately proven to allow the pathways in (a) to (d) to be used. Market pressure to only produce test reports will either reduce the range of products available in the market or increase compliance costs. I am happy to provide more information and test data as evidence to support this discussion and prove that testing every variant only increases cost and does not reduce risk. I appreciate that the ABCB is not a policing body, but clarification of the intent of the "subject to" clause structure would assist in guiding industry or at least determining how to remove this confusion in future editions. I appreciate your time, please feel free to contact me if you require anything further. I look forward to hearing from you.  Kind regards s22	CAS-23588-C9M7S6	s22	26/04/2023 16:42	
BCA Clarification 'subject to' what does this term mean?	Good Morning, Within the BCA Volume One there is a few times where the phrase "subject to" is used within a clause and referencing another clause. Question: What is the correct way to interpret a "subject to" clause. Should you: a.Ensure you meet both clauses (i.e. seeing it the same as "having regard to"); or b.Just meet the clause within the "subject to" and disregarding the first clause. Examples: Example 1 – BCA clause A5.2 and FRL s: -Legislative references: oA5.2 opens with "subject to A5.4"; oA5.4 then lists an FRL must be determined per Schedule 5. -Impact if only meeting A5.4 and disregarding A5.2: oA5.4 and Schedule 5 does not have codemark accreditation as an FRL methodology (only A5.2); oIf only allowing A5.4 compliance any codemark that defines an FRL is technically unenforceable. Example 2 – BCA Spec E2.2a-6 and occupant warning: -Legislative references: oSpec E2.2a-6 opens with "subject to E4.9"; oE4.9 then states occupant warning to AS1670.4; -Impact if only meeting E4.9 and disregarding Spec E2.2a-6: oAS1670.1-2018 clause 3.22 has more strict requirements for occupant warning to acoustically separated areas then AS1670.4-2018 clause 4.7; oIf only required to meet AS1670.4 and not AS1670.1 the occupant warning system would not be as effective in the building. My opinion: For the above reasons I have always interpreted "subject to" within the BCA as having a similar meaning to "having regard to" and effectively ensuring I meet both clauses in full. Is this the correct way to interpret the term "subject to" in the BCA?  Regards, s22	CAS-16541-X4B7K1	s22	27/07/2021 10:06	fianlly spoke to each other... keep both in mind, a sort of 'don't forget' phrase.
Clarification request : NCC A5.2 (1) (d)	Hi My name is s22 , I'm the assessments manager at s22 (accredited fire testing laboratory)  We would like you to kindly clarify on who is permitted or allowed to provide evidence of suitability related to the fire performance (fire resistance or reaction to fire) of building materials, components and structures for elements of construction and confirm that it should only be an accredited testing laboratory under NCC A5.2 (1) (d).  s22	CAS-11912-Z6K8B1	s22	s22	5/04/2020 0:53 attempted 9/4. Note lead-in, 'subject to A5.4 and A5.5...' - fire-resistance must be ATL.... hazard properties doesn't specify who, however ATL is logical choice given the importance of the tests.  14/04 got through today.  also asked about assessments/opinions 1530.4 opinion - A5.2(d)(i)
Demonstrate compliance with the NCC - Fig 2.1 NCC evidence of suitability framework	I would like to get clarification on the above and what demonstrates evidence via an Accredited Testing Laboratory. Within the ABCB (NCC Handbook) - 2.3.4 Report issued by an Accredited Testing Laboratory a table describes the definition of a report issued by an Accredited Testing Laboratory (as below). A5.2 Evidence of suitability – Volumes One and Two 1. Subject to A5.4, A5.5 and A5.6, evidence to support... (d) A report issued by an Accredited Testing Laboratory that— (i) demonstrates that a material, product or form of construction fulfils specific requirements of the BCA; and (ii) sets out the tests the material, product or form of construction has been subjected to and the results of those tests and any other relevant information that has