



Business Process Task Team Charge Meeting Notes from Teleconference 11/13/06

Attendees:

1. David A. Jordani, FAIA (Chair)
2. Dick Bilden
3. Bill Brodt
4. Bob Carlsen
5. Emily Cunha
6. Michael Hayes
7. Barbara Golter Heller
8. Glenn Hunt
9. Dennis Shelden
10. Scott Sustacek
11. Graham Thomas
12. James Watson
13. Scot Williams
14. Dave Alley
15. Debra Gondeck-Becker

Agenda:

Self Introduction of Attendees

- Name, organization, interest in NBIM, BPITT

Role and Structure of NBIMS; Mission of BPITT

Discussion of proposed working groups

Presentation from Dennis Shelden – Contracts, Risks and Liabilities Working Group

Wrap-up and next steps

Discussion:

David Jordani called the meeting of the NBIM BPITT to order at 12:10 Eastern on Monday November 13, 2006.

After reviewing the agenda for the meeting, each attendee discussed their role and interest in BIM, the perspective of their various organizations, and their specific interests in the BPITT.

Dave J. reviewed expectations of participants noting that 1-2 hours/week for member of sub-committee and 3-4 hrs/week for chair of sub-committee would be required. A discussion on deliverables also took place with mention of position papers, presentations at trade shows, and perhaps more focused documents and actions in specific areas such as contract terminology. Dave J. reviewed the plan and schedule for the draft version of the NBIM Standard.

A brief presentation was made on the structure of the NBIMS effort including activities of the Task Teams. The group also reviewed the BPITT Committee charge and discussed the intent of the various working groups/subcommittees:

- Roles and Responsibilities
- Staffing and Skill Sets
- Education & Training
- Services and Marketing
- Contracts, Risks and Liabilities

Dave J noted that one of the objectives of the meeting was to determine if the groups were properly conceived and to establish participation and action within the groups.

The group was challenged to think to think ten years into the future to a time when the use of BIM has been woven into the life cycle of facilities design, construction and operations. Articles will document dramatic increases in construction industry productivity crediting new business models and collaboration facilitated by the evolution of BIM technology. Cost improvements are noticeable – facilities cost less to design, build and maintain and profitability has increased for all stakeholders in the process. You get the picture – BIM as currently envisioned is a reality – it works and the industry is functioning on a new level. Technology evolutions aside, how did the culture of the construction industry manage to advance? How did stakeholders evolve to collaborate and manage the design, build, and maintenance cycles? How did we get past the concerns that now loom so large? What happened to the traditional roles and skill sets that were prevalent for so many years? How did we learn to communicate and share risks and rewards? What were the incentives?

With that challenge, the group was asked to look back from that point in history and determine how we got there using the model of our working groups to structure thoughts and establish a mission/focus for those groups.

With the early interest in contract language, the Contracts Risk and Liabilities working group had already been underway with efforts. Dennis Shelden (Gehry Technologies) is leading that effort and reported on the works of his task team.

Dennis Shelden discussed the current work of the Contracts, Risks, and Liabilities (CRL) Task Team. He talked about 4 vectors with the current focus of the group being on 1 and 2:

1. Building Delivery Model
2. Role of Parties, Communication
3. Level of Information
4. Technology and Representation.

Dennis and the CRL Task Team is working on writing the scope of the CRL sub-committee and developing a framework for the matrix or vectors. They intent to provide a draft proposal with vignettes within the matrix (vectors) (i.e. if you take this view, here are the implications).

Questions about the CRL work included:

- Dave Alley asked who owns the Intellectual Property embedded in the model? Dennis said they are not addressing IP issues at this time but will take the issue under consideration.
- Mike Hayes asked about contractual issues/terminology as related to having the data live through the lifecycle of a building. How does the contract reflect this for data that will change over 20/30 years? Bob Carlson responded with reference to the owner keeping it up to date. Some discussion ensued over owning the life cycle versus design model.

- Jim Watson noted that the 10 year standpoint is easier than our present, 0 year standpoint. He talked about owners using “transactional” data to keep a building going and likened BIM models to buying a software package: you buy a license for use of design with restrictions for resell, etc. Transactions that occur are tracked and the BIM model is updates. Dennis Sheldon added that owners may demand “licensed” version of design and there are precedents to this.

Skill sets were also discussed. Scott Nystrom sees more an impact on skill set than roles/responsibilities and will have to “hire up” for skill sets beyond drafter/designer. Mike Hayes also sees change in skill set (less drafting skills, more modeling and organizational skills). David Jordani stated with agreement that IT skill sets are moving towards a core competency model. Dave Alley added that skills must include ability to re-think process of design and collaboration (BIM technology forces collaboration). Barbara Heller suggested we can’t contribute a lot to the staffing/skill set – who does what and how they do it will work itself out in the field.

Bob Carlson also added there is organizational resistance on acceptance – a major obstacle on new technology. The need for top level of leadership to buy into BIM is very important. Bob also suggested we should get information from those on the edge, doing projects and get this information out. David Jordani suggested the use of a blog site for development of the tasks.

Talk lead into looking at other industries for precedents such as aircraft, transportation, manufacturing, etc. The task would be how to translate lessons from other industries into vernacular for the AECO industry.

Jim Watson talked further about a need for Owner’s Incentive – what they need downstream. He stated owners are looking at this more holistically (like ship building). Only incentive is the owner and the owner is the stakeholder. The group should look at other owner’s business model and owner’s nomenclature (industry wide not vendor-based standards). It was noted that owner’s should be involved in the Service and Marketing sub-committee.

Task Teams:

David Jordani suggested restructuring the remaining 4 sub-committees into 2 reflecting inward and outward focus groups. Barbara Heller also suggested a sub-group (or sub-sub-group) focusing on government and their unique requirements. The final sub-committees agreed to are:

Internal Focus: Includes previous teams of Roles and Responsibilities, Staffing and Skill Sets, and Education & Training.

External Focus: From the Owner’s perspective, the previous team of Services and Marketing.

Contracts, Risks and Liabilities: Same distinction as before

Action Items:

David Jordani will distribute the following to BPITT members:

- Copy of Charter
- Outline of V1.0 of NBIM Standard
- Email to participants with question of interest and level of commitment for groups

David Jordani will also look to schedule a meeting during AEC-ST for BPITT members to get together. Jim Watson, Mike Hayes, and Glenn Hunt anticipate being at AEC-ST.

Dennis Sheldon will look into copyright issues to clear distribution of Ashcroft’s article.