

STANDARD FORM CONTRACTING—THE ROLE FOR FIDIC CONTRACTS DOMESTICALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

Dr Donald Charrett, Barrister
Toby Shnookal, Barrister
TEC Chambers, Melbourne

STANDARD FORM CONTRACTING IN AUSTRALIA

In Australia today there are three major, current standard form contracts for traditional contracting on the basis of construction to the principal's design. They are the AS 4000–1997, ABIC MW–1 2003 and PC–1 1998. In addition, AS 2124–1992 and earlier editions of the AS 2124 form remain popular.

Variations of these forms, particularly the AS 4000 series, that have been developed for particular styles of contracting are also popular.¹ Variations dealing with design and construct projects (AS 4300–1995, now superseded by AS 4902–2000) and for use in back to back subcontracting (AS 2545–1993 and AS 4303–1995, now superseded by AS 4901–1998 and AS 4903–2000) are also widely used.

A good starting point for considering any standard form contract is to be cognisant of who produced it. The Australian Standard series of contracts are produced for Standards Australia by a panel of industry representatives that appear on their covers. These include representatives of organisations representing contractors, principals, engineers, architects and the Law Council of Australia. However, the origins of AS 2124 date back to the mid 1920s to a contract developed by the Australian Institution of Engineers.

In 1952 Australian Standards took over the production of the contract and renamed it CA24–1952. It was first produced as the AS 2124 contract in 1978. There were several revisions after that, and it was rewritten as AS 4000 in 1997.²

The ABIC (Australian Building Industry Contract) contracts are produced jointly by Master Builders Australia (MBA) and the Royal Australian Institute of Architects (RAIA). The ABIC MW1–2001 contract (now superseded by MW–1 2008) replaced the JCC series of contracts which were produced by the Joint Contracts Committee (JCC). The JCC comprised the MBA, RAIA and the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), now the Property Council. ABIC also produces the short form contracts SBW–1 2008 Simple Works Contract, BW–1 2002 Basic Works Contract and EW–1 2003 Early Works Contract. Both MW–1 and SW–1 are produced in versions for housing, and for Queensland.

The National Public Works Council (now the Australasian Procurement and Construction Council Inc (APCC)), the peak council of departments responsible for procurement, construction and asset management policy for the Australian, State and Territory governments and the New Zealand Government, also produced a standard form contract for construction to the principal's design. The latest version, NPWC,³ was published in 1981 and is occasionally still found in use (with the addition of substantial Particular Conditions).

The PC–1 1998 standard form contract is published by the Property Council of Australia. It may be widely used, but if it is, the authors have not come across it in practice. PC–1 differs from other standard form contracts in that it was produced by the Property Council of Australia (PCA) representing the interests of the commercial property industry in Australia.

It explicitly does not aim to balance the competing interests of the employer and the

contractor, and reflects the view 'that people who initiate and pay for building and construction projects are entitled to set the agenda and allocate the risks.'

The PCA describes the contract as 'unashamedly client-focussed' and suitable for all non-residential and engineering construction projects, including projects where some design is carried out by the Contractor, and for use as a design and construct contract.³

While there are other standard contracts in use in particular sectors of the Australian engineering and construction industry, it is these contracts that are the focus of many of the major texts on construction law in Australia.⁴

THE MOVE AWAY FROM STANDARD FORMS

Over the last twenty years in Australia, however, there has been a significant move away from using standard form contracts in major projects and towards the use of 'bespoke' contracts. This has come about for a number of reasons. Perhaps partly it has been the ease that word-processing has introduced to make amendments to the standard forms. More significantly, in many cases the employer has set out to, and has, changed the risk allocation embodied in the standard forms. One reason often articulated to justify the move to bespoke contracts, is the growing number of ways of project contracting.

Notwithstanding that major projects and major employers have all but abandoned the use of standard forms per se, straight forward medium sized projects often incorporate AS 2124 or AS 4000 by reference. But even here, typically such contracts also contain a long list of Special

Conditions that take precedence over the General Conditions.

How did we get to this situation where standard form contracts are not used for major projects? 20 years ago, as word-processing became commonplace, major law firms with an engineering and construction focus developed in house Special Conditions that amended the standard form contracts—then the AS 2124, JCC and MBW 1 contracts. Parallel with developing their sets of Special Conditions for projects of a particular type, the major law firms developed data bases of unreported decisions that dealt with the interpretation of standard form contract clauses. In those days dispute resolution in major contracts was primarily by arbitration, often by retired builders or other construction professionals without legal qualifications, and in that forum even decisions by lower courts were highly persuasive. In an analogy with the Falklands' war, unreported decisions were sometimes referred to as exocet missiles; your opponent didn't know they were coming until they were produced, with suitable flourish, at the arbitral hearing.

However, attaching Special Conditions to the rear of standard forms had, and still has problems. It drew attention to the changes that were being made. Moreover, the so called consensus contracts, the standard forms that had been developed with a degree of balance between the parties, achieved that balance in the detail of their terms, and assigned risk accordingly. The detail changes made in Special Conditions changed that balance and transferred risk away from the party responsible for drawing up the contract, usually putting more risk on the contractor.

Typically in the 1990s and 2000s the transfer of risk was

down the contracting chain as contracts were primarily drafted by parties higher in the chain. Although having the changes in stand-alone Special Conditions appropriately drew attention to those changes, even experienced contractors often signed such Special Conditions not realising the significant changes that had been made. On the other hand, sometimes there was (and is) significant debate about agreeing changes proposed in Special Conditions. In some cases, contractors simply refused to agree to any change to a standard form of contract.

At the same time as major law firms were developing their firm based standard Special Conditions, if we can call them that, project delivery methods did become more diverse. The late 1980s building boom brought with it a flurry of contracting styles.

This was reflected in the increasing complexity of the Special Conditions that were being drafted, and by and large, the standard form contracts did not keep up. The Lump Sum but with schedule of rates contracts of the 1970's were largely replaced with straight Lump Sum contracts, and Cost Plus contracts, but were soon added to by Design and Construct, Fast Track contracts, Partnering contracts, Target Price contracts (of various forms) and so on. BOOT contracts, (Build Own, Operate, Transfer) and EPC (Engineer, Procure and Construct) and a wide variety of other forms of contract became popular in major infrastructure projects.

Alliancing in particular became 'flavour of the month', and Australia is known as a world leader in this form of 'relationship contracting' (although there are recent signs of a partial retreat to more traditional 'adversarial' forms of contracting).

Drafting contracts by attaching Special Conditions was inherently dangerous; there was always the likelihood of inconsistency between the standard General Conditions and the added Special Conditions. In fact a large number of the contract disputes that cross a construction lawyer's desk have such an inconsistency at their core. A consistent document is more likely to be produced if it can be read from cover to cover.

And so, roughly speaking, we arrived at the point about ten years ago where major law firms had bespoke contracts available for their clients that probably started life as a standard form contract, but were significantly modified for the type of project envisaged. To all intents and purposes, these are standard form contracts developed by the major law firms. They are modified for the particular project under consideration, and, accordingly, are sometime referred to as bespoke contracts.⁵ This now appears to the authors to be the major way of contracting significant projects in Australia.

Each major law firm has its own style of contract which is typically recognisable to the lawyers in other major firms. The law firm that produces the contract will typically puts its name on the cover. Sometimes the original standard form contract is also identified, but not always. When disputes arise about a bespoke contract, it is often a forensic exercise of some difficulty to work out where a particular clause in issue has come from and how, in the changed framework of the contract read as a whole, it should be construed.

Tendering a major project nowadays inevitably requires obtaining legal advice on every term in a proposed bespoke contract. This inevitably adds significant time and cost to the tendering process.