been relied upon to demonstrate it fulfils specific requirements of the BCA. It then further explains "A report is issued by an Accredited Testing Laboratory to show that a building component has been subjected to particular tests, and sets out the results of those tests including any other relevant information that demonstrates its suitability for use in the building. An Accredited Testing Laboratory can also issue test certificates to certify that a particular product or system satisfies specified requirements." What does "can also" mean? Is it that the Laboratory can choose to provide a FULL or Summarised Test Report &/or issue just a test certificate to confirm that the product has met the requires of the test standard and therefore to the NCC? Would appreciate the ABCB stance on this and a contact so I can have further communication with that person.	CAS-20823-S9R6W6	s22	13/01/2023 12:45	No response recorded



Case Title	Description	Case Number	Customer Owner	Created On	Response (if recorded)
Documentation Required from Manufacturers/Suppliers to Demonstrate Compliance	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a manufacturer of fire rated wall systems, I am constantly asked for copies of our "Test" reports to demonstrate compliance with the NCC. From reading the NCC and section 3.3.4 of the Evidence of Suitability Handbook 2018 (EoS) is my understanding that we are only obliged to submit a "Report" from an Accredited Testing Laboratory (ATL).</p> <p>From the manufacturer's perspective, we spend vast amounts of money developing intellectual property (IP) through testing that we do not wish to be shared or made public for obvious reasons. We then develop fire assessments (essentially engineering opinions) with those same ATLs that we use to extend the applications for which the testing may apply and to protect the IP we have developed.</p> <p>We constantly receive requests for tests only and assessments are deemed "not acceptable". To counter these demands, we request that certifiers sign a Non-disclosure Agreement (NDA) with us to ensure our IP is protected. I have on several occasions been verbally threatened with legal action for preventing them from undertaking a statutory function under the Building Act. I have also received a letter from one building surveyor's lawyer outlining "why it is inappropriate for a building surveyor to sign a NDA's when undertaking the statutory functions under the Building Act."</p> <p>As an aside, at times, we have provided some of our tests to project fire safety engineers under NDA so that they can develop their own Performance Solutions where there is no other way to resolve a particular onsite issue.</p> <p>As experts in the framework of the NCC, I seek your clarification as to what documentation is required to be provided as a manufacturer/supplier of building materials to demonstrate compliance with the NCC with specific respect to section A5.2.1(d) please?</p> <p>Please feel free to call me if you need to and I look forward to your reply soon?</p> <p>s22</p>	CAS-13482-H6K0Y4	s22	19/08/2020 15:44	Advised A5.2(1)(d) requires a report from an ATL and that the EoS Handbook suggests testing information may be a part of that. the issue of intellectual property in this case is a matter to be dealt with between the supplier/manufacturer and relevant approval authority.
Evidence of Suitability	<p>Question 1 - About evidence of suitability for structural works and or energy efficiency.</p> <p>In appears that part A5.2(1) is only relevant to the fire safety matters.</p> <p>Is this a correct understanding that part A5.2(2) is addressing other matters such as structural works and/or energy efficiency?</p> <p>Question 2 - About evidence of suitability for construction.</p> <p>Is this a correct understanding that evidence of suitability is required for construction works. For example, a builder required to engage a professional engineer to inspect construction work and provide a report so a builder has evidence of suitability.</p>	CAS-12218-D9X8M9	s22	2/05/2020 12:23	s22 was confused about A5.2 . I explained the part to him with the help of the Introduction to Part.
