



Standard Classification for Serviceability of an Office Facility for Special Facilities and Technologies^{1,2}

This standard is issued under the fixed designation E1694; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This classification covers pairs of scales for classifying an aspect of the serviceability of an office facility, that is, the capability of an office facility to meet certain possible requirements for special facilities and technologies.

1.2 Each pair of scales shown in Figs. 1-6 printed side-by-side on a page, are for classifying one topic of serviceability within that aspect of serviceability. Each paragraph in an Occupant Requirement Scale (see Figs. 1-6) summarizes one level of serviceability on that topic that occupants might require. The matching entry in the Facility Rating Scale (See Figs. 1-6) is a translation of the requirement into a description of certain features of a facility that, taken in combination, indicate that the facility is likely to meet that level of required serviceability.

1.3 The entries in the Facility Rating Scale (See Figs. 1-6) are indicative and not comprehensive. They are for quick scanning, to estimate approximately, quickly, and economically, how well an office facility is likely to meet the needs of one or another type of occupant group over time. The entries are not for measuring, knowing, and evaluating how an office facility is performing.

1.4 This classification can be used to estimate the level of serviceability of an existing facility. It can also be used to estimate the serviceability of a facility that has been planned but not yet built, such as one for which single-line drawings and outline specifications have been prepared.

1.5 This classification indicates what would cause a facility to be rated at a certain level of serviceability, but it does not state how to conduct a serviceability rating nor how to assign a serviceability score. That information is found in Practice

E1334. The scales in this classification are complementary to and compatible with Practice E1334. Each requires the other.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:³

E631 Terminology of Building Constructions

E1334 Practice for Rating the Serviceability of a Building or Building-Related Facility (Withdrawn 2013)⁴

E1679 Practice for Setting the Requirements for the Serviceability of a Building or Building-Related Facility, and for Determining What Serviceability is Provided or Proposed

2.2 ISO Documents:⁵

ISO 6240 International Standard, Performance Standards in Building—Contents and Presentation

ISO/DIS 7162 Draft International Standard, Performance Standards in Building—Contents and Format of Standards for Evaluation of Performance

ISO/DIS 7164 Draft International Standard, Performance Standards in Building—Definitions and Means of Expression for the Performance of a Whole Building

3. Terminology

3.1 Definitions:

3.1.1 For standard definitions of terms applicable to this classification, see Terminology E631.

3.1.2 *facility, n*—a physical setting used to serve a specific purpose. **E631**

3.1.2.1 *Discussion*—A facility may be within a building, or a whole building, or a building with its sites and surrounding environment; or it may be a construction that is not a building. The term encompasses both the physical object and its use.

3.1.3 *facility serviceability*—the capability of a facility to perform the function(s) for which it is designed, used, or required to be used. **E631**

¹ This classification is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee E06 on Performance of Buildings and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee E06.25 on Whole Buildings and Facilities.

Current edition approved April 1, 2012. Published May 2012. Originally approved in 1995. Last previous edition approved in 2005 as E1694 – 95a (2005). DOI: 10.1520/E1694-95AR12.

² Portions of this document are based on material originally prepared by the International Centre for Facilities (ICF) and © 1993 by ICF and Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada. Their cooperation in the development of this standard is acknowledged.

³ For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards* volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

⁴ The last approved version of this historical standard is referenced on www.astm.org.

⁵ Available from American National Standards Institute (ANSI), 25 W. 43rd St., 4th Floor, New York, NY 10036, <http://www.ansi.org>.

