



a publication of

PAM

**PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA
MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS**

**CONCERNS OVER THE MISUSE AND/OR
MISREPRESENTATION OF QCLASSIC
CIS7:2006, CIS 7:2014 AND CIS 7:2021
FOR COMPLETED HOUSING PROJECTS**

PAM Practice Notes

OCTOBER 2022
Serial No.: 4-2022

©Pertubuhan Akitek Malaysia

Concerns over the Misuse and/or Misrepresentation of Qlassic CIS7:2006, CIS 7:2014 and CIS 7:2021 for completed Housing Projects

Background

Numerous members have received building assessment reports for completed housing projects prepared by 'defects inspectors' engaged by homeowners. These reports usually contain photographs with stickers placed throughout the property to identify building defects. Some reports may contain hundreds of stickers of alleged building defects. These reports have been used as evidence in housing tribunals and/or in courts. The benchmarks to establish alleged building defects used in some of these reports were based on CIDB Qlassic CIS7 Standards.

When CIDB introduced CIS7:2006 '*Quality Assessment System for Building Construction Works*' (Qlassic) and later versions in 2014 and 2021, it was intended to provide the construction industry with a benchmarking assessment rating tool for the quality of workmanship of building construction in Malaysia.

The adoption of Qlassic is entirely voluntary and the assessment is undertaken only *after* the completion of the works. The assessment, based on random samplings, covers several aspects of the building works including architectural finishes, basic M&E fittings, and external works. CIDB currently maintains a list of qualified Qlassic assessors.

Typically, a housing developer may set Qlassic target score(s) for their contractors as part of the contract. These contracts may carry 'reward / penalty' clauses if the contractor were able to achieve target Qlassic scores or otherwise. The ability (or failure) of the contractor to achieve the targets would become a matter to be resolved between the parties of the contract.

While some housing developers have promoted Qlassic on project hoardings and/or through other marketing methods, Qlassic benchmarking does not form any part of Schedules G and H of the Housing Development (Control and Licensing) Regulations 1989; and is not stipulated in the 4th Schedule (Building Description) of the Housing Developer's Sales and Purchase Agreement (S&PA). As such, Vacant Possession (VP) is not incumbent on the Qlassic assessment benchmarking score.

The concerns of misuse and/or misrepresentation of Qlassic for housing projects which have been handed over to purchasers stem from third-party report(s) prepared by 'defects inspectors' engaged by homeowners based on Qlassic benchmarking standards. (Refer to the Preface excerpted from CIS7:2021).

Architects that are confronted with defects reports of this nature should be aware that the Architect as the Principal Submitting Person [(PSP as stipulated under the Streets, Drainage & Building Act 1974 (Act 133) and the Architects Act 1967 (Act 117)] and Contract Administrator (CA) shall be guided by the specification and workmanship standards in the building contract.

In the event genuine building defects are observed, Architects may rely on contractual remedies under the conditions of the contract.

Conversely, Architects must be prepared to uphold their own standards of professionalism and assessment over disputed building defects when such allegations have met the following criteria:

- a) contractual requirements in the building contract.
- b) ensured the completed building has complied with prevailing laws and has been designed to minimum life, health and safety standards for the user, occupants and society at large as evidenced in Building Plans.
- c) materials specified and used will not harm the health and safety of users and occupants as evidenced and declared in the approved Building Plans.
- d) construction had followed good practices by all parties involved in the construction to ensure the quality required to achieve item (b) above, as evidenced by the signed CCC (F forms).

**[Excerpt taken from Preface of CIS7:2021]*

PREFACE

Construction Industry Standard (CIS 7) or better known as QLASSIC, was first introduced in 2006. The first revision of this CIS 7 was done in 2014 and the subsequent revision was made in 2021 (second revision). This second revision maintained the assessment for architectural works, basic M & E fittings and external works but dropped the assessment for Structural and M&E Works. The assessment weightage for architectural works, basic M&E fittings and external works were adjusted/prorated accordingly.

The use of Construction Industry Standard CIS 7:2021 is solely for building workmanship rating purpose and is not intended to be used as specification or compliance's requirement unless parties to a construction contract agreed to do so and shall binding the parties only.

The revision of this CIS 7: 2021 was carried out by a Technical Committee established by CIDB Malaysia represented by construction industry stakeholders.

It should be noted that the use of this standard is voluntary and compliance with this Construction Industry Standard does not of itself confer immunity from legal obligations.

Download the full document here:
[CIS7_2021.pdf \(cidb.gov.my\)](#)