Evidence of Suitability	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing to ask for clarification on the forms of evidence of suitability which can be presented for a Group Number and SMOGRARC, as per NCC 2019 Volume 1 A5.5.</p> <p>s22 has a collection of Testing to AS ISO 9705 on our products, in accordance with Specification C1.10 4(b). We also have Assessment reports in accordance with NCC 2019 A5.2(1)(e) interpolating these test results to cover a wider range of similar products. We have recently been challenged in the market place by a Certifier wanting to receive test reports only; as it is their interpretation of NCC 2019 Section A5.2 and A5.5 that only test reports are acceptable evidence of suitability for this fire hazard property.</p> <p>In reviewing your Handbook on Evidence of Suitability, Figure 4.1 states that an appropriate form of evidence for A5.5 is Report or other document which relies upon tests carried out in accordance with A5.5 . Are you able to clarify if this statement allows the use of a combination of test reports and assessment reports (NCC 2019 A5.2(1)(e)) as evidence of suitability?</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>s22</p>	CAS-20451-Y5X2R6	s22	4/11/2022 17:30	<p>24/11/2022 - s22 call back.</p> <p>Left a phone message with s22 call back.</p> <p>The following will be provided as a response to s22 :</p> <p>Thanks for your patience in waiting for a response. Given the complexity and potential impact of the query we have spent a bit of time discussing this internally.</p> <p>Ultimately whether assessment reports can be used is subject to interpretation and should be assessed case by case, by the authority having jurisdiction.</p> <p>Strict interpretation of A5.2 of the NCC would indicate that for fire hazard properties, such as group numbers, every variation of a product would need to be subject to a test as outlined by AS 5637.1. However it is acknowledged that the tested products will never fully represent those installed. As such a level of judgement by the authority having jurisdiction will need to be made to determine that the installed product is representative of the tested product based on the available evidence.</p> <p>If s22 pushes for a yes or no answer – ie yes or no to assessments – the following response will be given:</p> <p>This should be assessed on a case by case basis by the authority having jurisdiction. Understand that this may cause frustration, but we will investigate this further, and if warranted, further clarification will be provided.</p> <p>s22 Spoke to s22 . Let her know that we are still working through here request and I will give her another update next week.</p> <p>10/11/22 s22 rang me as I had responded to a previous query and we had a long conversation (30 min) on evidence of suitability for insulation and the application of Schedule 6.</p>
NCC 2021 webinar video - Do I have to use a NATA accredited testing laboratory	<p>To the ABCB team,</p> <p>I am a Senior Tech Advisor for the s22 . Quite often we receive queries on the requirements for use of NATA accredited laboratories and your webinar video was great for explaining this.</p> <p>I am wondering why the webinar video regarding use of NATA accredited testing laboratories and when evidence of suitability under Part A5.2(1)(e) can be use in lieu of NATA accredited laboratories in terms of FRLs, is no longer available for viewing. Has this video been withdrawn? and if so why?</p> <p>This was the link <a href="https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.youtube.com_watch-3Fv-3DE6jQ51C8o5Q-26ab-5Fchannel-3DAustralianBuildingCodesBoard&amp;d=DwMFAg&amp;c=JnBkUqWXzx2bz-3a05d47Q&amp;r=UuaGLxjc7f_Y-1UsB5de0qOgl6WzAXgq9pn57v1h77BqWW7cEAY6aNijK2w9jiA&amp;m=xXAANKvMKLCBU-4kxulh-UnLhmEFTawDFdoN6aoaY4&amp;s=CpaF77LOjMbNZdqdyYH8tabGh-Ts-WWku1kpP5j6rA&amp;e=s22">https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.youtube.com_watch-3Fv-3DE6jQ51C8o5Q-26ab-5Fchannel-3DAustralianBuildingCodesBoard&amp;d=DwMFAg&amp;c=JnBkUqWXzx2bz-3a05d47Q&amp;r=UuaGLxjc7f_Y-1UsB5de0qOgl6WzAXgq9pn57v1h77BqWW7cEAY6aNijK2w9jiA&amp;m=xXAANKvMKLCBU-4kxulh-UnLhmEFTawDFdoN6aoaY4&amp;s=CpaF77LOjMbNZdqdyYH8tabGh-Ts-WWku1kpP5j6rA&amp;e=s22</a></p> <p>s22</p>	CAS-17033-C4C7D1	s22	7/09/2021 12:42	left detailed msg inviting callback.
