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**Goal**

*ICC staff should be tasked to present a work plan to the ICC Board of Directors in 2011 to implement changes to the code development process that utilizes new and emerging technologies to increase member and stakeholder participation (Remote Participation), consistent with ICC’s mission. The work plan will provide for implementation of new processes by the start of the Code Development Cycle that will lead to the publication of the 2018 International Codes.*

**History:**
- CDRAC recommended this goal to the ICC Board April 2011
- Board Approved May 2011
- Board Confirmed October 2011
- Board Confirmed December 2011
Attributes of Remote Participation

- **Retain the Governmental Consensus Process**
- **Flexible voting window** - to maximize participation
- **Single platform** - for recording and tabulating votes, vote at FAH and a remote vote have equal value
- **Multi Path** - People have flexibility to vote in person at FAH and remotely, but only one vote will be recorded for each code change
- **Correlation** - Mechanism to address correlation issues and potential inconsistencies that may result from the vote
- **Change Management** - Board Steering Committee, Focus Groups, Beta Testing and Communication Plan
- **Others** – to be developed
Key Research Findings by CDRAC Research

- A solid majority of members embrace the notion of evolving the CDP and support remote participation concepts;
- Economic reasons (cost, lack of employer support, and time out of the office) are the primary barriers to participation - not dissatisfaction with, or lack of interest in;
- These economic barriers to face-to-face participation are likely to persist for some time;
- Younger code officials (age 35 and under) often find it difficult to participate meaningfully due to budget and organizational constraints;
- The few associations interviewed which have remote participation processes cite considerable benefits in moving to a technology-enabled process;
- A wide range of considerations must be addressed to successfully move to a remote participation process, such as member acceptance, security and confidence.
Suggested Rollout Plan

- **2012**: System design & build
- **2013**: Design/Build & Beta Test
- **2014**: Full Pilot Test on one Code
- **2015**: Go Live Group A
Outreach & Communications: Objectives

- **Maximize stakeholder input**
  - Engage key ICC constituencies in the development process
  - Establish online and offline forums for input and participation
  - Mobilize “ambassadors” at national, regional and chapter levels
- **Develop effective “branding” for Remote Participation**
  - Create compelling visual and verbal elements
  - Ensure that terminology is clear, accurate and resonates
- **Gather feedback to improve outcomes**
  - Engage active members and participants in the CDP in focus groups, surveys and other ways to explore ideas and discuss impacts of possible changes
  - Concept test technologies with users to ensure suitability
  - Coordinate with SDO’s, IAC, other partners
- **Target early adoption with key audiences**
  - Younger code officials
  - Key jurisdictions and agencies
  - Others as identified
## Aligning Project to Governmental Consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Consensus Foundations</th>
<th>Remote Participation Guiding Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Hearings are open to the public at no cost  
  • Anyone can submit a code change proposal and testify at the hearings | • All remote participation features (except voting) will be made available to the public  
  • Secure voting for eligible voters |
| • All testimony and committee recommendations are made in open public hearings | • Multiple input points and IT platform will improve accessibility to the process |
| • All final code change proposal decisions are made by public safety officials in an open hearing | • Remote voting “window” after the FAH will be transparent and only eligible members will be permitted to vote  
  • RP platform will dramatically expand access to code change decisions for all eligible ICC members |
| • Open appeal process  
  • Appeals considered per due process | • Appeals process will be modified based on remote voting functionality |
Elements of Remote Participation Platform

Collaboration

• Collaborative workspaces to enable participants to work together with colleagues, members and stakeholders within secure, online environments

Document Management

• More effective document & content management. Enabling technologies include:
  • Create, share, collaborate and display content
  • Cloud services & document version control

Forums

• New collaborative discussion forums, and workspaces to allow participants to stay current on all aspects of CDP process, meet online, and collaborate on projects.

Voting

• A unified centralized voting platform for both in-person and remote participants will enable:
  • Flexibility in voting path
  • Streamlined member profile maintenance
McKinley Advisors
ICC Remote Participation
Research
Methodology

Research Conducted December 2010

- Under 35 interviews
  - 40 in-depth interviews with “next generation” code officials
- Benchmarking
  - Exploration of effective practices with technology providers and comparable associations
- E-survey
  - 9,974 invited; 1,314 responses (13% response)
  ~ 2.52 Margin of Error at 95% confidence level
Key Findings

• A solid majority support remote participation and embrace the notion of evolving the CDP.

• Cost, lack of employer support and time out of the office are the primary barriers to participation.

• Perceptions of current CDP are mixed, with relatively few positive “brand” associations with the CDP.

• Other associations cite considerable benefits in moving to a technology-enabled process.

• A wide range of considerations must be addressed to evolve toward remote participation and Internet voting.
CDP Participation

% of Participation in the CDP
(last 5 years)

- Yes (368 responses) 28%
- No (946 responses) 72%

Type of Participation in the CDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Participation</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of CDP participants</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended final action hearings</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended initial action code development hearings</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted code change proposal(s)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted public comments on code change proposals</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDP Participation Factors

How much of a factor are each of the following in your decision to attend ICC's code development hearings?

(Answered only by CDP Participants)

- **Exposure and experience that you gain from participating.**
  - Major Factor: 7%
  - Minor Factor: 25%
  - Not a Factor: 68%

- **Contributing your experience and expertise to improve the codes.**
  - Major Factor: 8%
  - Minor Factor: 27%
  - Not a Factor: 65%

- **Desire to affect a specific code in a manner that best serves you/your jurisdiction.**
  - Major Factor: 13%
  - Minor Factor: 24%
  - Not a Factor: 63%

- **Ability to connect with peers, colleagues and friends.**
  - Major Factor: 10%
  - Minor Factor: 32%
  - Not a Factor: 59%

- **Already attending the ICC Annual Conference.**
  - Major Factor: 51%
  - Minor Factor: 30%
  - Not a Factor: 19%
Have financial constraints within your organization or jurisdiction negatively impacted your ability to attend ICC code development hearings within the past 24 months?

- Yes: 74% (Participants) 72% (Non-participants)
- No: 26% (Participants) 28% (Non-participants)
CDP Remote Participation

Considering the various remote participation options outlined in this survey, if some level of remote participation were available, do you think it would make it:

- More likely you would participate in the CDP: 85% (Non-participants), 64% (Participants)
- Less likely you would participate in the CDP: 6% (Non-participants), 1% (Participants)
- No impact on your participation: 30% (Non-participants), 14% (Participants)
## CDP Remote Participation

In your opinion, would remote participation increase, decrease or have no effect on each of the following outcomes (% selecting increase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at live code hearings</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of a single interest group to exert undue influence on the process</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of well-funded interest groups to exert undue influence on the process</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of the codes being adopted at the state and local level</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical excellence of the codes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest by state and local elected officials in the codes and the CDP</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall transparency of the process</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest by state and local building regulatory officials in the codes and the CDP</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ICC International Code Council](https://www.icc.org)
CDP Remote Participation

Which of the following best represents your opinion on the overall direction ICC should take with the CDP?

- Attempt to incorporate technology into the process, but preserve the face-to-face code hearings as the primary vehicle for participation: 57% (Participants), 51% (Non-participants)
- Redevelop the CDP from the ground up to focus on a technology-enabled process with a goal of involving a larger and more diverse group of participants: 29% (Participants), 38% (Non-participants)
- Leave it as is, making minor process improvements as necessary: 9% (Participants), 9% (Non-participants)
- Other, please specify: 5% (Participants), 2% (Non-participants)