

Example: Misconception of a fire suppression system

Situation:

Due to unclear planning concepts and costs of several sprinkler system providers we were asked to comment and consult.

Background:

Purchase of several existing buildings; Sprinklers were partially installed but did not reflect the current fuel load situation.

Presence of a tender package and design of a sprinkler system provider.

Building authorities demanded: Modification and extension of the existing sprinkler system. Acceptance of a, in the mean time already installed, manual suppression system by an official surveyor.

Approach:

1. Survey of the actual situation

First rough inspection of the design documents. Determination of the fire hazard classes according to the VdS-sprinkler-guidelines (VdS Schadenverhütungs GmbH) and of the criteria by which the manual extinguishing system shall be assessed, all based on the site inspection of the storage risks.

2. Survey analysis

The design documents were simply not suitable for a neutral tendering process. No official surveyor could possibly accept the manual suppression system. This is due to the fact, that for the used design criteria no guideline was available.

In respect to the determination of the fire hazard class the possibility of a class reduction in exists, by simply applying organisational measures.

The planned modification of the sprinkler central was oversized.

3. Out approach:

- Reduction of the fire hazard classification utilizing organisational means.
- Development of suppression system concept and coordination with the VdS.
- Monitoring of the design and tendering.
- Monitoring of the bidding process.

Conclusion:

- **Cost reduction of ½ Million EURO**
- **Acceptance by the building authorities and the insurer**

Engaging neutral consultants and planners pay's off.