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Welcome to the Back to Basics booklet on construction and engineering professional indemnity issues.

The aim of the booklet is to assist those who are relatively new to construction and engineering professional indemnity, or for those who would benefit from a quick reminder of some key points.

I hope you will find the material useful. Of course, please do not hesitate to contact me, or the rest of the team, should you have any questions.

“...One of the best firms out there’... ‘a real pleasure to work with’ according to clients, who praise its ‘first-rate services’ and its ‘perfect combination of intelligence, tactical prowess and personality’.”

Legal 500 2018

“...Incredible. In terms of reporting, they’re well aware of what the market requires. They’re commercial, straightforward and can see the bigger picture. They know what direction to steer the claimant in.”

Chambers and Partners UK Guide 2018
Part A
Understanding construction contracts and claims
Construction contracts

Parties
The construction and engineering sector is wide. It covers the construction of everything from schools to offshore oil platforms. The principles of construction and engineering contracts are very similar, whatever you are building, but the terminology used can be very different. We have focussed on the design and construction of buildings in order to keep things simple.

Main Parties
The main participants in a construction project are:

- **Employer / Developer / Client**: the person who wants a project built
- **Funder**: financing the project
- **Main Contractor**: overall responsibility for building and can have design responsibility if it is a Design & Build contract
- **Sub-Contractors**: employed by the Main Contractor to carry out specific parts of the works
- **Professional Consultants**: such as Architects, Engineers, Surveyors, Specialist Consultants etc. employed by either the Employer or the Main Contractor depending on the procurement method, and
- **Validation / Checking Engineer**: employed directly by either the Employer or the Main Contractor to check and report on the Sub-Contractor’s work.

Contracts

Procurement Methods
How these parties fit together contractually depends on the procurement method used, for example:

- Traditional
- CDP (Contractor’s Designed (or Design) Portion)
- Design & Build
- Management contracting
- Construction management
- EPC (Engineer, Procure and Construct)
- DBO (Design, Build and Operate)
- Multi-contracting, and
- Bespoke.
Standard Form Contracts

Contracts in the construction sector are usually based upon standard form contracts (although sometimes they are bespoke contracts drafted from scratch by lawyers). Standard form contracts are published and maintained by a range of construction and engineering industry bodies. Many of the standard form contracts are published as a suite of contracts covering the different procurement methods and contractual links in a construction project. The choice of standard form is normally based upon the sector. For buildings, the most common set of contracts are the JCT contracts.

Examples of some commonly used standard form contracts are:

Construction
- JCT, NEC and GC/Works.

Engineering
- FIDIC, ICC and IChemE.

Professional Consultants
- RIBA, RICS, NEC and ACE.

Collateral Warranties

Parties often also use collateral warranties. These create a contractual link between participants in a project that are not directly connected by the main construction contracts on project. (See the grey arrows on the diagrams on page 5).

The Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999 can be used to achieve the same result without the need for executing additional contracts.

Collateral warranties (or third party rights) are often relied upon when one party in the construction project becomes insolvent or by parties who are not part of the construction project (e.g. a tenant or subsequent purchaser).

If there is no contractual link between a party that has suffered a loss and the person that it wants to make a claim against then the party with the claim has to rely on rights in tort (negligence) or statutory rights.

Collateral warranties (or third party rights) normally create obligations up the contractual chain only and not down it. For example, a Sub-Contractor would agree with the Employer that it will carry out the works with reasonable skill and care but the Employer would not agree to pay the Sub-Contractor’s invoices should the Main Contractor fail to do so.
Completion of construction works

Key concepts

We have set out the terminology used in construction contracts in relation to buildings. Process plants have more complicated structures because of the need to commission and test the plant.

Practical Completion

- There is no precise legal definition but it is sometimes defined in the contract by the parties.
- Generally seen as when the works are complete apart from minor works which do not affect the safe use of the building (“snagging” items), or latent defects (which are discovered later).
- Often referred to as ‘PC’.