However, interestingly as we move into the new decade it seems fair to say that two things have happened in contracting. First, there seems to be a swing against the constant push to transfer risk to contractors. Major contracts written by experienced lawyers in Australia generally do not seek to push risk unfairly onto contractors, even if they are instructed only by the principal in producing the draft contract. For all the uncertainty some partnering type clauses introduced into commercial contracts, the validity of the underlying thesis that a project has to proceed on a co-operative and fair basis has been widely accepted. An unfair contract in which the contractor assumes all risks, even those he cannot manage, ultimately increases risks for the principal. It doesn't make a project more profitable for a principal, instead it raises the prospects of number of highly unpleasant scenarios that a principal might face during the progress of a project.

Secondly, although the variety of contracting methods continues to grow, project delivery has mostly fallen into one of three main types; a conventional construction project, a design and construct project, or an engineer, procure and construct (EPC) project. Within these broad categories there continue to be innovations seeking improvement over the traditional approaches, such as early contractor involvement (ECI), in which the principal endeavours to get the contractor's input into 'buildability' as early as possible before the design is finalised. Other forms of contracting, and there have been a lot of them, seem to be on the decline, although alliancing is still widely used.

Much has been written about the potential consequences of a principal endeavouring to transfer

all, or as much risk as possible, to the contractor. Often that is written from the perspective of the contractor, who is not surprisingly perceived to have a vested interest in ensuring that the employer accepts as many risks as possible, and whose views on what constitutes a 'balanced' contract may be regarded with scepticism.

However, the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) has put forward an arguably 'balanced' view on what constitutes a 'balanced' contract. 'JBIC provides policy-based finance with a mission to contribute to the sound development of the Japanese and international economy',⁶ and would reasonably be expected to have an interest in successful project execution.

It has published a 'Check List for One Sided Contracts' to assist in realizing effective and prompt implementation of projects financed by JBIC Official Development Assistance loans. This document notes:

... it is sometimes observed that contract documents prepared by the borrower contain one-sided contract provisions, changing a fair allocation of contractual risks between the parties. Such one sided contracts actually affect negatively the smooth implementation of projects and consequently are considered to be disadvantageous to the borrowers due, amongst other things, to the late completion of the project.⁷

The Check List cautions against altering the risk allocation in FIDIC contracts in these terms:

If modifications for any particular project alter the originally contemplated risk distribution to a large extent and the risks allocated to the contractor become excessively high, the following problems may occur:

- (1) higher bid price;
- (2) bid failure and disruption of project implementation;
- (3) non-participation in the bid of conscientious and capable contractors;
- (4) contract award to a bidder who fails or was not capable of estimating the risks properly;
- (5) poor construction quality and delay to the progress of the work due to lack of risk contingency;
- (6) undermining the relationship of mutual trust and respect between the employer and the contractor;
- (7) repetition of groundless claims from the contractor;
- (8) frequent disputes between the employer and the contractor; and
- (9) in an extreme case eventual termination of the contract.⁸

THE ADVANTAGES OF A STANDARD FORM CONTRACT

The advantages of using a standard form are many:

- Contractors, employers and engineers who use a standard form contract become familiar with the rights and obligations that they have under that form of contracting. This improves communication and efficiency in contract administration. This is of particular importance in international contracting where communication is more difficult and misunderstandings are proportionately more likely to arise.
- The cost of tendering is reduced as contractors familiar with the standard form know there is no risk that is hidden in the detail of terms they are unfamiliar with.
- The cost of negotiating the contract is reduced. Increasingly negotiating the legal terms of a bespoke contract based on a major law firm's contract has

become a major cost of project delivery. Using a trusted standard form reduces the potential area of disagreements, or at the very least, provides an impartial starting point from which the parties can negotiate from.

- The tendered price is likely to be less than for a bespoke contract, as contractors do not have to price additional risks they are not familiar with or are not usually required to assume.

Justin Sweet has recently written on the importance of standard construction contracts in the USA.⁹ He notes that 'the construction project, with its linked set of construction contracts between many participants and its complexity could not survive today without standard construction contracts'.¹⁰ And in commenting on the importance of standard contracts, he makes the following observation which the authors suggest is equally applicable to Australia's plethora of Commonwealth, State and Territory legislation impacting construction contracts:

Another important factor is that the United States is a federal system. The law of one state will govern the contract. National standardised construction contracts avoid balkanisation and its resulting confusion. It does for construction what the American Uniform Commercial Code did for goods transactions. But, as I shall note later, increased intervention by state legislatures has the potential for destroying much of the harmonisation engendered by national standard contracts.¹¹

THE FIDIC CONTRACTS

None of AS 2124 / AS 4000, ABIC MW-1 or PC-1 have an international equivalent that is commonly used outside of Australia. Internationally the most commonly used construction project contracts used worldwide

are the FIDIC construction contract suite.

The FIDIC contract suite is produced by the International Federation of Consulting Engineers, or, in French, the *Fédération Internationale des Ingénieurs-Conseils*. Hence the acronym FIDIC. The contracts are published in hardcopy and/or electronically in 13 languages, and more than 40,000 copies are sold each year.¹² They are used in both common law and civil law countries. FIDIC contracts have been adopted by a number of development agencies for projects funded by them, such as Australia (Ausaid), France, Japan (Japan International Cooperation Agency [JICA]) and Korea. The use of FIDIC contracts is worldwide, and their use is increasing. By way of an example, FIDIC contracts are being used for the multibillion dollar duplication of the locks in the Panama Canal.

Perhaps the largest rival to the FIDIC contracts on the world stage is the NEC suite of contracts, the New Engineering Contracts, published in London by the UK Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE). The NEC3 suite is wider in scope than the FIDIC suite, comprising:

- Engineering and Construction Contract (ECC) and Short Contract (ECSC) (2005);
- Engineering and Construction Subcontract (ECS) and Short Subcontract (2005);
- Framework Contract (FC) (2005);
- Term Service Contract (TSC) (2005) and Short Contract (TSSC) (2008);
- Supply Contract and Supply Short Contract (2010);
- Professional Services Contract (PSC) (2005);
- Adjudicator's Contract (AC) (2005).

NEC also publishes Guidance Notes and Flow Charts for each of its contract types. It is worth noting that for some years after the introduction of the NEC contracts in the late 1980s, the ICE continued to publish its ICE Conditions of Contract for civil engineering works. The first edition of the ICE standard form contract was published in 1945, with successive revisions culminating in the 7th edition in 1999. However, the ICE has recently withdrawn its support for the ICE Conditions of Contract, and is now promoting the use of NEC standard forms only:

NEC was developed to enable good practice through the inclusion of project management principles to the contractual process. It was also designed to be as flexible as possible in order to achieve a standardised approach to the various engineering, construction and building sectors.

It is this collaborative approach, recognised as best practice, that ICE wishes to foster. The NEC family offers a unique holistic approach to managing a project, that goes beyond simply defining the legal relationships and can be applied to all projects no matter how large or small or how simple or complex.¹³

It is interesting (at least to the engineer/lawyer authors) to note that both FIDIC and NEC contracts are produced by engineering institutions, and that the Australian Standard AS 2124 / 4000 contracts have a similar pedigree. The FIDIC contracts provide a central role for the engineer in the certification process during the performance of the works. It is the engineer who performs the certification process that in other contracts is performed by a role described as the superintendent, architect or similar.

The first FIDIC contract was published in 1957 under the title of Conditions of Contract (International) for Works of Civil Engineering Construction. It was based on the 4th edition of the English ICE Conditions of Contract, and took advantage of UK jurisprudence that had interpreted that contract. The FIDIC contract was intended to be used for civil engineering works procured by the traditional method of a contractor constructing the works to a design prepared by an independent consulting engineer, acting on behalf of the employer. This contract became known as the red book because of its cover, a title still used for its successor. Indeed, FIDIC contracts are still often referred to as 'books'.