NCC Vol 1 A5.2	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Section A5.2 details the evidence of suitability, starting with a CodeMark certificate. Nowhere does it mention the Australian Standards. Which of the clauses relate to the Australian Standards which are considered to be the deemed-to-satisfy solution?</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>s22</p>	CAS-11806-J9S4Z8	s22	27/03/2020 13:45	Spoke to the customer 230pm 6 April 2020. The Customer had found the answer in the NCC and didn't need much help. I emailed the customer with a link to the Evidence of Suitability Handbook on the ABCB website
Polystyrene external wall cladding	<p>I have a conflicting answer from a private certifier. One particular certifier is insisting that polystyrene wall cladding cannot be used on a class one building, even if sited 900mm from a boundary as it does not satisfy the Performance Requirements, and is insisting on a Performance Solution. All other certifiers I have contacted seem to be accepting polystyrene as acceptable as Deemed to Satisfy. Should producing the Branz Appraisal for the polystyrene material be sufficient documentation under Part A5 of the BCA in particular A5.2 (f) enough for the certifier to approve the use of material without the need to provide a separate Performance based solution ? The Branz Appraisal is No.696 (2010) .</p>	CAS-11382-B5C1J2	s22	18/02/2020 12:40	called 21/2 clarified polystyrene as a wall cladding is not a dts material/product and does require a performance solution. branz appraisal documentation may be an appropriate evidence of suitability, noting it does document compliance with performance requirements, though ultimately to discretion of certifier if in the context of product is used, the documentation satisfies all relevant PR.



Case Title	Description	Case Number	Customer Owner	Created On	Response (if recorded)
Query on A5.2	<p>Hi ABCB Team</p> <p>Query on A5.2(1) of BCA 2019 Volume 1 Amendment 1.</p> <p>A5.2(1) reads Subject to A5.4, A5.5 &amp; A5.6 evidence to support... may be in the form of A5.2(1)(a) to (f)</p> <p>As evidence of suitability must comply with A5.4, A5.5 &amp; A5.6 before A5.2(1)(a) to (f) the appropriate authority must be satisfied A5.4, A5.5 &amp; A5.6 complies.</p> <p>A5.4 refers to schedule 5 of the BCA</p> <p>Schedule 5 provides multiple ways of compliance to be demonstrated for fire resistance of building elements. Particularly it allows for identical prototypes and minor variations of a prototype in certain circumstances.</p> <p>Can you please confirm that compliance with Schedule 5, Part 2 – Rating (b) &amp; (c) can only be demonstrated by A5.2(1)(d)? Or are all options under in the form of A5.2(1)(a) to (f) able to demonstrate compliance.</p> <p>A5.5</p> <p>In summary A5.5 requires fire indices for specific materials to be subject to Schedule 3, 6 and Spec C1.10.</p> <p>-Schedule 3 provides multiple definitions for data to be evaluated in varies tests by Australian Standards</p> <p>-Schedule 6 states Spread-of-Flame Index and Smoke-Developed Index &amp; ability to prevent ignition and to screen its core material from free must be carried out in accordance with AS1530.3 and AS1530.4</p> <p>-Spec C1.10 of Volume One requires Group number and smoke growth rate index requires test to 5637.1. and AS1530.3</p> <p>Could you please confirm what evidence of suitability is able to be accepted by the appropriate authority under A5.2. It has been raised by building surveyors that only evidence under A5.2(4) can be accepted to demonstrate compliance for A5.5</p> <p>A5.6</p> <p>Provides two ways of compliance to be demonstrated for resistance of the incipient spread of fire. Particularly it allows for identical prototypes and minor variations of a prototype in certain circumstances.</p> <p>Can you please confirm that compliance with A5.6 can only be demonstrated by A5.2(1)(d)? Or are all options under in the form of A5.2(1)(a) to (f) able to demonstrate compliance</p> <p>Cheers</p>	CAS-20154-M3J4Q2	s22	3/10/2022 17:08	No response recorded
Referencing the NCC, BCA and PCA	<p>Could you please provide information on the current and most up-to-date format for referencing the NCC, BCA and PCA standards and codes in documentation? Including the format for expressing clauses/standards from each code and the level of detail required for each reference. For example "Provisions of Clause A5.2 of the Building Code of Australia (BCA) 2019" or should it be "Provisions of Clause A5.2 of the National Construction Code (NCC) 2019 Volume 1 and 2". Then for standards, should it be "BCA 2019 Clause E1.3 (Fire Hydrants) and Performance Requirement EP1.3" or "BCA 2019 Amdt 1 Clause E1.3 (Fire Hydrants) and Performance Requirement EP1.3" or "NCC Vol. 1 Amdt 1 2019 Clause E1.3 (Fire Hydrants) and Performance Requirement EP1.3"</p>	CAS-14989-Y9V7L6	s22	28/01/2021 15:14	Provided advice on referencing the NCC
BCA 2022 Vol 2 - NSW Part H8 missing from Schedule 5 NSW	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Please be advised that Part H8 Livable Housing Design refers to NSW H8, but NSW H8 is not listed under Schedule 5 NSW.</p> <p>Is this an error or am I mistaken somehow?</p> <p>Cheers</p>	CAS-20879-V6Q1V7	s22	20/01/2023 12:17	Not a mistake. Seems to be there. He noted thats fine - perhaps he did not see it.