Practical Completion Statement

- Often has far reaching consequences, for example in relation to liquidated damages, Contractor’s liability for patent defects, retention, risk for the works and possession of the building.
- Also referred to as a Practical Completion or PC Certificate.

Rectification Period

- Period following Practical Completion (normally 6 or 12 months; often 24 months in engineering contracts).
- Contractor normally must return to site to remedy any defects which appear during this period and / or has the right to return to site to remedy defects which appear.
- Sometimes called the Defects Notification Period, Defects Correction Period or Defects Liability Period.
- Note that the Contractor’s liability for defects may not stop at the end of this period. It depends what the contract says.

Notice of Completion of Making Good

- Issued once defects have been rectified at the end of the Rectification Period.
- Confirms that any defects which the Employer required the Contractor to rectify have been rectified.

Patent Defects

- Defects which can be detected at Practical Completion.
- Works should be free from patent defects at Practical Completion.

Latent Defects

- Defects which cannot be detected at Practical Completion, even upon reasonable inspection.

But … there are always exceptions to the rules! Parties may agree otherwise in their contract or approach matters differently in practice.
Types of claims

- Death or personal injury
- Breach of warranty
- Physical damage to the works
- Loss and expense
- Business interruption
- Variations
- Extensions of time
- Acceleration
- Defects (design/workmanship)
- Performance bond
- Final account
- Liquidated damages
- Breach of planning or other regulatory requirement
- Delay, disruption and compensation events
- Fitness for purpose
- Employer’s liability
- Damage to third party property
- Business interruption
- Extensions of time
- Acceleration
- Defects (design/workmanship)
- Performance bond
- Final account
- Liquidated damages
- Breach of planning or other regulatory requirement
- Delay, disruption and compensation events
- Fitness for purpose
- Employer’s liability
- Damage to third party property
### Who might have a claim against whom?

The table below sets out some examples of the types of claims which might be experienced in a traditional building contract, with a Contractor’s Designed Portion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Main Contractor</th>
<th>Sub-Contractor</th>
<th>Professional Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Contractor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Contractor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Consultant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employer

Employer might claim against Main Contractor for:
- Defective design
- Workmanship defects
- Delay (general or liquidated damages), and / or
- Termination.

Main Contractor might claim against Employer for:
- Unpaid sums
- Variations
- Loss & Expense
- Delays, Extensions of Time and Compensation Events
- Acceleration, and / or
- Termination.

Sub-Contractor might claim against Employer for:
- Unpaid sums
- Variations
- Loss & Expense, and / or
- Delays...
  
  ...where the Main Contractor is insolvent.

Professional Consultant might claim against Employer for:
- Unpaid fees, and / or
- Termination.

#### Main Contractor

Employer might claim against Main Contractor for:
- Defective design
- Workmanship defects
- Delay (general or liquidated damages), and / or
- Termination.

Main Contractor might claim against Sub-Contractor for:
- Any sums claimed against it by Employer, and / or
- Termination.

Sub-Contractor might claim against Main Contractor for:
- Unpaid sums
- Variations
- Loss & Expense
- Delays, Extensions of Time and Compensation Events
- Acceleration, and / or
- Termination.

Professional Consultant might claim against Main Contractor for:
- Contribution for defective design.

#### Sub-Contractor

Employer might claim against Sub-Contractor for:
- Defective design
- Workmanship defects, and / or
- Delay (general or liquidated damages).

Main Contractor might claim against Sub-Contractor for:
- Defective design, and / or
- Failure to certify.

Sub-Contractor might claim against Professional Consultant for:
- Contribution for defective design.

Professional Consultant might claim against Sub-Contractor for:
- Contribution for defective design.

#### Professional Consultant

Employer might claim against Professional Consultant for:
- Defective design
- Indemnities for breaches eg in relation to Final Account
- Inadequate supervision
- Incorrect payment documents
- Incorrect certification
- Failure to warn, and / or
- Termination.

Main Contractor might claim against Professional Consultant for:
- Defective design, and / or
- Failure to certify.