The FIDIC books contain considerable content that is not intended to be contractual but is in fact of guidance to their operation and use. Subsequent editions of the construction contract were published in 1967, 1973, 1977, 1987, 1992 and 1999.

The FIDIC Construction Contract was a straightforward construction focussed contract and was unsuitable for projects where major items of plant were fabricated away from the construction site to a design by a contractor. Accordingly, in 1963, FIDIC published a contract directed to projects for mechanical and electrical works, the Contract for Plant and Design-Build.

This contract became known as the yellow book. This contract had an emphasis on testing and commissioning and was focussed on the manufacture and installation of plant. Subsequent editions of it were published in 1980, 1987 and 1999.

In the mid-1990s FIDIC responded to the increasing popularity of projects proceeding

as design and construct projects, and where, if relevant, the builder had to commission all plant. The first edition of the FIDIC Conditions of Contract for Design-Build and Turnkey is known as the orange book. This contract reflected the modern concept that the builder does not actually design the plant that is incorporated into a facility; it has engineers specify the plant and tenders for it and then incorporates it into the project. The process of engineer, procure and then construct (EPC) is ordinarily also followed by commissioning also performed by the contractor. FIDIC updated the orange book in 1999, renamed it Conditions of Contract for EPC/ Turnkey Projects, coloured it silver, and it is known as the silver book.

In 1999 the three then current contracts were updated. The 1999 version of the FIDIC contracts are the current versions, although as referred to below, they are in the process of being updated. The 1999 updates were prepared by a single committee which aimed to standardise the terminology used and to make them as user-friendly as possible. The current FIDIC contracts comprising what is colloquially known as the 'rainbow' suite comprises:

- Conditions of Contract for Construction for Building and Engineering Works Designed by the Employer—the red book;
- Conditions of Contract for Plant and Design-Build—the yellow book; and
- Conditions of Contract for EPC/ Turnkey Projects—the silver book.

In addition to the basic 'rainbow' suite, FIDIC publishes:

- Conditions of Contract for Design, Build and Operate Projects (2007)—the gold book;
- Short Form of Contract (1999)—the green book

- Form of Contract for dredging and reclamation works (2006) [similar to Short Form of Contract, but with engineer certification].

There is one further contract published by FIDIC that should be mentioned. As discussed below, FIDIC does not ordinarily permit its standard form contracts to be amended, unless a special licence is negotiated. This is an important feature of FIDIC contracts. Ordinarily the standard form of the FIDIC contract must be amended by what are termed Particular Conditions; what we in Australia would ordinarily refer to as Special Conditions. The international multilateral development banks that fund development projects around the world have particular requirements for their global projects to protect their interests.

For a number of years their procurement conditions required their lenders to use the 1987 FIDIC red book, supplemented by extensive Particular Conditions that made significant changes and additions to 'standard' FIDIC terms.

In 2005 they negotiated a licence with FIDIC to publish the MDB Harmonised Edition of the FIDIC Conditions of Contract for Construction. The MDB edition contains a number of specific changes and additions so that a repetitive set of Particular Conditions are not required for every project and every bank, and the banks incorporated the MDB edition in their standard procurement documents.

Changes to the red book include placing 'social' obligations on the contractor in respect of staff and labour force, and clauses which provide the banks with a right to audit the contractor's accounts. The MDB version of the red book was first published in 2005, and revised editions were published in 2006 and 2010.

In spite of the fact that the World Bank was and is a Participating Bank that cooperated with FIDIC in the production of the 2010 edition, it has again reverted to its own General Conditions of Contract, different from the 2010 MDB Harmonised Edition.¹⁴

FIDIC also publishes a number of documents of considerable usefulness in the procurement of projects. Principally, it publishes guides to contracts. It also publishes a document, The Contracts Guide that includes the text of all three contracts side by side.¹⁵ The guide commences with assistance to the reader in deciding which of the three main FIDIC contracts is most applicable to the project under consideration. It goes on to provide assistance on how to manage prequalification, invitations for and evaluation of tender, letters of intent and so on. It contains a helpful explanation of each of the terms in each of the three main contracts, but it does not refer to judicial authority on them. The Guide is published in English, French, German, Spanish and Arabic.

This approach is sensible as more than 85% of the content of each of the three main FIDIC contracts is the same.

There is an MDB Supplement to the Contracts Guide which highlights and discusses the differences between the red book and the MDB edition.

The differences between the contracts published by FIDIC are essentially based on the style of project delivery contemplated. Fundamentally which party prepares the design, and how risk is allocated is addressed differently.

The Construction Contract is based on the principal (referred to as the employer) providing the design. The other FIDIC contracts provide for the design being performed by the contractor. The EPC/Turnkey Projects Contract is used when the employer wants the certainty of a fixed price for a 'turnkey' fully operational project, and is prepared to pay a cost premium for the contractor to assume most of the risks.

The standard clauses in the three main FIDIC contracts are divided into 20 clauses. Of them, 17 have the same content, although there are some differences between them that reflect the differences required by the different forms of project delivery and risk allocation. Clauses 3, 5 and 12 vary between the contracts in the following way:

| | Construction (red book) | Plant & Design-Build (yellow book) | EPC/Turnkey (silver book) |
|----|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 3 | Engineer's Duties & Authority | Engineer's Duties & Authority | Employer's Administration |
| 5 | Nominated Subcontractors | Design | Design |
| 12 | Measurement and Evaluation | Tests after Completion | Tests after Completion |

Clause 12 of the Construction Contract is of particular interest as it provides the process of assessment of a contractor's claim. While the terms contemplate that a lump sum for the works (or components of it) might be specified, somewhat unusually in the Australian context, the standard form of the

contract contemplates payment on the basis of a schedule of rates. This type of contract is still reasonably common in civil works projects in Australia, but has fallen out of use in straight forward construction projects. The risk of measurement in building projects in Australia is nowadays ordinarily carried by the contractor.

The FIDIC contracts are coherent and consistent with a logical arrangement of clauses. They have been drafted by independent consulting engineers and lawyers with experience in the drafting and management of international construction contracts. The Update Task Group which produced the 1999 editions had representatives from Sweden, UK, Germany, France and Argentina, i.e. significant input from people with experience in civil law as well as the common law. Although the ultimate design of these contracts and the content is the responsibility of FIDIC, the drafts were reviewed by persons from 15 different countries.

A number of organisations such as the European International Contractors (EIC), the International Association of Dredging Contractors and the International Bar Association also reviewed the drafts. Of course, such review does not necessarily imply endorsement. Notwithstanding its pre-publication input, the EIC does not necessarily accept that the risk allocation in FIDIC contracts is appropriately balanced (and indeed has made somewhat trenchant criticism of the risk allocation in the silver book).

For each of the rainbow contracts it has published Contractor's Guides in which it 'highlights and discusses the risks confronting contractors within the restrictive contractual framework'.¹⁶

The forms of contract within the suite cover most common forms of project delivery, but each contract may need to be adapted to suit particular project delivery concepts. In effect the approach is similar to that taken in the AS 4000 series contracts and can be contrasted with the approach in the NEC contracts. The NEC Engineering and Construction contract is published as a

single contract with a number of optional clauses which is intended to have sufficient flexibility in its terms to allow for any form of project delivery. However, these options cater for 5 sufficiently distinct types of project delivery such that NEC also publishes five specific ECC contracts, simplified to remove unused options.

Of course the FIDIC contract suite has not been specifically developed for any particular legal system. FIDIC explicitly warns that:

- modifications to the General Conditions may be required in some legal jurisdictions; and
- the standard form contracts do not contain any limitation on the duration of legal liability.

In Australia, it is immediately apparent that the relevant Security of Payment regime that applies to a particular contract should be incorporated to provide consistency of operation. The engineer should expressly be deemed to be delivering a Payment Certificate on behalf of the employer in response to a Payment Claim, and the time limits for delivering it should be made consistent with the time limits in the relevant Act.

