Session 002-005 — Construction, commissioning, and final acceptance

Instructor: Luis Linares
Course: High-Containment Laboratory Design

Purpose of the document:

This lecture map is designed to help participants navigate the content of Session 002-005, identifying not only the topics covered, but the logic that connects them. The session does not introduce isolated elements, but develops a continuous chain: from the materialization of risk in construction, through the loss or preservation of system coherence, to performance verification and final acceptance based on evidence. This document functions as an orientation and study tool and does not replace the lecture.

SECTION 1 — Risk becomes physical in construction

Main focus:
Establish that the construction phase marks the point at which risk defined in planning and design ceases to be a technical abstraction and becomes a real physical condition that must be executed, controlled, and verified.

Key points:
• The risk defined in previous phases does not disappear or resolve automatically.
• In construction, that risk is translated into concrete physical conditions.
• Containment ceases to exist as intent and becomes fully dependent on execution.
• Each construction decision introduces or preserves conditions that affect system performance.
• From this point on, the laboratory ceases to be a conceptual project and becomes a real system with physical behavior.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• At what point does risk stop being a definition and become a real condition?
• What happens if execution does not correspond exactly to the defined risk?

Orientation signal:
This section marks the beginning of the critical shift in the project: from design to physical system, where real containment performance begins to be defined.

SECTION 2 — Construction as the determinant of containment

Main focus:
Reposition the concept of containment from design to construction, establishing that containment does not exist in drawings or specifications, but only in what is actually built.

Key points:
• Design defines intent, but does not guarantee outcome.
• Construction determines whether containment exists in reality.
• The laboratory operates according to installed conditions, not according to design intent.
• Coherence between design and execution is the necessary condition for containment.
• A deviation during construction breaks that coherence, regardless of design quality.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• Where does containment truly exist: in drawings or in execution?
• Can a correct design produce a system that does not contain?

Orientation signal:
Establishes that responsibility for containment shifts from technical intent to physical result.

SECTION 3 — Loss of coherence as the origin of failure

Main focus:
Explain that failure in a BSL-3 laboratory is not a single event, but a progressive process in which coherence between defined risk and physical execution is lost.

Key points:
• Failure does not occur due to a single critical decision.
• It results from the accumulation of deviations throughout construction.
• Each deviation introduces a difference between what was defined and what was executed.
• That difference affects system performance cumulatively.
• The system may appear complete, but have lost the coherence required to contain.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• At what point does system failure actually begin?
• Is the loss of coherence visible during construction?

Orientation signal:
Introduces the cumulative logic of failure and eliminates the idea of a single error.

SECTION 4 — Variability in construction and its impact on performance

Main focus:
Analyze how small variations during construction generate deviations that affect overall system performance.

Key points:
• Variations in materials, tolerances, and sequence introduce deviations.
• These deviations are not isolated; they integrate into the system.
• System behavior depends on the interaction of its parts.
• A local variation can affect global containment.
• Performance is not the sum of elements, but the result of their interaction.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• What real impact does a small variation have in a containment system?
• Can a seemingly minor deviation affect total performance?

Orientation signal:
Connects detailed execution with full system behavior.

SECTION 5 — Construction as the last point of control

Main focus:
Establish that construction represents the last effective opportunity to correct deviations before they become permanently integrated into laboratory operation.

Key points:
• Deviations can be identified and corrected during construction.
• Once built, the system enters operation with those conditions.
• Later corrections involve greater technical complexity.
• They also involve higher cost and operational impact.
• Uncorrected decisions are transferred directly into the laboratory life cycle.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• When does it stop being viable to correct a deviation?
• What happens if a deviation is accepted during construction?

Orientation signal:
Defines construction as the last real point of technical control.

SECTION 6 — Cost and schedule pressure as drivers of deviation

Main focus:
Analyze how real execution conditions influence technical decisions that may introduce deviations.

Key points:
• Construction occurs under cost and time pressure.
• These pressures affect decisions on site.

• Decisions may diverge from the defined risk.
• Deviations are introduced and justified by operational conditions.
• Technical coherence can be lost under these conditions.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• What decisions change when a project enters pressure?
• How are deviations justified on site?

Orientation signal:
Introduces external factors that directly affect system performance.

SECTION 7 — Fragmentation in construction and loss of coherence

Main focus:
Explain how fragmented execution among multiple actors contributes to loss of system coherence.

Key points:
• Construction involves multiple disciplines and actors.
• Each executes a part of the system.
• Without integration, inconsistencies emerge.
• These inconsistencies translate into cumulative deviations.
• Containment depends on coordination among all actors.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• What happens when each discipline executes without integration?
• Where is system coherence lost?

Orientation signal:
Reinforces that containment is the result of integration, not isolated execution.

SECTION 8 — Commissioning as performance verification

Main focus:
Define commissioning as the process that verifies the real performance of the containment system.

Key points:
• It is not a final project activity.
• It is a process of verifying the complete system.
• It evaluates performance under real operating conditions.
• It includes evaluation under failure scenarios.
• It allows demonstration of whether the system contains or not.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• What does it really mean to verify a laboratory?
• Is it enough to prove that the system works?

Orientation signal:
Introduces verification as a requirement to validate containment.

SECTION 9 — Real conditions and failure scenarios

Main focus:
Establish the criteria under which system performance must be evaluated.

Key points:
• Static conditions do not represent real behavior.
• The system must be evaluated under real conditions.
• It must also be evaluated under failure scenarios.
• Containment must be maintained in both conditions.
• Performance must be demonstrated through evidence.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• What happens when the system stops operating under ideal conditions?
• Is containment maintained under failure scenarios?

Orientation signal:
Defines the technical criteria for verification.

SECTION 10 — As-built as the basis for verification

Main focus:
Establish that system verification depends on the real representation of what has been built.

Key points:
• As-built drawings represent the constructed system.
• They allow verification of real performance.
• They are the basis for operation and maintenance.
• The accuracy of the as-built affects the validity of commissioning.
• Without reliable as-built documentation, verification loses validity.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• What is being verified if the as-built does not represent the real system?
• Can a system be validated without reliable documentation?

Orientation signal:
Connects documentation with technical verification.

SECTION 11 — Contract as a structure for technical decision-making

Main focus:
Explain that the contract defines how technical decisions are made during construction.

Key points:
• The contract establishes performance criteria.
• It defines who has technical authority.
• Without measurable criteria, decisions become interpretative.
• Technical decisions are transferred to the construction site.
• Containment may depend on interpretations during execution.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• Who decides on site when the contract is not clear?
• What happens when there are no measurable criteria?

Orientation signal:
Introduces the contract as a structural mechanism for technical control.

SECTION 12 — Final acceptance based on performance

Main focus:
Define laboratory acceptance as the result of technical evidence of system performance.

Key points:
• Acceptance does not depend on completion of construction.
• It does not depend on commissioning alone.
• It depends on evidence of system performance.
• This evidence must include real conditions and failure scenarios.
• Acceptance establishes that the laboratory meets containment criteria.

Rhetorical questions / Attention signals:
• When can a laboratory be considered compliant?
• What evidence is required to accept containment?

Orientation signal:
Closes the session by establishing acceptance as performance-based technical verification.

How to use this lecture map

When reviewing the session:
• Identify the point at which risk becomes physical.
• Recognize the relationship between design and execution.
• Identify deviations and their accumulation.
• Understand commissioning as performance verification.
• Evaluate acceptance as technical evidence, not as completion.