Sub-Contractor might claim against Professional Consultant for:
- Contribution for defective design.
Part B
Key legal principles behind professional indemnity claims in construction projects
What is contract law and common law?

Common law
Common law is the body of law made by the Courts through their judgments over the last 800 years, as opposed to statute law which is made by the Crown via Parliament. For our purposes we are using the term to mean rights that the parties to a construction project are given by the law, as opposed to the rights that they agree to give each other by contract.

Contract law
Contract law is simply the law in relation to the agreements. Most contract law is common law, but there is some statute law e.g. the Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999.

Key concepts

Tort
The law of tort is the remedies provided by the Courts if one person has injured another.

Negligence
- Occurs when a defendant breaches a duty to take reasonable care, which causes loss to the claimant.
- Negligence is a tort.
- It is also possible to be liable for breach of contract as a result of breaching a contractual duty of care, often referred to as contractual negligence.

Measure of Damages
- Breach of contract - measure of damages is to put the injured party in the position it would have been in had the contract been performed.
- Negligence - measure of damages is to put the injured party in the position it would have been in had the tort not been committed.

Pure Economic Loss
- This is where the claimant’s only loss is economic, which is not consequential on damage to the claimant’s own property (see for example the “Spartan Steel” case).
- For example, loss of profit, wasted expenditure or diminution in value.
- Recovery of pure economic loss under a claim for negligence is generally not possible, although there are exceptions to this rule.

Causation
- In order to recover any losses, a claimant must establish that the defendant’s action or inaction caused its loss. This has two steps; factual and legal causation.
- Factual causation: The defendant’s action (or inaction) must have, as a matter of fact, caused the claimant’s loss. This is established by the “but-for” test. So, but-for the defendant’s action or inaction, the claimant’s loss would not have occurred.
- Legal causation: This is often referred to as “remoteness”. The tests in contract and tort are set out on page 13.

Direct and Indirect Losses
- Distinction as to what damages are recoverable for breach of a contract.
- These terms are used in exclusion clauses to limit the parties’ liability to each other for certain losses.
- Direct losses are often referred to as the first limb in Hadley v Baxendale. They are losses which occur in the ordinary course of things. The parties are deemed to have knowledge of such losses, regardless of whether or not they actually knew.
- Indirect (or consequential) losses are often referred to as the second limb in Hadley v Baxendale. These are losses which occur outside the ordinary course of things and are due to special circumstances which were known by the parties.
- Loss of profit could be either direct or indirect.
**Limitation**

- Once the limitation period for a claim has expired, the defendant can raise limitation as a defence to the claim. If successful, the court will not consider the substance of the claim.
- The basic principles are set out in the Limitation Act 1980 (1980 Act), which provides that limitation periods start to run from when the “cause of action accrues”. When the “cause of action accrues” is set out in case law.
- The cause of action in tort, and under a contract, may occur at different times even though the wrong or breach is the same. This is important because there may be a longer limitation period in tort than in contract.
- Limitation periods can be suspended by a standstill agreement. These require the consent of the claimant and defendant.

**Concurrent Liability**

Parties can have concurrent liability, which is where they owe each other obligations under both a contract and at common law. However:

- This can be excluded through contractual terms;
- A concurrent duty does not arise simply because a contract exists;
- A concurrent duty is more likely to arise in professional appointments than a building contract, due to an “assumption of responsibility”; and
- The scope of the contractual duty of care depends on the wording in the contract. See Robinson v PE Jones (Contractors) Limited [2011] EWCA Civ 9 for discussion on concurrent liability.
## Key differences between contract and common law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Common Law/Tort (Negligence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obligations</strong></td>
<td>Obligations between the parties are set out in the contract.</td>
<td>Obligations between the parties are set out at common law. These obligations are built up through case law, which the courts continue to review and update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If either party breaches the terms of the contract (including terms implied by common law or statute), the other party will have a claim for breach of contract.</td>
<td>There is no requirement for a contract between the parties but a duty of care must be established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a construction project, the most relevant claim at common law would be in the tort of negligence.</td>
<td>In a construction project, the most relevant claim at common law would be in the tort of negligence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Cause of action accrues on the date the contract is breached.</th>
<th>Cause of action accrues on the date damage is suffered (which can be significantly later than for a contractual claim).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 years for a contract signed under hand. 12 years for a deed (1980 Act s5 and s8).</td>
<td>Normally 6 years (1980 Act s2). For latent damage, it is the later of 6 years from when the cause of action accrued and 3 years from when the claimant knew, or ought to have known, the material facts about the loss suffered, the identity of the defendant and the cause of action. This is subject to a long stop date of 15 years from when the negligent act / omission occurred (1980 Act sections 14A and 14B).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties can agree to shorten or lengthen this period in their contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pure Economic Loss</th>
<th>Recoverable, unless specifically excluded under the contract.</th>
<th>Only recoverable if there is a “special relationship” between the parties, which depends on the facts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only recoverable if there is a “special relationship” between the parties, which depends on the facts.</td>
<td>Current case law suggests a building contract will not normally imply such a “special relationship”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Losses must be within the contemplation of the parties at the time of formation of the contract.</td>
<td>Losses must have been reasonably foreseeable by the defendant at the time the duty was breached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct losses are generally recoverable (unless excluded under the contract).</td>
<td>Often referred to as “The Wagon Mound” test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect losses are not always recoverable. It depends on the facts and in any event they are often excluded under the contract.</td>
<td>No distinction between direct and indirect losses (although see comments on Pure Economic Loss).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remoteness</th>
<th>To put the claimant in the position it would have been in had the contract been performed.</th>
<th>To put the claimant in the position it would have been in had the tort not been committed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful for claimants in “good bargain” cases.</td>
<td>Useful for claimants in “bad bargain” cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantification of Loss</th>
<th>To put the claimant in the position it would have been in had the contract been performed.</th>
<th>To put the claimant in the position it would have been in had the tort not been committed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useful for claimants in “good bargain” cases.</td>
<td>Useful for claimants in “bad bargain” cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*www.womblebond.com*
Contractual “standard of care”
...and what it actually means

Reasonable Skill and Care
- The professional agrees to carry out its work using reasonable skill and care.
- Whether or not this has been complied with is an objective test: the “man on the Clapham omnibus”.
- For professional liability cases, the “Bolam” test is relevant. This judges professionals on the standard of a reasonably competent practitioner having regard to the standards normally adopted in his profession at the time of the act or omissions.
- For example, if a professional complies with standard practice or guidelines at the time of acting, he most likely will not be in breach, even if that guidance later turns out to be incorrect.
- Normally covered by insurance policies, but be careful of inadvertently agreeing to a higher standard without insurers’ approval. Eg where a project concerns a high rise building, an Employer will often require a standard of a professional experienced in tall buildings.

Fit for Purpose
- A professional agrees that their work will be fit for the purpose required. For example, an architect agrees the drawings he produces will be suitable for a specific use.
- If the drawings are not suitable, then the architect will be liable – regardless of whether he was negligent, the reason for the unsuitability or whether it was someone else’s fault.
- Often not covered by insurance policies.

Strict Liability
- Similar to fitness for purpose.
- A professional (e.g. architect) agrees that the work they produce (e.g. drawings) will be entirely accurate.
- If the drawings are not accurate, then the architect will be liable – regardless of whether or not he was negligent, the reason for the error, the impact of someone else, or any damage actually caused to the claimant.
Parties often need to transfer rights and obligations in construction projects. For example, in a design and build scenario, the Developer often appoints the professional team to develop the initial design. A Main Contractor is then appointed and the Developer transfers the professional team’s appointments to the Main Contractor.