Similarly, in Victoria, it would be wise to ensure the contractor is required in its Payment Claims to differentiate claims made under the contract for excluded amounts which cannot be made under the *Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act*.

It also goes without saying, that prior to using a FIDIC contract in Australia the terms should be considered in the light of Australian jurisprudence.

REFERENCES ON FIDIC CONTRACTS

The widespread use of FIDIC contracts around the world has not surprisingly resulted in a substantial body of reference literature. These include books authored by engineers and/or lawyers, including Bunni,¹⁷ Totterdill,¹⁸ Baker *et al*¹⁹ from a common law perspective, and Jaeger & Hök,²⁰ and Robert Knutson (ed.)²¹ from a broader international perspective. In books authored by engineers, it is not surprising to find a number of flow charts, giving a visual representation of how the contract clauses mesh together for discrete issues that arise.²²

Many journal articles have been published, particularly in the *International Construction Law Review*.²³ Of particular interest to Australian users of FIDIC contracts are two articles written by Jonathan Kay Hoyle, shortly after the 1999 'new' first editions in the rainbow suite were published.²⁴ These articles compare and contrast certain clauses in the FIDIC yellow and silver books with those in AS 4300 / AS 4902, and PC-1. Hoyle looks at the FIDIC clauses in the light of the jurisprudence that has construed the meaning of various terms in Australian contracts, and highlights potential risk areas for employers and contractors.

In addition to an examination of general features of drafting, he looks at the engineer/superintendent, design obligations and documentation, unforeseen conditions and site data, performance guarantees, defects and variations in Part 1, and consequential loss and limitation, force majeure, extension of time, notices and conditions for extensions of time, concurrent delay, liquidated damages and contractor's delay costs in Part 2.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF FIDIC CONTRACTS

FIDIC contracts are not just about documenting the contractual entitlements of parties. Commensurate with the 'No Dispute' concepts that underpinned the introduction of AS 4000 and the plain English language adopted in the NEC contracts, FIDIC contracts include project management procedures essential for the efficient execution of the Works. The users of these contracts are expected to be the individuals who write and administer the contracts. FIDIC contracts are not intended to be put in the bottom drawer and forgotten about; they are intended to provide the framework of the relationship between the parties as it actually occurs on site.

Accordingly, they provide for clear communication between the engineer, the employer and the contractor. The language used is clear and it is essential that the engineer and the contractor's representative should be familiar with their provisions. The contracts should be referred to in the day-to-day communications and management of the Works and the contract. The contractor needs to follow the strict provisions of the contract in relation to the giving of notice of a claim.

A failure to comply with a time limit is intended to disentitle the contractor from an extension of time or a variation.

To assist with the most practical aspects of project delivery under a FIDIC contract, FIDIC organises training courses, workshops, seminars and conferences around the world for its contracts. There should be no excuse for an engineer, a principal or a contractor not understanding what is required of it. FIDIC presents training courses on:

- Practical use of FIDIC contracts;
- Claims and dispute resolution;
- Dispute adjudication Boards;
- Contract management; and
- Professional services agreement.

In addition, FIDIC cooperates with other organisations in organising international conferences. It takes part in conferences on:

- International Contracts Users (IBA);
- International Contracts and Dispute Resolution (ICC); and
- Dispute Boards (Dispute Review Board Foundation and Dispute Board Federation).

To assist in all aspects of contracting, in addition to the standard form Conditions of Contract referred to above, FIDIC also publishes the following documents relevant to the overall procurement process:

- Quality Based Selection 2010;
- Definition of Services Guidelines Building Construction 2009;
- Five key areas of risk in consultants' appointments 2009;
- Standard Prequalification Forms for Contractors 2008;
- Project Procurement 2008;
- Professional indemnity insurance and insurance of project risk 2004;
- Improving the Quality of Construction 2004;
- FIDIC Guidelines for the Selection of Consultants 2003;
- The White Book Guide with other Notes on Documents for Consultancy Agreements (2nd ed 2001);
- State of the World FIDIC Infrastructure Report 2009;
- Insurance of large civil engineering projects 2004.

THE ADVANTAGES OF USING FIDIC CONTRACTS IN AUSTRALIA

There are particular reasons why the FIDIC standard form contract should be used. While any particular term in a FIDIC contract might be debated in the context of Australian jurisprudence, from an international perspective, the contract is world's best practice. Its dispute resolution procedure, and the reference of disputes to a Dispute Adjudication Board leads the Australian standard form contracts.

There are good reasons for not encouraging modification to standard form contracts. Even a small change can have a dramatic effect on how a contract is interpreted. FIDIC does not sanction its standard forms to be amended in the way that has occurred in Australia to the Australian standard forms.

The format in which FIDIC publishes its contracts (either in hardcopy or as encrypted PDF electronic files) is designed to actively discourage unauthorised copying and amendment of the General Conditions. Any project specific amendments to FIDIC General Conditions must be detailed in the Particular Conditions. This ensures that any changes that are made to the standard conditions are obvious and transparent. Insisting on this process maintains the integrity of the FIDIC General Conditions and reduces the time for assessing tender documents. It also minimises the possibility that a tenderer might be unaware of a project specific amendment that significantly increases the contractor's risks.

It is hoped that this approach to amendment of the standard form of FIDIC contracts is maintained. Standard form contracting increases certainty

and the practical familiarity of those charged with actually using the contract. At least part of the need to amend a standard form contract has been avoided by the publication of the suite of contracts. All major forms of project delivery are catered for within the existing FIDIC framework.

However, as referred to above, since 2005 the Multilateral Development Banks have used the MDB Edition of the FIDIC Construction Contract. In considering the requirements of the MDBs for amendments to the general conditions, FIDIC developed a policy under which it might agree to amendment of the standard General Conditions. To gain approval:

- the amendments should be required for a specific and relatively unique
- project;
- the Particular Conditions consolidated in the General Conditions will make procurement simpler and more transparent;
- the Terms of Use and an appropriate licence fee must be agreed; and
- the specific amendments are made by competent drafters.

In situations where FIDIC does agree to amendments of its General Conditions, the licence to use the FIDIC contract requires that either FIDIC or the contracting parties can ask to be supplied with the General Conditions track marked to show the changes from the standard version provided by FIDIC in a Word file.

THE ENGINEER

Notwithstanding one of the perceived advantages of using a standard form contract is that judicial precedent aids certainty to its interpretation, it is beyond

the role of this paper to consider how individual terms of the standard form contracts have been or may be interpreted by the courts. The reader is referred to the papers by Jonathan Kay Hoyle for specific commentary in the Australian context.²⁵ But it should be said in the international sphere it would seem preferable to use an international contract so that decisions of individual state courts in Australia might be swept aside by larger international concepts of contracting that apply equally to civil code jurisdictions as they do in any state of Australia.

It is interesting, in this respect, to note that even in England, when the New Engineering Contract was first produced in 1993, perhaps the largest competitor to the FIDIC contract suite on the global stage, drafting of that contract started from first principles rather building on an existing standard form. Similarly AS 4000 was a major rewrite of AS 2124. Both examples suggest that hanging on to judicial precedent, whilst comfortable and empowering for lawyers, is not something the construction world values as highly as the lawyers do.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to compare the individual terms of the standard form contracts in use in Australia and compare them to each other and those in FIDIC contracts. In this regard the reader is referred, as a starting point, to the excellent work *Understanding Australian Construction Contracts*²⁶ and in particular the excellent comparison tables that appear at the end of each chapter.

However, the role and independence of the engineer is a central issue in contracting and warrants special mention.

