the guidance given will prove useful to members who have bought or are about to purchase the code.

Professional indemnity insurance

Andrew Shaw writes from Wakefield in West Yorks and is concerned that professional indemnity insurers are not strict enough in their terms when it comes to providing cover for consulting engineers.

I am writing further to the recent discussion via your pages on the matter of professional indemnity insurance. I am in favour of the move to inform clients when PI is not carried but, unfortunately, this will only apply to members of the IStructE (or ICE no doubt), and does not apply to those persons who provide 'anonymous' calculations which one meets frequently, and which may have doubtful 'parentage'. I am confident that the vast majority of members will act responsibly in this regard.

However, it does not cease to amaze me how much freedom PI providers give to consulting engineers when entering into fee arrangements. After all, they receive their premiums based

on a percentage of the firm's turnover, and, if the firm is taking on work on an unrealistic fee, due to pressures of the market-place, then insurers also lose out on premium income. This is particularly the case when collateral warranties are involved which may involve onerous consequential damage terms and third party rights, significantly expanding traditional responsibilities. For instance, many clients, advised by their well-remunerated solicitors, will not now accept the British Property Federation forms of collateral warranty for this reason, yet many are still unprepared to pay reasonable fees.

I do feel that the move to bring PI insurance to the forefront can only be beneficial to IStructE members in this regard, but I would be happier still if insurers were more vociferous with regard to fee income (does anyone remember 'fee scales'?), which might just increase our bargaining power when it comes to fee negotiations.

Any improvements to assist the negotiating process for fair fees in exchange for work done can only be welcomed.

Emails can be sent to Verulam via: reynolds@istructe.org.uk

Tables errata

'Crack width calculation to BS 8007 for combined flexure and direct tension'

H. G. Kruger has errata to the tables in his technical report published on 17 September 2002. Errors have occurred in the calculation of design surface crack widths in Tables 1 and 2 for Case 1: x < 0. Therefore, Tables 1 and 2 should be replaced with the following. The author apologises for any inconvenience caused.

Table 1: Design surface crack widths for different configurations of flexure and direct tension							
T [kN]	[kNm]	M [mm]	x [mm]	W ₁ [mm]	W ₂		
675	0		0.200	0.200			
675	1 -	10712.1	0.204	0.197*			
675	5 -	-2002.4	0.220*	0.182*			
675	10	-913.7	0.239*	0.164*			
20		87.8	83.0	0.208	-		
5		87.8	84.6	0.202	-		
1		87.8	85.0	0.200	-		
0		87.8	85.1	0.200	-		
* corrected values							

Table 2: Surface crack width examples							
Parameter	1	Example 2	3				
Case	X<0	x>h	0 <x<h< td=""></x<h<>				
a ₁ mm	48	48	48				
a ₂ mm	55	46	46				
A _{s1}	T16@125mm	T16@150mm	T16@150mm				
A _{s2}	T10@150mm	T12@150mm	T12@150mm				
M kNm	30	10	63				
T kN	400	525	60				
ρ_1/ρ_2	3.07	1.78	1.78				
-k ₁ K	1.37	0.27	-0.22				
—К	6.30	1.48	-1.22				
-k ₂ K	32.14	7.85	-6.44				
x mm	-132.7	1289.9	72.2				
w ₁ mm	0.188	0.200	0.199				
w ₂ mm ¹	-0.038*	0.177					

 $[b = 1000 \text{mm}; h = 300 \text{mm}; f_y = 460 \text{MPa}; E_s = 200 \text{GPa}; E_c = 27 \text{GPa}];$ Negative value indicates that face is uncracked; * corrected value

ARE YOU A CONSULTING STRUCTURAL ENGINEER?

If so, you need to join the new IStructE On-Line Directory

IStructE is launching a web-based Directory of Firms – initially in the UK, soon worldwide.

Annual cost per office is only £100 – but if you sign up before 31 March the first 12 months will be free.

Just log on to www.istructe.org.uk and follow the on-screen prompts.