This can be achieved in two main ways; assignment or novation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Novation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers the <strong>benefit</strong> of a contract (eg to have works carried out), but not the burden (eg to pay for the works).</td>
<td>Transfers both the <strong>benefit and burden</strong> of the contract (eg to have works carried out and pay for those works).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires the consent of <strong>just the parties</strong> to the assignment (eg the Developer and the Contractor, but not the professional). However, this can be amended through the terms of the contract, for example by limiting the number of assignments or the identity of the assignee.</td>
<td><strong>Extinguishes one contract and replaces it with a new contract on the same terms but between different parties.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can be a legal or equitable assignment.</strong></td>
<td>Parties often agree to apportion services pre and post novation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice is a legal assignment. In order to be effective, it must be:</td>
<td>Best practice is to use a formal Novation Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In writing: a verbal agreement is not sufficient;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Absolute: it must be the unconditional assignment of the whole of a right under the contract; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On notice: the third party (eg. the professional) must be given notice in writing of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An equitable assignment is less formal, but also less certain:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be verbal or written;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does not require notice; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transfers the equitable ownership, but not the legal ownership. The assignor (ie the Developer) may therefore need to be involved in any subsequent court proceedings against the professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What you need to establish to bring a claim

Establish the relationship

Tort:
• Duty of Care: “Caparo” test.

Contract:
• Agreement, consideration and intention.
• Can be verbal.
• Includes express and implied terms.

Breach

Tort:
• “Reasonable man” test or “Bolam” test for professional liability.

Contract:
• Depends on the specific terms of the contract.

Causation

Same basic principles in tort and contract, but see comments elsewhere on specific tests.

Factual Causation:
• “But-for” test.

Legal Causation:
• Intervening acts.
• Remoteness.
• Scope of the defendant’s duty of care in respect of the kind of loss suffered: SAAMCo principle (tort or contractual duty of care only).

Loss

Mitigation:
• A claimant must take reasonable steps to minimise its loss and not take unreasonable steps which increase its loss. Burden of proof is on defendant to prove a failure to mitigate.

Contributory Negligence
• Damages will be reduced where the claimant was partly at fault (tort or contractual duty of care only).

Loss
• Not essential for breach of contract claim. If there is no loss, an award can be made for nominal damages (normally £1). Of course if there is loss, then that must be proven...

Records are key!

Remember – the claimant must prove its case on the balance of probabilities. The facts must support the claim!
## Summary of main dispute resolution forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispute Resolution Forum</th>
<th>Basis for forum</th>
<th>Binding?</th>
<th>Confidential?</th>
<th>Usual timescales</th>
<th>Qualifications of decision maker</th>
<th>Normal cost position</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjudication</td>
<td>Contract or Statute (Housing Grants Construction and Regeneration Act 1996).</td>
<td>Yes (usually on interim basis, until finally determined by litigation or arbitration).</td>
<td>Yes – unless application made to court.</td>
<td>28 days (although it is often extended).</td>
<td>Anyone: lawyer, engineer, quantity surveyor, architect... (parties often agree in their contract either on the individual or Adjudicator Nominating Body).</td>
<td>Normally each party bears their own (parties can agree otherwise but ineffective if agreed prior to service of adjudication notice). Adjudicator typically has jurisdiction to order either party to pay his costs (although they both remain jointly and severally liable).</td>
<td>The use of &quot;smash and grab&quot; adjudications has spiked and is expected to decline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Agreement between the parties.</td>
<td>No (unless binding settlement agreement signed).</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Quick – a day or so, with a couple of weeks' preparation.</td>
<td>No decision maker. Mediator is normally accredited.</td>
<td>Each party bears their own. Share mediator's fees and expenses.</td>
<td>Requires a desire from both parties to settle the claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>Default if parties do not agree to something else.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Normally 1 - 2 years. Specialist procedures can sometimes be used, which can be shorter, eg Part 8 procedure can be as quick as 1 month.</td>
<td>Judge.</td>
<td>Loser pays. To be recoverable, costs must be proportionately incurred. Rare to recover 100% of costs. Note Part 36 offers.</td>
<td>Pre-Action Protocol for Construction and Engineering Disputes should be followed prior to commencing claim, unless there is a limitation deadline. Significant recent developments in relation to cost management and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution Forum</td>
<td>Basis for forum</td>
<td>Binding?</td>
<td>Confidential?</td>
<td>Usual timescales</td>
<td>Qualifications of decision maker</td>
<td>Normal cost position</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>Contract or ad-hoc agreement.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Normally over 1 year, but generally shorter than litigation.</td>
<td>Varies.  Can be a sole arbitrator or a tribunal. Arbitrators can be legally qualified, or may be in the industry eg a quantity surveyor.</td>
<td>Loser pays. Parties can agree otherwise, however any agreement ineffective if made before the dispute arises. Note Calderbank offers.</td>
<td>Can be quicker than litigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry or other regulatory bodies eg RIBA Disciplinary Committee</td>
<td>Professional Consultant's membership of regulatory body.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Varies.</td>
<td>Member of disciplinary tribunal of regulatory body.</td>
<td>Varies.</td>
<td>Often in conjunction with another dispute resolution forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tip:** Make sure all the contracts in the chain have the same dispute resolution forum.
But scope of the insurance policy may be different from the wording in the contract, leaving some losses uninsured.