Each of AS 2124 / AS 4000, ABIC MW-1 and PC-1 provide a role

for a superintendent. In AS 2124 and AS 4000 the role is defined as 'the superintendent', although historically the role was more often than not performed by an engineer. In the ABIC MW-1 the role is performed by 'the Architect' reflecting the fact the RAI is one of the authors of the standard form. In PC-1 the role is performed by the 'Contract Administrator'. The role performed differs between the contracts. In PC-1 the Contract Administrator is the agent for the principal in all matters. Further, in PC-1 there is no obligation on the principal to ensure the Contractor Administrator performs fairly, reasonably or to a similar standard of conduct.

The 4th edition of the FIDIC Construction Contract published in 1987 introduced an express term requiring the engineer to act impartially when giving a decision or taking any action which might affect the rights and obligations of the parties. Prior to that, the impartiality of the engineer in performing certification functions was implied. Judges in Australia and the UK have used a variety of words to express the implied obligation of a certifier, be it engineer, architect or however named in a construction contract, to act fairly. It has been referred to as an obligations to act with independence and impartiality',²⁷ and to 'act in a fair and unbiased manner' and to 'reach such decisions fairly, holding the balance between his client and the contractor'.²⁸

The certifier 'must be fair and he must be honest' and must act 'impartially and fairly',²⁹ 'honestly and impartially',³⁰ 'fairly, impartially and in accordance with the powers given to him by the conditions'³¹ and 'to hold the balance fairly as between employer and contractor'.³²

Nevertheless, in engineering and construction contracts there is always a tension between the obligation to act independently in exercising the certification function and the fact the certifier is engaged and employed by the principal. More than that, in engineering and construction contracts the certifier does perform functions and gives directions as the agent for the principal.

Under the Security of Payment legislation as it exists on Australia's east coast, even though the certification function must be performed independently, the response to a contractor's Payment Claim must be in a Payment Schedule from the principal. Accordingly, having performed an independent assessment of a Payment Claim, the certifier then has to change hats and deliver a Payment Schedule as agent for the principal.

This complexity is perennial in engineering and construction contracts. It is, in the authors' opinion, a central reason why the certification role should be performed by an engineer or an architect. Both these professions have a long history and culture of performing the certifying role, and have developed appropriate professional ethical codes.

Some engineering and construction contracts in Australia seek to get around the dual role of the certifier by adding something of a legal fiction. They include a term stating that notwithstanding that the certifier is employed by the principal (and in fact may even be an employee of the principal), the certifier is independent and not the agent of the principal. Of course, as the certifier is not a party to the construction contract, it is somewhat difficult to see how the construction contract can

define the relationship between the certifier and the principal, but quite arguably the definition has contractual effect as between the principal and the contractor. Further, as between the contractor and the principal, the parties plainly intend a contractor will have redress against the principal if the certifier is unfair.

Such contracts therefore typically also impose an obligation on the principal to ensure the certifier acts fairly. This creates the somewhat tortuous path for pleaders on behalf of contractors claiming against principals. The action of the certifier must be pleaded as unfair and hence the principal has breached its obligation of ensuring the certifier would act fairly.

In revising the FIDIC contract forms to the 1999 versions, considerable attention was given to this issue. A survey of FIDIC contract users was carried out by Reading University in the 1990s and about half of the replies expressed a preference for an express term requiring the engineer to act impartially as in the 1987 FIDIC Construction Contract, while the other half did not feel comfortable with the engineer being required to act impartially while he was being employed and paid by the employer.

In the result the 1999 editions of the Construction Contract (red book) and Contract for Plant and Design-Build (yellow book) state: 'whenever carrying out duties or exercising authority, specified in or implied by the contract, the engineer shall be deemed to act for the employer'.³³ In this way, a failure by the engineer to perform its role properly will entitle to the contractor to directly pursue the employer without the somewhat artificial route relied on in many Australian pleadings.

All modern contracts are directly concerned with providing clear risk allocation as between the parties. Good contracts assign risk to the party who can best manage them.

Notwithstanding the explicit acknowledgement that the engineer is the employer's agent, the FIDIC red and yellow books expressly require that:

*Whenever these conditions provide that the engineer shall proceed in accordance with this sub-clause 3.5 to agree or determine any matter, the engineer shall consult with each party in an endeavour to reach agreement. If agreement is not achieved, the engineer shall make a fair determination in accordance with the contract, taking due regard of all relevant circumstances.*³⁴

The drafting is to be commended. The engineer is clearly the agent for the employer and clearly is charged with the role of determining disagreements between the employer and the contractor in the first instance. Not inconsistently with that role, it also has to make fair decisions. [Although the 1987 requirement of an engineer's determination to be 'impartial' has been removed in the 1999 editions, fairness is essentially similar to impartiality.³⁵] The term also, in mandatory language not used anywhere else in the contract, requires the engineer to consult with both parties with the purpose of trying to reach agreement. It is a contract that requires a commitment to dialogue.

That the engineer is both the agent of the employer and contractually required to act fairly are not inconsistent with Australian jurisprudence. Whether the contract says the certifier is or is not the agent of the principal or makes no pronouncement, Australian courts tend to use very similar words to describe the fairness obligation in certification.

For example, some contracts the subject of judicial interpretation have gone even further and given the certification role to the principal itself. In one such contract the court found that the power of the principal to value variations itself and 'in its sole discretion' nevertheless had to be exercised 'honestly, bona fide, and reasonably'.³⁶ In the leading case of *Peninsula Balmain Pty Ltd v Abigroup Contractors Pty Ltd*,³⁷ Hodgson JA found that the project manager, appointed as the certifier and as acting as agent of the principal had to exercise its certifying functions honestly and impartially. And in a case where the principal's representative took the place of the certifier under the ICE Conditions of Contract, the court nevertheless found that the principal was bound to act honestly, fairly and reasonably in arriving at its judgment, even where no such obligation was expressed in the contract.³⁸

In *Costain v Bechtel* a contract based on the NEC standard form was considered. It was argued that because, under the amended contract in question, the project manager was specifically employed to act in the interests of the employer, he was not obliged to act impartially. In dismissing the argument Jackson J said 'It would be a most unusual basis for any building contract to postulate that every doubt shall be resolved in the favour of the employer and every discretion shall be exercised against the contractor'.³⁹

The FIDIC EPC/Turnkey Contract does not have an engineer named as such. In that contract the certification function is carried out by the employer's representative.

Another change made in the 1999 Construction Contract is that the employer now can replace the engineer on 42 days notice. The contractor can prevent this happening by raising a reasonable

objection on notice to the employer.

Forty two days is a time period used elsewhere in FIDIC contracts. It is also the time in which the engineer must respond to a contractor's claim with approval, or with disapproval with detailed comments.

RISK ALLOCATION

All modern contracts are directly concerned with providing clear risk allocation as between the parties. Good contracts assign risk to the party who can best manage them.

Within the overall scheme of intended risk allocation, particularly in respect of design risk, each of the FIDIC contracts aims to be fair and equitable by allocating risks to the party best able to control, deal with and manage them. In comparison to earlier editions, and consistent with the authors' observations of the direction in Australia referred to above, the 1999 editions somewhat reduced the contractor's exposure to certain risks. In particular, changes in the following areas reduced contractor's risk:

- the definition of events comprising force majeure was broadened;
- the contractor recovers time and money for force majeure;
- the contractor has greater power in relation to the employer's ability to pay and in ensuring that payment is made in full and on time.