A.13. Special Facilities and Technologies

Scale A.13.1. Group or shared conference centre

Occupant Requirement Scale		Facility Rating Scale
9 ☐ LOCATION OF MEETING SPACE: Require consistent access to a conference centre for the organization in the same building or complex. SIZE OF MEETINGS: For large meetings, e.g. 50 to 100 people.	8 ☐	9 ☐ Present provision: A departmental conference centre exists, able to handle several groups of 25 to 50 people at tables in adjacent meeting rooms, with a main plenary session of 200 people or more.
7 ☐ LOCATION OF MEETING SPACE: Can tolerate using space in a canteen, work area or display area. SIZE OF MEETINGS: Require space for large meetings in the same building, e.g. 100 people. FUTURE NEED FOR A CONFERENCE CENTRE: A certain or very likely need in the future for a departmental conference centre in the same building or complex.	6 ☐	7 ☐ Present provision: A departmental conference centre is not provided. Large meetings, e.g. 100 people, can take place in a separate display or work area where office work is only minimally disrupted, or, in a portion of a food service eating area that can easily be closed off. Potential space: There is space available for a dedicated departmental conference centre, with the necessary qualities of size, dimensions, location, and access to facilities. Potential services: Building services could be modified or added to, at reasonable effort and cost.
5 ☐ LOCATION OF MEETING SPACE: Can tolerate using space in an open plan area adjacent to a main circulation route or lobby. SIZE OF MEETINGS: Require space for large meetings in the same building, e.g. 100 people. FUTURE NEED FOR A CONFERENCE CENTRE: Foresee a possible need in the future for a departmental conference centre in the same building or complex.	4 ☐	5 ☐ Present provision: A departmental conference centre is not provided. Large meetings, e.g. 100 people, can take place in an open plan area, located close to the main circulation route and entry. Potential space: Space is available for a dedicated departmental conference centre, but is of marginal quality, e.g. marginal ceiling height for a main auditorium, poor location in the building, insufficient nearby toilets, and marginal space for adjacent meeting rooms. Potential services: Building services are inadequate, but with sufficient capacity to upgrade, or could be added with moderate difficulty and cost.
3 ☐ LOCATION OF MEETING SPACE: No present or future need for a departmental conference facility in the same building or complex.	2 ☐	3 ☐ Potential space: A departmental conference centre is not provided. There is no suitable space available, e.g. insufficient ceiling height for a main auditorium, and narrow room dimensions. Meeting rooms are not adjacent, and have poor access. Potential services: Building services are inadequate. There is some capacity or space to upgrade but very difficult and costly.
1 ☐ LOCATION OF MEETING SPACE: There is no requirement at this level. SIZE OF MEETINGS: There is no requirement at this level. FUTURE NEED FOR A CONFERENCE CENTRE: There is no requirement at this level.		1 ☐ Potential space: A departmental conference centre is not provided. There is no available space, e.g. insufficient space for adjacent meeting rooms and office, and insufficient public circulation space. Potential services: Building services are inadequate with no capacity or space to upgrade. Sound separation is inadequate and upgrade is very difficult and costly.

☐ Exceptionally important. ☐ Important. ☐ Minor Importance.
Minimum Threshold level = ☐ NA ☐ NR ☐ Zero ☐ DP

NOTES Space for handwritten notes on Requirements or Ratings

FIG. 1 Scale A.13.1 for Group or Shared Conference Center

A.13. Special Facilities and Technologies

Scale A.13.2. Video teleconference facilities

Occupant Requirement Scale	Facility Rating Scale
9 ☐ PRESENT NEED FOR FACILITY: Require immediate access to a video teleconference centre in the same building or complex.	9 ☐ Present provision: A dedicated video teleconference centre is fully installed to a good standard, or is easily upgraded.
7 ☐ PRESENT NEED FOR FACILITY: No immediate need for a teleconference centre in the same building or complex. FUTURE NEED FOR FACILITY: A certain or very likely need in the future for a video teleconference centre in the same building or complex.	7 ☐ Potential space: Video teleconference facilities are not provided. Space for a video teleconference facility is good, e.g. in the range of 3.0 m to 3.5 m ceiling height in screen end of space. Potential services: Building services are easily capable of providing special conditions required with minimum effort and cost. Air handling is very quiet.
5 ☐ PRESENT NEED FOR FACILITY: No immediate need for a video teleconference centre in the same building. FUTURE NEED FOR FACILITY: A possible need in the future for a video teleconference centre in the same building or complex.	5 ☐ Potential space: Video teleconference facilities are not provided. Space for a video teleconference facility is just adequate, e.g. in the range of 3.0 m ceiling height. Potential services: There is capability in building services to provide the special conditions required, if upgraded, or special air handling and acoustic isolation can be added with moderate effort and cost.
3 ☐ PRESENT NEED FOR FACILITY: No present need for a video teleconference centre in the same building or complex. FUTURE NEED FOR FACILITY: No future need for a video teleconference centre in the same building or complex.	3 ☐ Potential space: Video teleconference facilities are not provided. There is no suitable space, e.g. marginal ceiling height, and poor location. Potential services: Building services are inadequate. There is some capacity to upgrade ventilation, but it is very difficult and costly. Sound separation is insufficient and upgrade is very difficult and costly.
1 ☐ PRESENT NEED FOR FACILITY: No requirement at this level. FUTURE NEED FOR FACILITY: No requirement at this level.	1 ☐ Potential space: Video teleconference facilities are not provided. There is no space, e.g. insufficient ceiling height. Potential services: Building services are inadequate with no capacity to upgrade. Sound separation is insufficient and upgrade is very difficult and costly.

☐ Exceptionally important. ☐ Important. ☐ Minor Importance.
Minimum Threshold level = ☐ NA ☐ NR ☐ Zero ☐ DP

NOTES Space for handwritten notes on Requirements or Ratings

FIG. 2 Scale A.13.2 for Video Teleconference Facilities

3.1.3.1 *Discussion*—The scope of this performance is of the facility as a system, including its subsystems, components, and materials and their interactions, such as acoustical,

hydrothermal, air purity, and economic; and of the relative importance of each performance requirement.