Note, defective workmanship: Normally not covered by professional indemnity insurance. Performance bonds or guarantees may protect Employers.

Always check the policy wording! If in doubt, speak with your broker or legal adviser.
Experts can be used throughout a project and / or a claim. Some examples of the roles that experts can play are:

- **Prior to works commencing to advise on tenders and potential flash points**
- **Court / regulatory body may appoint expert to assist them**
- **Defence and promotion of claims**
- **During the works as and when disputes arise to enable the works to progress**
- **During the works to bring the project back on track**
Reduce the risk

If in doubt, take legal advice to ensure that you are not exposed to unnecessary risks. For example:

1. **Check the contractual chain**: are contracts up and down the chain back to back? If not, you may get caught out.

2. **Always make sure that the contract and insurance policy are back to back**, eg standard of care.

3. **Consider incorporating contractual wording to protect yourself where possible**, such as:
   a) **Net contribution clause**: limits a party’s liability when two or more parties to a construction project are liable for the same loss or damage. The liability of each party will be limited to the amount for which it is responsible, as would be apportioned to that party by a court. Without it, each party could be liable for 100% of the loss and would then have to recover a contribution from contributing parties. This takes time and money – and could potentially be impossible if the other party is insolvent or does not have sufficient insurance to cover the loss.
   b) **Caps on liability**, for example by reference to the Professional Consultant’s PI insurance.
   c) **Shorter limitation periods** than provided by the Limitation Act 1980.
   d) **Exclude certain types of losses**, for example, exclude consequential losses or anything excluded under the PI policy.

---

**Any Questions?**

**Contact us**

Hannah Cane  
Partner  
T: +44 (0)207 788 2376  
E: hannah.cane@wbd-uk.com

Simon Lewis  
Partner  
T: +44 (0)191 279 9552  
E: simon.lewis@wbd-uk.com

David Skelton  
Partner  
T: +44 (0)175 267 7607  
E: david.skelton@wbd-uk.com

Belinda Fox  
Managing Associate  
T: +44 (0)238 020 8155  
E: belinda.fox@wbd-uk.com

Emily Leonard  
Managing Associate  
T: +44 (0)207 788 2322  
E: emily.leonard@wbd-uk.com

Helen Pearce  
Associate  
T: +44 (0)207 788 2380  
E: helen.pearce@wbd-uk.com

Zoe Lettieri  
Associate  
T: +44 (0)117 989 6654  
E: zoe.lettieri@wbd-uk.com

Hannah Gardiner  
Solicitor  
T: +44 (0)207 788 2509  
E: hannah.gardiner@wbd-uk.com

---

“Extremely knowledgeable and totally effective at what they do.”  
Chambers and Partners UK Guide 2018

[The] team has ‘heaps of experience’ and ‘an attentive and proactive’ approach.  
Legal 500 2018