The differences in risk allocation between the contractor and Employer in the three main forms of FIDIC contracts is illustrated in the following table:

| Key | | | | |
|---------------|---|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Employer's risk | | | |
| | Contractor's risk | | | |
| | Shared risks | | | |
| Clause | Risk | Const (Red) | P&DB (Yellow) | EPC/T (Silver) |
| 1.9 | Delayed drawings or instructions | | | |
| 1.9 | Errors in employer's requirements | | | |
| 2.1 | Right of access to the site | | | |
| 4.7 | Setting out | | | |
| 4.12 | Unforeseeable physical conditions | | | |
| 4.24 | Fossils | | | |
| 7.4 | Testing delays by employer | | | |
| 7.5 | Rejection of materials | | | |
| 7.6 | Remedial work | | | |
| 8.4(a) | Extension of time for completion—variation | | | |
| 8.4(b) | Extension of time for completion—delay giving entitlement to an EOT | | | |
| 8.4(c) | Exceptionally adverse climatic conditions | | | |
| 8.4(d) | Unforeseeable shortages and the availability of personnel or goods caused by epidemic or government actions | | | |
| 8.4(e) | Delay, impediment or prevention caused by the employer, its personnel or other contractors | | | |
| 8.5 | Delay caused by authorities | | | |
| 8.6 | Rate of progress | | | |
| 8.9 | Consequences of suspension | | | |
| 9.4 | Failure to pass tests on completion | | | |
| 11.4 | Failure to remedy defects | | | |
| 12.1/14.1 | Increased quantities during construction | | | |
| 12.4 | Omission of work through a variation | | | |
| 12.4 | Failure to pass tests after completion | | | |
| 13.3 | Variation procedure | | | |
| 13.7 | Adjustment for changes in legislation | | | |
| 13.8 | Adjustment for changes in cost | | | |
| 14.8 | Delayed payment | | | |
| 15.4 | Payment after termination | | | |
| 17.1 | Indemnities | | | |
| 17.2 | Care of the works prior to the taking over certificate | | | |
| 17.4 | Consequences of employer's risks | | | |
| 19.4 | Consequences of force majeure | | | |
| 20.1 | Contractor's claims | | | |

STRUCTURE OF FIDIC CONTRACTS

The structure of each of the contracts is as follows:

- 1 General Provisions—subjects which apply to the contract in general.
- 2—5 Employer, engineer, contractor, nominated subcontractors—duties and obligations of the different organisations that play a part in the execution of the Works.
- 6—7 Staff and labour, plant materials and workmanship—the requirements for the items which the contractor brings to the site.
- 8—11 Commencement, delays and suspension, tests on completion, employers taking over, defects—follows the sequence for events during the construction.
- 12—14 Measurement and evaluation, variations and adjustments, contract price and payment—procedures for the employer to pay the contractor for the work.
- 15—16 Termination by employer, suspension and termination by contractor—logically at the end of the construction sequence.
- 17 Risk and responsibility—relates to the project as a whole, and includes subclauses used rarely, as well as matters concerning the parties' responsibilities.
- 18 Insurance—procedures which must be implemented before the Works commence.
- 19 Force majeure—general clause that will only be used if the particular problem occurs.
- 20 Claims, disputes and arbitration—procedures for submission and response to contractors claims, the appointment of the Dispute Adjudication Board (DAB), obtaining the DAB's decision,

amicable settlement and arbitration.

FIDIC CONTRACT PROVISIONS IN THE AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

The FIDIC suite of contracts has evolved over a considerable time period, with input from a wide range of engineers, contractors, employers, lawyers and various interested organisations representing many players in the construction industry.

There are many who contend these contracts represent best international contracting practice, without favouring either the contractor or the employer. However, FIDIC contracts have had significantly different input to standard form contracts currently in general use in Australia and it is therefore not surprising that a number of provisions are unusual by Australian standards.

For example, FIDIC contracts provide for:

- Termination for convenience by the employer, other than to carry out the work itself or by another contractor. In this event, the contractor is not entitled to recover its lost profit.
- The contractor can slow down or suspend the work if the engineer does not certify an Interim Payment Certificate within 49 days from the Contractor's Statement (i.e. a claim). Australian Security of Payment legislation provides a more extensive right in any event.
- Termination by the contractor after 14 days notice if the engineer does not certify an Interim Payment Certificate within 56 days from the Contractor's Statement.
- Termination by the contractor after 14 days notice if the employer does not make payment of an Interim Payment Certificate within 98 days from the Contractor's Statement.

- If the employer considers it is entitled to any payment by the contractor, including for delay (liquidated) damages, it must make a formal claim to the engineer, following a similar procedure to that which the contractor must follow. However, unlike the contractor, there is no time bar for an employer's notice of a claim, which must be given 'as soon as practicable after the employer became aware' of the relevant event.⁴⁰ [However, in the MDB Harmonised Version of the red book, 'the notice shall be given as soon as practicable and no longer than 28 days after the employer became aware, or should have become aware' of the relevant event.⁴¹]

- Either party may be excused from performance of its contractual obligations (except with respect to obligations to pay the other party) by an exceptional event or circumstance (force majeure). The contract may be terminated if a party is or will be prevented by force majeure from performing its obligations for a continuous period of 84 days, or from multiple periods totalling more than 140 days due to the same event. In the event of such termination the contractor is entitled to payment of its costs, but not loss of profit.

- A formal dispute between the parties is submitted to a Dispute Adjudication Board (DAB) in the first instance. The DAB must hand down its determination for resolution of the dispute within 84 days. This determination is binding on both parties unless and until it is overturned by agreement or arbitration, which can only be commenced if a party issues a notice of dissatisfaction within 28 days of the DAB's determination. The Construction Contract provides for a 'full-term' DAB appointed at the start of the project which is intended to maintain an ongoing knowledge

of the progress of the works and the contract by regular site visits and meetings with the parties. The other major FIDIC Contracts provide for an 'ad hoc' DAB, appointed only after a dispute arises with its activities confined to resolution of the specific dispute.

CONTRACT PROVISIONS WHICH MAY BE SUPERSEDED BY THE LAW OF THE COUNTRY

Although the FIDIC contracts are intended to be used in any country, including both common law and civil law systems, there are a number of provisions that may be inconsistent with domestic law. FIDIC recognises that the terms of the contract must be considered for each application in each country. In Australia, as referred to above, FIDIC contracts should be harmonised with the relevant Security of Payment legislation. Other state based legislation also needs to be considered.

On an international level the following are some of the provisions that are in this category:

- The 28 day time limit for submission of a contractor's claim may be illegal in some countries.
- Delay damages (liquidated damages) which are in excess of a genuine pre-estimate of the likely damages caused by a delay would not be enforced by the courts in many common law countries (including Australia). However, contractual penalties are permissible under the civil code in many countries.
- In some countries the employer is entitled to delay damages even if the delay does not cause it any loss. In other countries the employer must be able to show some loss before it could claim delay damages.

- In some countries the right to delay damages can be lost if a legal procedure is not followed (rather than a contractual procedure).

- The extent of permissible variations may be constrained by the law, e.g. competition law in the European Union may put a limit on the extent to which the scope of the original contract (let by competitive tendering) can be increased.

- The contractor might be entitled to certification of completion before 100% of the work has been finished, e.g. in the Philippines the contractor is entitled to certification at 95%.

The parties to a contract may wish to avoid the application of domestic national law by stipulating the applicable law in the contract. Going further, the contracting parties could make reference to a legal framework that is independent of any country. This could be a non state body of law, such as the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts. Of course, domestic law will give varying effect to such terms.

UPDATE OF THE RAINBOW SUITE

FIDIC has an Update Task Group which is currently reviewing the three main FIDIC contracts with a view to issuing a new edition possibly in 2011 or 2012. Although the extent of the changes to be made has not yet been finalised, the new editions will have the same structure and clauses as the 1999 editions. Experience with the use of these contracts in the last 10 years has demonstrated that the overall structure is logical and easy to follow.

The current indications are the planned changes will be aimed at improvement of the existing wording, rather than any wholesale change to the structure or layout of the documents.