fire stopping of services AS1530.4	<p>The FPAA Information Bulletin 17 "Changes to note on AS1530.4:2014 reference in the NCC 2019" dated 1.08.19 promotes the use of Assessment Reports from testing authorities, in relation to fire stopping test carried out under AS 1530.4:2005, demonstrating that the AS 1530.4:2005 test is equivalent to the AS 1530.4:2014 test and therefore permissible under Clause 2(b) of BCA Schedule 5 as demonstrating DTS compliance with C3.15(a)(i). However, it is my view that Schedule 5 must be read in context to C3.15(a)(i) which does not permit the equivalent test approach of Schedule 5 clause 2(b). What is the ABCB position?</p>	CAS-18335-S6F4Q1	s22	14/02/2022 12:57	No response recorded
FRL for Spandrels	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Could you please clarify the NCC FRL requirements for Spandrels. C2.6 requires spandrels to have an FRL of not less than 60/60/60. The Vertical Separation in External Walls video on your website also says the FRL of a spandrel needs to be 60/60/60. The NCC BCA Guide also says spandrels need to be 60/60/60, and gives an example at Figure C2.6(3) of a non-loadbearing spandrel having an FRL of 60/60/60.</p> <p>But notwithstanding all of that clause 6 of Schedule 5 says if a non-loadbearing element is able to be used that element need not comply with the structural adequacy requirement.</p> <p>So my question is, does a spandrel always have to be 60/60/60 per C2.6, and per the ABCB video, and per the ABCB Guide, or can it be only -/60/60 if its installed in a building where it is not loadbearing?</p>	CAS-23345-B6W5L3	s22	25/03/2023 10:14	Spoke to s22 advised to look at schedule 5 which provides a concession.
Incorrect Table Formatting on Web Version	<p>Hi ACBC,</p> <p>Table 1 in Schedule 5 Fire-resistance of building elements gives the wrong information when viewed online rather than in a downloaded PDF. The column alignment changes so it appears (among other things) as beams sprayed to contour with vermiculite require a 50mm thickness rather than 35mm. For columns protected by hollow terracotta blocks and plaster the misalignment is 2 columns so it appears as though you can't achieve a 90 minute fire rating.</p> <p>This misalignment has caused an issue on a project I'm on where contractors and engineers are reading different figures in the table based on the format being used (pdf or browser).</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>s22</p>	CAS-22834-K7L2L2	s22	9/02/2023 1:28	No response recorded
Livable Housing Design Standards for NSW	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Just wanted to check if the Livable Housing Design Standards for NSW will come into effect from 1st May 2023 for Class 2? or it will not start from 1st May 2023 as it will not be applying to NSW?</p> <p>As I can see in the NCC Volume 1 Schedule 5 NSW Variations under NSW Part G7 Living Design says NSW Part G7 Livable housing design says : "This Part has deliberately been left blank. Part G7 does not apply in NSW as livable housing design requirements do not apply to sole-occupancy units in a Class 2 building in NSW".</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>s22</p>	CAS-20663-Q6T9J1	s22	6/12/2022 15:19	Read verbal disclaimer. Explained state/NCC relationship. Although there is a variation in NSW for LHDS for NCC 2022, I suggested it's best that he contact NSW Fair Trading (NSW admin) to ascertain what exactly is needed for his project, as they are the regulators.
