

29 April 2005

Mr Andrew Haire
Senior Director (Policy & Competition Development)
Infocomm Development Authority of Singapore
Fax: (65) 6211-2116

Dear Mr Haire

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION - REVIEW OF THE CODE OF PRACTICE FOR
INFO-COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES IN BUILDINGS (“COPIF”)**

1. Please refer to IDA to the public consultation on COPIF.
2. We are pleased to submit comments and suggestions, as enclosed, to IDA for the above proceeding.

Yours sincerely

Telecommunication Facility Co-ordination Committee (TFCC)

Encl

COMMENTS ON DRAFT COPIF 2005

1. To improve the ease of reading the COPIF, it is suggested that the drawings of manholes and pipes in Section 5, Figures 5.1 to 5.29, to be moved to the Annex.
2. We suggest to update the following to bring the draft COPIF 2005 more inline with the industry practice:
 - a) Change Class 'D' to Class 'C' for Figure 5.1;
[Reason: Typo error]
 - b) To insert a new sub section "Lead-in pipes or pipeline systems shall be constructed at a depth of 1m below carriageway and at a depth of 1.2m below side-table or footpath. In addition, lead-in pipes or pipeline system towards the outside of the development boundary shall not be facing the direction of trees/OG box, other permanent obstacles and into State Land" in Section 5.2;
[Reason: Depth of 1m and 1.2m in accordance with LTA's practice for all public roads. To ensure that lead-in pipes can be picked up easily by service provider, they should not be obstructed by any physical obstacle. Separately, National Parks Board's COP states that there shall not be any services/underground plant within the 2 metres radius of a tree.]
 - c) To include "shall be of grade 20" after concrete surround in Section 5.2.6;
[Reason: This was formerly known as 1:2:4 by the industry but has now be termed as grade 20.]
 - d) To include "Grade 20" before 1:2:4 mix in Section 5.2.9;
[Reason: Same as above in (c).]
 - e) Change SS:272 to SS:141 for Figure 5.4;
[Reason: Typo error]
 - f) To include "at least a depth of 1m" after the road-side drain in Section 5.5.3;
[Reason: LTA's practice/Drainage Department requirement]
 - g) Delete Figure 5.6;
[Reason: Reducer is not in use.]

- h) To include “The pipes shall also be laid at a depth of 1m below carriageway and at a depth of 1.2m below side-table or footpath” in Section 5.7.4;
[Reason: LTA’s requirement for laying of pipes below all public roads.]
 - i) To include “Wherever possible, the pipes should be laid in straight run in length of 6.0m and joined together using a coating of solvent cement applied to both the coupler and pipes.” in Section 5.7.6; and
[Reason: This is to reduce the number of joints in the entire pipeline. It is noted that too many joints may weaken the entire pipeline.]
 - j) To include “A 1-way trap shall be provided at the neck of these manhole to prevent foreign object from entering the manhole.” in Section 5.8.3.
[Reason: For manhole constructed on low ground, there is a greater chance of water aggregation, it will thus be good to have such a 1-way trap.]
- 3. TFCC noted that it is not stated clearly in draft COPIF 2005 that for development with underground basement, where the lead-in pipes or pipeline system stops at the retaining wall, cable trays must be provided from the retaining wall to the MDF room, TERs and risers. Furthermore, TFCC is of the view that as such cable trays are essential to the roll out of telecommunication services, they should also be included as in joint inspection checklist.
- 4. TFCC is of the view that where lead-in pipes over-cross the drain, developer or owner when seeking Drainage Department for approval, should also undertake to the Drainage Department for any subsequent diversion work by Drainage Department.
- 5. TFCC is of the view that for cluster landed housing with more than 30 units, a MDF room should be provided to allow telecommunication system licensees to install their equipment for the provision of telecommunication services. The size shall follow requirement in Table 6.3.4 of draft COPIF:2005.

TFCC

Telecommunication Facility
Co-ordination Committee

6. TFCC is of the view that separate ELCB and its electrical accessories should be provided for the provision of different services (to denote BCS or non-BCS equipment) into the development.
7. TFCC has encountered instances where it needs to conduct multiple rounds of inspection as developers or owners did not manage to rectify all shortcomings or discrepancies. The above imposes considerable resources on TFCC. TFCC's preference is thus to only conduct one joint inspection to highlight any shortcomings or discrepancies and not to conduct further re-inspection. Developers or owners will then rectify the shortcomings and discrepancies based on the joint inspection.
8. TFCC requested to be kept informed of owners of single-unit landed houses who have chosen not to install internal wiring and/or BCS.