

## **HARK! A CALL FOR A CHANGE OF DIRECTION?**

by Ralph Liebing, RA, CSI  
Cincinnati, OH

Did someone dare commit heresy and "mention" a change of direction? A change to how we look at things, and how we view and evaluate them?

A call to do things "differently?" Whooooooaaaaa!!!!

Look, no body is looking for or calling for revolution but it may well be that in the minds of more than just a few there is need for adjusting focus and making a correction(?) that we are now traveling. Perhaps it is a mere recognition that things addressed, regulated, and stridently supported and defended really need a second look--not major surgery, but more of an "attitudinal change".

In reading various web sites patronized, utilized and contributed to by spec writers, the last few weeks have garnered, among many others, the following snippets—

- "waste of time"
- "should not be an end in themselves"
- "complete waste of time"
- "distinguishing good and bad spec writers"
- "it's not about margins and indents"
- "competency"
- "proper for the project not the format"
- "should be about content, not margins"

You know, bottom line in the real world, is the fact that great numbers of specifications would fall a good deal short of CSI "ideal". There is reason, rather reasons! for that. The various programs, guide lines, documents, etc. of CSI while extremely well-founded and conceived are 1) not perfect as CSI is, after all, a group of humans), and 2) are voluntary as in having no true, functional oversight imposed--there is no mandate, no demand, no secret handshake that permits use. To date, there has been no verified sighting of "Specs Police". In addition, it is not possible to cover every conceivable circumstance, nuance, and quirk in projects.

Perhaps we need to ratchet down, a little bit, the pride we have in the documents and programs (created through the blood, sweat, and tears of some very fine and astute folks) and project them as "very fine documents and highly recommended for use" in lieu of the thinly veiled innuendo that they are either mandatory or non-use is unthinkable. We may need to show value in use, in lieu of the doom of non-use. May be that is just called "flexibility".

To utilize the "flavor" of a CSI document finalized with certain advisable and pertinent modifications, is no sin or crime. It is well within reason to use a basic resource and adjust it to the specifics of the project requirements and needs. What is needed, most, is a two-sided effort to address the astute and understanding mind to makes these adjustments correctly and properly to the benefit of the client and project--and to, on the other hand, "allow" pride-in-document to be more understanding.

Additionally, some new "rays" of perspective may be needed. How do we do this may need to be "how can we do this better?", or "is this still valid what with the changed world?" To stand firm, in place won't work, but radical, wide-ranging disruptions are not the answer either. There appears to be need for measured change in the perspectives, the approaches, the concepts and the efforts--uh, "thinking outside prescribed Project Manual" to paraphrase!