Measurement of Floor Area of a Room Containing a Mezzanine	<p>I'm seeking clarification on the intended method of measuring the "floor area of a room" that contains a mezzanine, specifically in relation to application of Clause 2.6 of Specification C1.1 of the NCC.</p> <p>The concession of clause 2.6 of Spec C1.1 applies to a mezzanine with a floor area that "does not exceed 1/3 of the floor area of the room".</p> <p>A mezzanine is defined in the NCC as an "intermediate floor within a room". The Guide to the NCC reiterates that a mezzanine must be "part of a room".</p> <p>In Schedule 5 of the NCC, the floor area in relation to a room is defined as the "area of the room measured within the finished surfaces of the walls". A mezzanine by definition must necessarily be within the finished surfaces of the walls, and as above, must be part of the room.</p> <p>With consideration of the above, it is unclear whether the floor area of the room should include or exclude the floor area of the mezzanine.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that this is different to considerations in relation to DTS Provision C1.2 with regard to whether a mezzanine is to be considered as a "storey".</p> <p>I would suggest that a simple annotated sketch of a mezzanine in a room in the Guide to the NCC or other publication, labelling the floor areas of the room and mezzanine as "A" and "B" respectively with an accompanying an equation of <math>B \leq A/3</math>, would be of assistance in clarifying this matter. I have prepared such a sketch that I would be willing to share if considered appropriate.</p> <p>Thanks for your time.</p>	CAS-19660-D4R0C2	s22	3/08/2022 16:09	Advised them it was just the floor area, no mezzanine included.



Case Title	Description	Case Number	Customer Owner	Created On	Response (if recorded)
NCC Vol 2 - 3.7.1.8 Separating Walls - I'm in receipt of the following interruption from my authority to which I refute, I seek tech clarification from the ABCB and I would appreciate your review.	<b>s22</b> . Onsite, the separating walls between two class 1 townhouses had a polystyrene cladding system installed over a fire rated party wall system. The EPS type cladding material has been installed over both townhouses party wall junction without an adequate fire separation. Please supply evidence that the external wall cladding that has been installed between the allotment boundary is non-combustible and complies with NCC Part 3.7.1 Fire Separation and the Performance Requirements P2.3.1 for Fire separation. In separate correspondence, the <b>s22</b> the edge of external walls" facing each other at an adjoining allotment boundary are external walls required to be fire-resisting Onsite 1. The party wall system is a <b>s22</b> wherein the fire rated board extends into the partywall junction with mineral fibre. It is a propriety system used across Australia. The NCC compliance pathway is DTS, A5.2? Evidence of suitability / Accredited Testing Laboratory <b>s22</b> / A5.4? Fire-resistance of building elements / Schedule 5 / Standard Fire Test 2. The light weight external wall is <b>s22</b> .. another propriety system. The NCC compliance pathway is a Performance Solution wherein compliance with A5.2? Evidence of suitability / Certificate of Accreditation (BRAC). Note: the product previously held a CodeMark (ABCB) and achieves a BAL 29 rating Compliance To apply Clause 3.7.1.3 External walls of a Class 1 buildings, its application MUST be read in conjunction with Clause 1.1.1 (External Wall and Separating Wall Definitions), Clause 1.3.2(a)(ii) (Classification and Figures 1.3.1 and 1.3.2) and Clause 3.7.1.4 (Measurement of Distances). By way of definition (Clause 1.1.1)... A Separating Wall CANNOT be an External Wall and thus in determining the FRL of the External Wall (ie; in our case the Front and Rear Façades) Clause 3.7.1.4 (Measurement of Distances) MUST be adopted to determine its FRL, thus NO FRL required	CAS-15997-L5J3X8	<b>s22</b>	3/06/2021 16:29	No response recorded