The most recent of the major contracts issued by FIDIC, the Contract for Design, Build and Operate Projects (the gold book), incorporates a number of improvements that are being considered for incorporation into the Construction Contract, the Plant Design-Build Contract and the EPC/Turnkey Projects Contract. Some of these relate to terminology, such as replacing the term Force Majeure with the term 'exceptional risk', revising the definition of 'dispute' and the term 'communications' being replaced with 'notices and other communications'. Standardisation is seen as an important thing to maintain.

Certain features of the MDB Edition will be incorporated into the revised contract. For example, the term Contract Data will be introduced in lieu of the Appendix to Tender. This term is becoming common in Australian contracts.

One of the major changes being considered takes us back to the issue of defining the independent role of the certifier with as much precision as possible. The current suggestion for the next edition is that the engineer's role and obligation will be defined to be:

... to act as the experienced, professional and independent engineer for the purposes of the contract.

This adds to the issue of agency and independence a standard of performance of the engineer that looks commensurate with the sort of standard that would be expected under the Australian domestic law of negligence.

In keeping with the idea that FIDIC contracts are intended to define the relationship between the contracting parties in a practical way, and in a way that those administering the contract can understand, a new subclause under clause 8 is proposed to ensure that

The contracts incorporate many features that should make them attractive to Australian lawyers including fair risk allocation, sensible provisions relating to the certification process and best practice dispute resolution mechanisms.

both parties have a contractual obligation to give advance early warning of certain things. The current contracts only require the contractor to give advance notice or early warning to the engineer of potential events which might adversely affect or delay the Works. The proposed text for the new provision is: 'Each party shall endeavour to give notice to the other party in advance of any known or probable future events or circumstances which may adversely affect the Works, including delaying the execution of the Works, or increasing the contract price. The engineer may require the contractor to submit an estimate of the anticipated effect of the future event or circumstances, and/or a proposal under sub-clause 13.3 [variation procedure].'

Other changes being considered include:

- giving the contractor an entitlement to terminate the contract if the employer does not give possession of the site within 84 days of the letter of acceptance;
- including the design requirements more clearly in the contract;
- including tighter definitions of the requirements for the operation and maintenance manuals to comply with the contract;
- clarification of the Works to be performed;
- providing more definition of what is required of the contractor's program. The suggested text is: 'The programme shall fully comply with the requirements set out in Annex X of the Particular Conditions'. The specific requirements in Annex X are then intended to ensure that the programme is prepared in sufficient detail to ensure

good planning, execution and monitoring of the works. The current practice incorporated in the FIDIC subcontract and the Society of Construction Law Delay and Disruption Protocol are being considered;

- providing for automatic extensions of time in circumstances where the DAB has decided that the contractor is entitled to an extension of time;
- refining the formation of the DAB procedures;
- putting a greater emphasis on health and safety;
- provide for a changed regime for employer's taking over so that issuing a Taking-Over certificate will shift care of the Works to the employer but only the Performance Certificate will certify acceptance of the Works;
- modifying the claims, disputes and arbitration process. It is proposed the approach in the Design, Build and Operate Projects Contract (gold book) will be put into the FIDIC rainbow contracts. A definition of dispute will be inserted. The sub-clauses relating to employer's and contractor's claims may be removed from clause 20 which will be confined to disputes.

CONSTRUCTION SUBCONTRACT 2009

The original FIDIC Conditions of Subcontract 1994 were produced for use with the FIDIC Construction Contract 1987. Work on drafting a new subcontract started in 2006. A draft was presented at the FIDIC International Users' Conference in December 2008 for review, and user's comments were reviewed and amendments were made to the review edition. A test edition of the new subcontract was issued at the FIDIC International Users' Conference in London in December 2009.

The features of the new subcontract are:

- It is as back-to-back with the FIDIC 1999 Construction Contract as possible, and follows the format of the 1999 suite. It incorporates by reference the terms of the 1999 Construction Contract, including the Annexures and Particular Conditions and therefore must be read with it.

- It incorporates the principle of 'pay when paid', but not 'pay if paid'. Thus, the main contractor is not relieved from ever making payment just because it never receives payment from the employer. However, the Guidance Notes give an alternative clause for jurisdictions where pay-when-paid provisions are not enforceable, as is the case under Security of Payment legislation in Australian jurisdictions.

- It incorporates seven Annexes. The published document comprises 35 pages of Conditions of Contract clauses; plus 31 pages of Guidance Notes and alternative clauses for a number of commonly occurring issues.

The seven Annexes comprise:

A: Particulars of the Main Contract;

B: Scope of Subcontract Works and Schedule of Subcontract Documents;

C: Incentive(s) for Early Completion, Taking-Over by the Contractor, and Subcontract Bill of Quantities and/or schedule of prices (if any);

D: Equipment, Temporary Works, Facilities, and Free-Issue Materials to be Provided by the Contractor;

E: Insurances;

F: Subcontract Programme;

G: Other Items.

- It expressly requires the main contractor to coordinate the works including the works

of all its subcontractors. The subcontractor is required to co-operate with the main contractor, other subcontractors and the employer's personnel. The subcontractor has an obligation, whenever required by a contractor's Instruction, to submit details of the arrangements and methods which it proposes to adopt for the execution of the subcontract works, and no significant alteration to these arrangements and methods can be made without the contractor's prior consent.

- It sets out definitive programming requirements for the subcontractor's programme. The main contractor is entitled to rely upon the subcontract programme when co-ordinating the works and/or planning its activities and those of other subcontractors. The main contractor is required to give the subcontractor all reasonable cooperation and assistance in order that it may progress the subcontract works as required by the subcontract programme.

- It provides for taking-over of the subcontract works when the main works are taken over. The default position is that the subcontract works are deemed to have been taken over when the relevant part of the main works are taken over by the employer, however, the subcontractor remains obliged to the main contractor until such time as the main contractor is relieved of its obligations by the employer. If the main contractor is to take over the subcontract works before the relevant main works are taken over by the employer, then this must be stated in Annex C.

- It provides that the subcontract defects notification period expires on the date of expiry of the main contract defects notification period. The subcontractor has the same obligations after taking-

over to remedy defects and outstanding works as those set out under clause 11 of the main contract. Performance is certified under the subcontract only when the performance certificate is issued under the main contract.

- Clause 20, claims and disputes, is drafted giving three options for subcontracts of differing complexity, value and importance. In particular, it incorporates an option which addresses the issue of multiparty dispute resolution.

Whilst the subcontractor assumes and performs all the obligations and liabilities of the main contractor in relation to subcontract works, there are exclusions for setting out, quality assurance, rights-of-way, etc in Annex A. The subcontractor is required to carry out the subcontract works so that there is no breach of contract by the main contractor under the main contract.

In relation to disputes, the subcontract provides for the 'middle ground' in clause 20 for subcontracts of mid-range complexity where there is a probability that a subcontract dispute is related to a dispute under the main contract. The sequence of steps in the first and second alternative dispute resolution methods are given in the Guidance Notes.

In clause 20, the main contractor can notify the subcontractor that a dispute is related to a main contract dispute. There is then a 'moratorium' of 112 days: the subcontract dispute is suspended during this time, giving the main contractor the opportunity to obtain a decision on its dispute with the employer from the main contract DAB, however, the decision of the main contract DAB is not binding on the subcontractor. After the moratorium has expired, the subcontractor has the option

to refer the dispute to the subcontract DAB or directly to arbitration, as it so wishes. The main contractor may only refer the dispute to the subcontract DAB. If the subcontract dispute is unrelated, either party can refer it to a subcontract DAB, to be appointed on an ad-hoc basis.

In the first alternative (simple) option for dispute resolution, there is no provision for the main contractor to decide whether a dispute is related or unrelated to a dispute under the main contract. The subcontract dispute is to be resolved by arbitration, and there is no DAB.

