

Date: 09 June 2022

Industry Professionals

Dear Sir/Maam

EARTH CONTROL MEASURES (ECM) – ECM DESIGN SCORING FRAMEWORK

Since 2002, the Institution of Engineers Singapore (IES) have rolled out various ECM workshops to equip Qualified Earth Control Professionals (QECP) with better understanding of ECM design and implementation for ECM works. The QECP Review Panel Scheme was also jointly rolled out by IES, the Association of Consulting Engineers (ACES) and the Public Utilities Board (PUB) in 2015, to review the design and comprehensiveness of the plans.

2 As part of continuous efforts to raise the quality of ECM design submissions, IES/ACES will be implementing an ECM Design Scoring Framework as a structured way to evaluate the quality of ECM design submissions, to take effect from 1 July 2022.

3 Each new ECM design submissions to PUB will be scored according to the structured ECM Design Scoring Framework based on the types of errors found in the submissions. Errors are categorised into (i) major errors/omissions, (ii) minor errors/omissions, and (iii) Other errors/omissions, with points tiered based on the severity of errors in each category.

4 Demerit points will be issued to QECPs based on the tabulated score in each submission. QECPs whose submission is scored with 6 or more demerit points may risk a 1-year suspension under the Qualified Erosion Control Professionals Registry administered by IES-ACES (*subjected to QECP Review Panel's discretion*). Please see Annex A below for details of the ECM Design Scoring Framework (non-exhaustive).

5 If there is need for clarification, please contact Victor Tham (IES QECP Registry) at victor.tham@iesnet.org.sg.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully



Mr Yeo Keng Soon
Director
Catchment & Waterways
PUB



Mr Dalson Chung
President
Institution of Engineers
Singapore



Er. Teo Yann
President
Association of Consulting
Engineers
Singapore

Annex A

ECM Design Scoring Framework (*Non- Exhaustive*)

No	Scoring Criteria	Demerit Points
1	Submission has been rejected > 3 times by PUB	6
2	<p><u>Major design errors/omissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QECP endorsement missing • Protection of existing drains not considered • Using existing live drain as part of storage pond • No cut-off drains provided • Under-sizing of total storage volume by 50% or more • Did not specify length of cut-off drain to be used as storage volume • Cut-off drain not connected to storage pond • Improper connection between multiple storage ponds • No sub-catchment calculations for separate ponds • Drainage work – Did not provide ECM detail plan for drain construction work • Drainage work – Did not indicate that “sand bags shall be removed during heavy rain & end of the day when work has stopped” • Drainage work – Existing drain fully blocked without proper bypass provided • Designed above ground storage pond (i.e. runoff unable to properly gravitate into storage pond) • Using entire site as a storage pond silty water (i.e. realistically will not be able to do works while entire site is filled with silty water waiting to be treated) • Multi-phase work – No separate drainage system OR ECM plan for each phase 	2 (Per error; No cap)
3	<p><u>Minor design errors/omissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access road and ECM for road not indicated for multi-phase project • Under-sizing of total storage volume by 10 – 49% • Using cut-off drain full length as part of the storage volume • Using cut-off drain located at steep slope as part of the storage volume 	1 (Per error; Cap at 3 points)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using treatment plant or washing bay as part of the storage volume • Used “C” value that is too low without valid explanation (e.g. soil data) • Used “C” value of < 0.65 for general soil condition • Did not provide physical hump(s) to segregate sub-catchments within ECM site • Clean water discharge point(s) not connected to public drain • Clean water discharge point(s) not shown • Did not provide silt trap(s), when it is necessary • Did not provide CCTV monitoring system (for exposed area ≥ 0.2 ha) • Did not show proper anchoring of silt fencing • Did not provide adequate treatment plant(s), when it is necessary • Did not provide maintenance checklist and schedule • Insufficiently detailed calculations. • Missing dimensions on detailed plans and cross-section drawings (e.g. for storage pond, cut-off drains, etc) 	
4	<p><u>Other errors/omissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong entry into the online forms (exposed area, address, wrong file attached, etc) • Reports and E-forms do not tally • ECM checklist incorrectly filled • No road name on the plan OR no location plan • Invalid QECP certificate attached • Missing cross-sectional drawings • Revised ECM plan – Did not explain why revision to approved plan is made • Revised ECM plan – Did not highlight the difference in the revised ECM plan 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Per 2 errors; Cap at 2 points)</p>