Part E2 - NSW Variation Clauses are Wrong	Hey, when you view Part E2, specifically Clauses E2D16 - E2D20 and click the NSW Variation button the heading for each Clause doesn't change and doesn't match the numbering of Part E2 in Schedule 5 - NSW Variations. This is confusing and may lead to people applying the codes incorrectly to Class 9b assembly buildings. Can this be corrected or at least a warning applied so that people are aware before making an error?	CAS-24959-M8B3F6	<b>s22</b>	28/08/2023 16:48	Good morning <b>s22</b>  Thanks for raising this, the team is looking into options to resolve the misalignment.  The aligned clause titles can be found in the Schedule 5 New South Wales section of NCC Online and in the PDF copies of the NCC.  Thanks
Structural adequacy requirements for fire walls	I would like to clarify whether or not the structural adequacy component of the FRL listed for a fire wall applies where the wall is designed as a non-load bearing wall. For instance, in a building of Type B construction, table 4.1 specifies that a fire wall in a Class 5 building must have an FRL of 120/120/120. But if the wall is wholly non-loadbearing, it is my understanding that the structural adequacy component of the FRL simply doesn't apply.  Clause 6 of Schedule 5 seems to support this stance as does the explanation in the Guide to the NCC.	CAS-13184-X8M8X5	<b>s22</b>	31/07/2020 13:34	No response recorded
Evidence of Suitability	Hi NCC,  I came across an assessment report from NATA accredited testing laboratory and I have a doubt on their assessment. Here is the scenarios: Air handling duct was actually tested as per AS 1530.4 with dimensions 1000mmx250mm and successfully passed the integrity and insulation criteria with respect to determination of FRL for -/120/120.  Approach of accredited testing laboratory: based upon the above test, the laboratory assumed that a duct with dimensions of 2500mmx2500mm would pass the integrity and insulation criteria if tested in accordance with AS 1530.4. The testing laboratory claims that the assessment is legit according to clause A5G3(1)(d) (evidence of suitability). Question: My question here is, is the claim of testing laboratory valid? The assessment report says, even if the size of duct would be doubled than actual tested, it would pass. They have made this bold assumption and claim that their assessment comply with NCC requirements as per Clause A5G3(1)(d). How can they claim if the specimen has not been gone through testing stipulated in Specifications 1?	CAS-24880-Z0Z1Q0	<b>s22</b>	21/08/2023 15:11	Called the client and clarified the position of the ABCB. Advised the client, that assessment report issued by ATLS are common and are one of the pathways to cover variations to tested systems. However, it is up to the Authority Having Jurisdiction to accept or reject the assessment report if there is insufficient test data to justify the proposed variation. Or the variation is not considered to be minor.
New Provisional codes A5G2 and A5G3	I am looking for information about new codes in the NCC they are A5G2 & A5G3 can you please assist with this enquiry as we are being asked by TAFE to supply information around evidence of suitability	CAS-20126-W6J7Y6	<b>s22</b>	28/09/2022 17:04	referred to handbook
Notes associated with Clause A5G3 of NCC 2022, Volume 1	To whom it may concern, We seek confirmation as to whether the reference to a "certificate" as stated in the notes section for Clause A5G3 of BCA 2022 (as per below), would also apply to a Codemark Certificate? Noting that the Building Surveyor has to be satisfied that the technical requirements remain valid between NCC 2019, Amendment 1 and NCC 2022. "Current documentary evidence, such as a certificate or report, containing references to NCC 2019 provisions remains valid despite amended provision references in NCC 2022, subject to technical requirements remaining the same between editions." Thank you.	CAS-25510-Z6CSW4	<b>s22</b>	17/11/2023 14:14	CodeMark certificates are issued each three years, so the wording is to cover certificates that were issued under NCC 2019. These certificates are still current only if the NCC technical provisions they were certified under have not changed.