The second alternative dispute resolution method is the related/unrelated option. A related dispute arises from a related claim (i.e. related to a claim under the main contract), an unrelated dispute arises from an unrelated claim. If the dispute does not arise from a subcontractor's claim, then there is provision for the main contractor to decide whether the dispute is related or unrelated to a dispute under the main contract. In a related dispute, the subcontractor gets a share of the benefit that the main contractor receives under the main contract. If the subcontractor is not satisfied with that share, then the dispute is treated in the same way as an unrelated dispute, to be decided by a subcontract DAB.

Kratochvilova and Mendelblat recently reviewed this test edition, and discussed selected clauses.⁴² They noted certain ambiguities in the drafting, and identified clauses where the subcontractor's obligations are not back-to-back with the contractor's obligations to the employer. These result in added risks that both contractor and subcontractor may wish to ameliorate by appropriate Particular Conditions.

For example, the subcontractor must notify the contractor 'immediately' of any non-cooperation from e.g. other subcontractors, the wording of the clause suggesting that any delay in notifying the contractor of non-cooperation will disentitle the subcontractor from an entitlement to time and cost. As there is no time period specified for the subcontractor to issue a notice of dissatisfaction with a DAB's determination, the contractor is at risk that a dispute could be referred to arbitration at any time after the DAB's determination (cf the rainbow suite where a notice of dissatisfaction must be served within 28 days of the DAB's decision as a condition precedent to arbitration).

CONCLUSION

The FIDIC contract suite provides an internationally accepted platform for Australian companies doing business internationally and domestically. The contracts incorporate many features that should make them attractive to Australian lawyers including fair risk allocation, sensible provisions relating to the certification process and best practice dispute resolution mechanisms. They are intended not only to be consulted for the parties' legal rights and responsibilities when they fall into dispute, but provide strong day to day guidance by providing a manual for contract administration. They are excellently supported in this regard by collateral documents and training opportunities.

FIDIC is committed maintaining the integrity of its contracts as standard forms. Whereas Australian Standard form contracts have, in recent years, been somewhat seen as just the starting point for a bespoke contract, a FIDIC contract should not be modified in the same way.

The adoption of FIDIC into the Australian engineering and construction scene would see a return to standard form contracting on an international platform.

REFERENCES

1. In total there are 16 standard form contracts in the set. See Asset Maintenance and Service contracts—the Standards suite is complete Pilley, John, (2005) 21 BCL 6
2. Standard Conditions of Contract, John L. Pilley and Harley Coobes, Issue 4, *BDPS News*, April 2001
3. http://propertycouncil.gravitymax.com.au/nat/page.asp?622=270538&e_page=17330 (November 2007)
4. *Understanding Australian Construction Contracts*, Bailey and Bell; *Brooking on Building Contracts* (4th ed.) Cremean, Shnookal and Whitten
5. Bespoke—an item custom-made to the buyer's specification
6. <http://www.jbic.go.jp/en/about/role-function/pdf/jbic-brochure-english.pdf>, accessed 23 March 2011
7. http://www.jica.go.jp/activities/schemes/finance_co/procedure/guideline/pdf/check_e.pdf, accessed 23 March 2011
8. *Ibid* p1
9. Justin Sweet, 'Standard construction contracts in the USA' [2011] *ICLR* 101
10. *Ibid*, 129
11. *Ibid*, 107
12. However, to put this in context, the most widely used standard construction contracts in the USA, issued by the American Institute of Architects, sold an average of 231,500 contracts per year in the period 2004—2008: Justin Sweet,

- 'Standard construction contracts in the USA' [2011] *ICLR* 101, 105
13. http://www.neccontract.com/news/article.asp?NEWS_ID=749&Type=News, accessed 24 March 2011
14. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROCUREMENT/Resources/Works-4-07-ev2_May2010_v4.pdf, accessed 24 March 2011
15. The FIDIC Contracts Guide
16. European International Contractors, 'EIC Contractor's Guide to the FIDIC Conditions of Contract for EPC/Turnkey Projects (the New Silver Book)' [2000] *ICLR* 504; European International Contractors, 'EIC Contractor's Guide to the FIDIC Conditions of Contract for Construction (the New Red Book)' [2003] *ICLR* 53; European International Contractors, 'EIC Contractor's Guide to the FIDIC Conditions of Contract for Plant and Design-Build (the New Yellow Book)' [2003] *ICLR* 332; See also: Richard Appuhn & Eric Eggink, 'The Contractor's View on the MDB Harmonised Version of the New Red Book' [2006] *ICLR* 4
17. Nael G Bunni, *The FIDIC Forms of Contract* (3rd ed. 2005)
18. Brian W Totterdill, *FIDIC User's Guide: A Practical Guide to the 1999 red and yellow books* (2006)
19. Ellis Baker, Ben Mellors, Scott Chalmers & Anthony Lavers, *FIDIC Contracts: Law and Practice* (2009)
20. Axel-Volkmar Jaeger & Götz-Sebastian Hök, *FIDIC—A Guide for Practitioners* (2010)
21. Robert Knutson (ed.), *FIDIC An Analysis of International Construction Contracts* (2005)
22. Nael G Bunni, *The FIDIC Forms of Contract* (3rd ed, 2005), Brian W Totterdill, *FIDIC User's Guide: A Practical Guide to the 1999 red and yellow books* (2006)
23. For e.g. see Jonathan Kay Hoyle, 'The Rainbow Down Under—Part 1 Some Reflections from the Antipodes on Aspects of the New FIDIC Design-Build Contracts' [2001] *ICLR* 5, 5 which lists 9 papers published in *ICLR* from 1998 to 2000
24. Jonathan Kay Hoyle, 'The Rainbow Down Under—Part 1 Some Reflections from the Antipodes on Aspects of the New FIDIC Design-Build Contracts' [2001] *ICLR* 5; 'The Rainbow Down Under—Part 2 Further Reflections from the Antipodes on Aspects of the New FIDIC Design-Build Contracts' [2002] *ICLR* 4
25. *Ibid*
26. Ian Bailey and Matthew Bell (2008)
27. *Dixon v South Australian Railways Commissioner* [1923] HCA 45, (1923) 34 CLR 71 per Isaacs J
28. *Sutcliffe v Thackrah* (1974) AC 727, 737 per Lord Reid
29. *Ibid*, 740, 741 per Lord Morris
30. *Peninsula Balmain Pty Ltd v Abigroup Contractors Pty Ltd* [2002] NSWCA 211, (2002) 18 BCL 322
31. *Cantrell v Wright and Fuller Ltd* [2003] EWHC 1545 (TCC); (2003) 91 Con LR 97
32. *Scheldebouw BV v St James Homes (Grosvenor Dock Ltd)* [2006] EWHC 89, [24] per Jackson J
33. Sub-clause 3.1
34. Sub-clause 3.5
35. A Sen, *The Idea of Justice* (2009) 54
36. *WMC Resources Ltd v Leighton Contractors Pty Ltd* [1999] WASCA 10; (2000) 16 BCL 53, 62 per Ipp J
37. *Peninsula Balmain Pty Ltd v Abigroup Contractors Pty Ltd* [2002] NSWCA 211, (2002) 18 BCL 322
38. *Balfour Beatty Civil Engineering Ltd v Docklands Light Railway Ltd* (1996) 78 BLR 42
39. *Costain Ltd v Bechtel Ltd* [2005] EWHC 1018 (TCC)
40. Sub-clause 2.5
41. Sub-clause 2.5
42. Emma Kratochvilova and Michael Mendelblat, 'Testing the Water—A New FIDIC Subcontract' [2011] *ICLR* 46
-
- Donald Charrett and Toby Shnookal's paper was presented at a joint Vicbar and Society of Construction Law Australia seminar in Melbourne on 29 March 2011. Reprinted with permission.
-