

INITIAL STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT REPORT (SIAR)

Factory Name: **TITAS SWEATER INDUSTRIES LTD.**
Address: **Kashimpur Road, Gazipur, Bangladesh. Gazipur
Dhaka Bangladesh**
Assessor: **Sumerra**
Date: **28 May 2014**





Introduction to the Report

The following report contains a site profile and summary of non-conformities identified during an onsite assessment commissioned by the Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety (Alliance) and conducted by a third-party Qualified Assessment Firm (QAF). The assessment was conducted against the Alliance for Bangladesh Worker Safety Assessment Protocols (APs) and Fire Safety and Structural Integrity Standard, which is harmonized with the factory assessment guidelines developed by Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET) for the Bangladesh National Tripartite Plan of Action (NTPA). The goal of the Alliance process is to provide clear and practical technical requirements by which Bangladeshi Ready Made Garment (RMG) Factories producing for Alliance members may be consistently and fairly evaluated for fire, structural, and electrical safety in a non-duplicative manner. Each assessment will prompt action plans that will be used by RMG factories to systematically and sustainably improve safety conditions for garment workers. Beyond tracking and reporting on action steps taken in a transparent manner, the Alliance organization and its members will seek to further support factory improvements through technical assistance, training, implementation support for functional Worker Committees, and in some cases financial assistance and wage support for workers if factories are closed for remediation.

The contents of the report do not constitute a guarantee of compliance with the applicable laws, the Alliance Standard or the absolute or continued safety against fire, electrical and/or structural integrity issues that may lead to injury or loss of life. The report is designed to provide a non-exhaustive summary of risk issues, based on a limited sampling and duration of time onsite by the named QAF. Neither the QAF nor the Alliance can certify or guarantee the quality, outcome, or effectiveness of actions taken in response to the report.

For more information and report feedback please go to: www.bangladeshworkersafety.org.



Factory Name: TITAS SWEATER INDUSTRIES LTD.

Address: Kashimpur Road, Gazipur, Bangladesh. Gazipur Dhaka Bangladesh

Assessor: Sumerra

Date: 28 May 2014



ALLIANCE
FOR BANGLADESH WORKER SAFETY

GENERAL INFORMATION

General Information

Factory Name:	TITAS SWEATER INDUSTRIES LTD.
Address:	Kashimpur Road, Gazipur, Bangladesh. Gazipur Dhaka Bangladesh
Country:	Bangladesh
Province:	Dhaka
City:	Gazipur
Zip Code:	
Audit Duration:	2 Days
Re-Audit:	Re-Audit After 0 Months
Draft Report Date :	July 7, 2014
Final Report Date :	September 25, 2014
Are all Action Items From Previous Assessment Completed?:	N/A
Buildings in Complex :	1
Number of Building Levels (Stories) :	6
Approximate Building Area (SF) :	129674 sft.
Date of Building Construction :	First 4 stories: 2003. Top 2 stories: 2008.
Date of Last Building Renovation/Addition :	2008 (4th & 5th Floor)
Is the Building mixed use?:	No
Ancillary Structures in Complex :	3: Boiler, Chemical, Electrical LT rooms
Number of Ancillary Levels (Stories) :	1 (Ground)
Approximate Ancillary	890

Factory Name: **TITAS SWEATER INDUSTRIES LTD.**

Address: **Kashimpur Road, Gazipur, Bangladesh. Gazipur Dhaka Bangladesh**

Assessor: **Sumerra**

Date: **28 May 2014**



ALLIANCE
FOR BANGLADESH WORKER SAFETY

Structures Area (SF) :	
Number of Occupants :	1950
Exterior Facade Description :	5" brick masonry infill between RCC structural frame elements
Structural System Description :	Concrete beam & monolithic slab system with beams spanning both directions between columns. Foundation & lateral load resisting system are moment resisting concrete frame.
Issues were not found during the structural integrity assessment that required the Emergency Escalation Protocol (and referral to NTC Review Panel)?:	Yes



ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

Structural System Design

Question:	Are the available FoS for the columns adequate based on Preliminary calculation?	
Priority Level:	High	
Non-Compliance Level:	1	
Description:	42psi Central 1.80 Corner 1.92 Edge 1.85 20psi Central 2.06 Corner 2.05 Edge 2.03 FoS 1.5 - 1.86 (for 42 psf live load) indicates some doubts about safety	
Source of Findings:	Uploaded Document: Stress Calculation	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Based on results for central and edge columns, engage a qualified engineer to investigate the strength of the concrete and quantity of the steel in the columns. Concrete strength shall be assessed by taking at least 4 nos. of 4 inch diameter cores from the area of concern. If cores are to be taken from column, it is advisable to take it from an upper level where the stresses are low for practical reasons 3 inch cores may be taken from columns). In addition, UPV shall be used to have concrete strength in sufficient number of columns in the lower tiers so that a level of confidence is achieved. The calibrated results of core tests and UPV shall be used to determine a reliable value of concrete strength in columns. The size and diameter of steel rebar in most of the columns of two lowest tiers shall be authentically determined using a Ferro scanner or similar device. In order to confirm the diameter of embedded bars as obtained from Ferro scanner, the engineer may have to remove the concrete cover in one or two locations.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Provide results of preliminary calculations in space provided. a) column capacity; FoS > 1.86 - Safe b) column capacity; FoS 1.5 -1.86 - Needs Evaluation c) Column capacity; FoS 1.25-1.5 - Needs Evaluation d) Column capacity; FoS <1.25 - Unsafe In case of a critically low FoS (<1.25), consider Immediate Escalation Protocol	
Question:	Can credible structural documentation indicating general conformance with 2006 BNBC or other comparable applicable international model building code be produced?	
Priority Level:	Medium	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	As per their submitted structural documents, there is no declaration about Building Code.	
Source of Findings:	Document Review: Available documents.	



Suggested Plan of Action:	Engage a qualified structural engineer to develop the required documents to confirm compliance with building code. Documents must comply with Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.19 and 8.20.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Reference Alliance Standards Part 8 Section 8.2 Structural Integrity of Existing Factory Buildings	
Question:	If built after 2006, can documented compliance with the seismic and wind requirements of the 2006 BNBC be provided?	
Priority Level:	Medium	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	Design Engineer did not mention wind or seismic requirements and therefore conformance with 2006 BNBC could not be ascertained.	
Source of Findings:	Document Review: Design Engineer did not mention wind or seismic requirements	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Engage a qualified structural engineer to develop the required documents to confirm compliance with seismic and wind requirements. Documents must comply with Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.19 and 8.20	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standards Part 8 Section 8.17 Design for Lateral Loads and 2006 BNBC Part 6 Section 1.5	
Question:	Can documentation be provided that the building is compliant with the requirements for wind loading and storm surge loadings as detailed in BNBC Part 6 Section 1.5.3?	
Priority Level:	Medium	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	Design Engineer did not mention wind or storm surge loadings and therefore conformance with wind and storm surge loading could not be ascertained.	
Source of Findings:	Document Review: Design Engineer did not mention wind or storm surge loadings	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Engage a qualified structural engineer to confirm satisfactory structural performance of the buildings under wind loading. Compliance may be waived if the Factory Owner provides satisfactory evidence of a cyclone operations plan that includes full evacuation of the factory in advance of any approaching cyclone.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	



Standard:	2006 BNBC Part 6 Section 1.5. Compliance may be waived if the Factory Owner provides satisfactory evidence of a cyclone operations plan that includes full evacuation of the factory in advance of any approaching cyclone"	
Question:	Where density of operations, storage of materials, or equipment weights require live load capacity in excess of 2.0 kN/m2 (42 psf), do the design documents confirm that the required load capacity exists? Or has the load capacity been analytically confirmed and certified by an Alliance-qualified structural engineer?	 
Priority Level:	Medium	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	Storage of materials on 2nd Floor, Part C, Carton Godown and 4th Floor Part B, Bonded Warehouse have not been considered for load capacity. Structural documents are not available to confirm load capacity.	
Source of Findings:	Photograph: Storage loads	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Have a qualified structural engineer confirm that capacity to support the load is available. Load Plans complying with Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.20.4.3 should also be developed.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standards Part 8 Section 8.15 Minimum Floor Design Loads	
Question:	Are Certificates of Occupancy available for review?	
Priority Level:	Low	
Non-Compliance Level:		
Description:	As per approved plan this is 6 storied Industrial building which was approved by Sub Asst. Engineer & Upazilla Engineer, LGED, Gazipur dated 27th July 2011 and Upazilla Nirbahee Officer, Gazipur dated 7th August 2011. This building was also approved as a factory by Md. Shohidul Islam, factory Deputy Chief Inspector on 4th May 2014	
Source of Findings:		
Suggested Plan of Action:	Provide Certificates of Occupancy for review.	
Suggested Deadline Date:		
Standard:	Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.3 Preliminary Structural Assessment	
Structural System Construction		
Question:	If yes, have the structural members constructed with MCAC been investigated by an appropriate program of in-situ testing and representative destructive testing or core samples?	



