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**Attention to:** ﻣﺆﺳﺴﺔ احمد غطاس ﻟﻠﻤﻘﺎﻭﻻﺕ

**IDI PR #:** **100004**

**Established by: Gamal Saad**

**TIS Visit**

**Inspection Report - Soil Improvement**

**Date of visit: 20-Jan-2025**

**Location: 24.6722188,46.7283191**

**( Inspection Department, Saudi Arabia)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Owner** | مصطفى سامي | **TIS Company** | CPV Arabia |
| **Contractor** | ﻣﺆﺳﺴﺔ احمد غطاس ﻟﻠﻤﻘﺎﻭﻻﺕ | **Report Issue Date** |  |
| **Project Location** | 24.718106169467518,46.8131461331344 | **Inspection #** | 9 |
| **Inspection Stage** | Soil Improvement | **No. Of buildings** | 1 |
| **Inspector Name** | Gamal Saad | **Work in progress** | Soil Improvement( ) |
| **Email** | GSAAD@CPVARABIA.COM | **Telephone** | 0591007296 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Inspection Results: Satisfactory with Technical Reservation** |
| **Description of the inspections carried out:**  CPV ARABIA has conducted an on-site technical inspection (IDI) for Project PR #100004 during the pre-pouring phase of the Soil Improvement.  The details of the inspection are described further as we go through this report. |

**Summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **Risks Assessment:** - High Risk, Major stability issue that can affect the building’s stability   Soil Report, Construction Plans and Saudi Building Code have to be followed  **Stages missed without TIS involvement:** - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image   - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image   - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image   - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image   - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image   - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image   - The project has a missing stage as shown in the attached image  **Interpretation of Additional Visit:** - Not exist |

|  |
| --- |
| General Site Pictures and Construction Plans |
|  |
|  |
| General site picture and construction plans |

|  |
| --- |
| Checklist |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Checklist** | **SBC Reference** | **Result** | **Remarks** |
| **1** | **Inspection criteria** | | | |
| 1.1 | Is the site ready for inspection with safe inspection conditions and safe access for the TIS inspection? | - | Passed |  |
| 1.2 | Were there any modifications in the project that is different from the RD0, Soil Report and Construction Plans...etc.)? | - | Passed |  |
| 1.3 | Is there any missing inspection stages in the project? | - | Passed |  |
| 1.4 | Are there any defects observed that can affect the building’s stability or RD5 inspection for slab stage hasn’t been closed yet? |  | Passed |  |
| 1.5 | Is the laboratory conducting tests certified by an ISO/17025-accredited body? | - | NA |  |
| **2** | **Checklist** | | | |
| 2.1 | Are there any visible signs of inadequate compaction, such as surface irregularities or material segregation? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.2 | Are the area cleared of debris, vegetation, and loose soil? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.3 | Does the soil classification report been provided and Soil type match the approved specifications? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.4 | Are The compaction layer is uniform, and thickness matches with SBC specifications.? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.5 | Do the Compaction equipment and methodology comply with the approved method statement? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.6 | Does the moisture content of the soil match the optimum moisture content (OMC) as per the provided proctor test/modified proctor test results? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.7 | are the Field dry density measured using approved methods (e.g., sand cone, nuclear gauge) as per test specifications? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.8 | Are the compaction test results (Field compaction percentage) satisfactory and comply with SBC? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.9 | Is the test area level, debris-free, and prepared according to the approved method statement? | - | Not Passed |  |
| 2.10 | Are the load is applied incrementally as per approved standards (e.g., ASTM D1196)? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.11 | Are The load-settlement relationship matches design requirements for bearing capacity and settlement limits? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.12 | Is a detailed test report, including load-settlement curves and results provided? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.13 | Are the compaction test results for the previous layers provided and verified on site? | - | Passed |  |
| 2.14 | Does the test plate meet the specified dimensions and thickness? | - | Passed |  |

Risk Assessment

|  |
| --- |
| **The plate diameter and thickness as per test specifications**   **Passed** |
| **The compaction test results for the previous layers have been provided and verified on site .**   **Passed** |
| **Test report is not detailed, including load-settlement curves and results**   **Passed** |
| **The load-settlement relationship matches design requirements for bearing capacity and settlement limits**   **Passed** |
| **The load is applied incrementally as per approved standards (e.g., ASTM D1196).**   **Passed** |
| **The test area is not level, not free from debris, and not prepared according to the approved method statement**   **Not Passed** |
| **The compaction test results (Field compaction percentage) are satisfactory and comply with SBC**   **Passed** |
| **The field dry density measured using approved methods (e.g., sand cone, nuclear gauge) complies with the test specifications**   **Passed** |
| **The moisture content of the soil is within the optimum moisture content (OMC) based on the provided proctor test results.**   **Passed** |
| **The compaction equipment and methodology comply with the approved method statement.**   **Passed** |
| **the area cleared of debris, vegetation, and loose soil**   **Passed** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Engineer In Charge of Inspection** | **Area Manager** | **Technical Inspection Manager** |
| **Name:** Gamal Saad | **Name:** | **Name:** |
| **Signature:** | **Signature:** | **Signature:** |
| Date of Issuing the report: | | |