

Engineering New Zealand
PO Box 12 241
Wellington 6144
New Zealand

Attention: Martin Pratchett

By email: martin.pratchett@engineeringnz.org

26 May 2020

Feedback – Producer Statement forms

We understand that Engineering NZ and ACE New Zealand have asked for feedback from the engineering community on plans to improve the standard Producer Statement templates. You have already collected feedback from individual ENZ members with an online survey and have also requested feedback from technical societies. We thank you for engaging with the NZGS on this matter and hope that our feedback will be useful to you.

The following section summarises the feedback from our members, with commentary added giving the NZGS position. We have included some of the feedback comments in full, to give clarity about what our members have told us. Where a number of individuals made similar points we have only included one example.

Issues related to the standard Producer Statement templates

Field size and content

“The fields in the middle section of the form (for filling in the drawing numbers, compliance documents, variations, design assumptions) are not long enough.”

NZGS position: This is a common issue. Options to address this could be by making the fields larger, or by providing an additional page template for this content. This would need to include a mechanism to ensure that additional pages do not get lost.

“When filling in design review and construction review statements, there should be a field for all the documents provided for review – ie to include design reports etc.”

“The forms have fields for the drawing numbers, but no fields for the specification title. Sometimes these details are included in the drawings, sometimes in a separate document.”

NZGS position: This is currently dealt with by referencing an attached schedule. Building the schedule into the form, or providing a template, would be a useful amendment.

“The producer statement often refers to an attached schedule – it would be good to have a field to name the attached schedule so it was apparent there should be a schedule attached.”

NZGS position: We support this suggestion.

Sighting building consents

“In the form we must list building consent numbers and associated variations and amendments, including the all-encompassing statement that “we have sighted these building consents and the conditions attached to them”. For the vast majority of sites which we inspect, we have not been provided with a copy of the full building consent plus conditions, amendments, etc (sometimes it is like pulling teeth to simply obtain a copy of the drawings!). So we usually cross-out the phrase that “we have sighted these building consents...”.”

NZGS position: We do not think that it is appropriate to have a part of the form regularly crossed out, so a change is important. ENZ should clarify that sighting of this information is mandatory and that the Producer Statement must not be signed without the CPEng (or PEngGeol, where appropriate) who has signed the form having seen the Building Consent and the conditions.

Related issues

The NZGS did not solicit feedback about the Producer Statement process. However, we received some feedback that is related to the templates (or the guidance that could be provided with them) which we believe should be considered at the same time as the form redesign.

PS4 for excavation adjacent to boundary

“We often see a requirement for PS4 -Excavation adjacent to boundary, which it appears is intended to attest that there has been no adverse effects across the boundary when there has been a cut made adjacent to that boundary. This is commonly impossible to assess when there might be no access to the neighbours’ site(s), and/or no means or ability to make an assessment of the pre-construction state of the ground and/or structures across the boundary.”

NZGS position: This appears to be an attempt to manage an RMA issue using a Building Consent process. Clarity over the recommended process for managing excavations close to the boundary could be provided through an update to the guidance that supports the Producer Statements, or as a separate practice note. This is a challenging area, and NZGS recommends that a practice note would be of value to regulators and consultants.

PS4 when there is no geotechnical report

“We sometimes see BC Conditions requiring a PS4 Geotechnical, requiring confirmation that the ground conditions are consistent to those reported in the Geotech report submitted for Building Consent (or words to that effect), when in fact, there might be no such report. In these situations, we word our supporting document to say that we consider the ground conditions to be appropriate for the anticipated building loads (or words to that effect).”

NZGS position: This appears to be an oversight by the consenting authorities, perhaps using standard conditions without fully checking that the report they refer to exists. The most robust and appropriate response would be to ask for the condition to be amended or removed in each case. However, this would create delays and additional expense. We suggest that ENZ work with local authorities to provide guidance on how to deal with this situation.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely



Ross Roberts

NZGS Chair

Email: chair@nzgs.org

Phone: +64 21 301 062