Priority Level:	Medium
Non-Compliance Level:	3
Description:	No documentation of in-situ testing and representative destructive testing or core samples of MCAC was available.
Source of Findings:	Document Review: No testing documents available
Suggested Plan of Action:	The compressive strength of structural elements constructed using MCAC shall be investigated by an appropriate program of in-situ testing and representative destructive testing of core samples.
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014
Standard:	Reference Alliance Standards Part 7 Building Materials Section 7.2 Masonry-chip aggregate concrete (MCAC)
Question:	Are all non-structural elements suspended from, attached to, or resting atop the structure adequately anchored and braced to resist earthquake forces?
Priority Level:	Medium
Non-Compliance Level:	2
Description:	Storage racks observed at 2nd Floor, Part C Carton area, and 2nd Floor Office Area, Accessories store are not braced to resist earthquake forces.
Source of Findings:	Photograph: Photo of storage rack
Suggested Plan of Action:	Adequately anchor and brace all non-structural elements such as the rack systems to resist earthquake forces to comply with the BNBC and Alliance Standard.
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014
Standard:	Alliance Standards Part 8 Section 8.18 Seismic Bracing of Key Non-Structural Elements and 2006 BNBC Part 6
Question:	Was masonry-chip aggregate concrete (MCAC) used in the construction of the building?
Priority Level:	
Non-Compliance Level:	
Description:	This building constructed by brick chips.
Source of Findings:	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Have a qualified structural engineer assess the durability aspects as suggested in Alliance Standard Part 7 Section 7.2 and take appropriate remedial measures.





Suggested Deadline Date:		
Standard:	Reference Alliance Standards Part 7 Building Materials Section 7.2 Masonry-chip aggregate concrete (MCAC)	
Structural Safety Programs		
Question:	Is a program in place to ensure that the live loads for which a floor or roof is or has been designed will not be exceeded?	
Priority Level:	Medium	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	No program is in place to ensure that the live loads for which a floor or roof is or has been designed will not be exceeded.	
Source of Findings:	Document Review: No Program available	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Develop a program to ensure that all live loads for which a floor or roof has been designed for will not be exceeded. The designated Load Manager shall oversee this program and ensure it is enforced.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standard Part 13 Section 13.7 and Part 8 Section 8.9.	
Question:	Have Load Plans been prepared for each floor documenting the actual maximum operational loading that is intended and/or allowable on each floor.	
Priority Level:	Low	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	Load Plans have not been prepared for each floor documenting the actual maximum operational loading that is intended and/or allowable on each floor.	
Source of Findings:	Document Review: No load plans available for review	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Have a qualified structural engineer develop Floor Loading Plans per the requirements of Part 8 Section 8.20.5.3.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.10 Floor Loading Plans (Load Plans)	
Question:	Are Floor Load Plans posted as required?	
Priority Level:	Low	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	No floor load plans posted as required.	



Source of Findings:	Document Review: No load plans displayed	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Have a qualified structural engineer prepare load plans including the information required in Section 8.20 of the Alliance Standard.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.20.5.3	
Question:	Are areas used for storage of work materials and work products, clearly marked to indicate the acceptable loading limits as described in the Load Plan for that floor?	
Priority Level:	Low	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	Areas used for storage of work materials and work products are not clearly marked to indicate the acceptable loading limits.	
Source of Findings:	Document Review: No load plans available for review	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Provide signage or the appropriate markings at all areas used for storage to indicate the acceptable loading limits detailed in the Load Plan (noted elsewhere).	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standard Part 8 Section 8.11 Floor Load Markings	
Question:	Is a designated representative (Factory Load Manager), who is onsite full time, trained regarding the structural floor capacity, and serves as an ongoing vendor resource and monitor of operational factory floor loadings?	
Priority Level:	Low	
Non-Compliance Level:	3	
Description:	No factory load manager has been designated.	
Source of Findings:	Worker Interviews: Management confirms no Load Manager appointed	
Suggested Plan of Action:	Designate a representative as the Factory Load Manager. The Factory Owner shall ensure that at least one individual, the Factory Load Manager who is located onsite full time at the factory, is trained in calculating operational load characteristics of the specific factory. The Factory Load Manager shall serve as an ongoing resource to RMG vendors and be responsible to ensure that the factory operational loads do not at any time exceed the factory floor loading limits as described on the Floor Loading Plans.	
Suggested Deadline Date:	15 Nov 2014	
Standard:	Alliance Standards Part 8 Section 8.9 Factory Load Manager	

Factory Name: **TITAS SWEATER INDUSTRIES LTD.**

Address: **Kashimpur Road, Gazipur, Bangladesh. Gazipur Dhaka Bangladesh**

Assessor: **Sumerra**
Date: **28 May 2014**



ALLIANCE
FOR BANGLADESH WORKER SAFETY

--	--	--