

Message

From: Roper, Jonathan [/O=CELOTEX LTD/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JROPER]
Sent: 01/11/2013 09:57:49
To: Evans, Paul [pevans@celotex.co.uk]
Subject: RE: RE:

Well... I think we have two possible solutions for testing in which both David @ IFC and I have confidence in. Will explain more on Monday but essentially since the beginning of the project, we have been looking at testing worst case scenario with an improved fire barrier to be then supported by an assessment report which broadens the scope of potential systems that we are applicable for.

After much research, I don't think this is possible and I don't believe K'span have a similar report. We cannot seem to find or design a suitable barrier in which we have enough confidence that it can be used behind a standard ACM panel which we know will melt and allow fire into the cavity. Speaking to SIMCO on Wednesday in B'ham with IL, he confirmed that architects will specify K15 with a standard fire barrier and panel. When the work is contracted and then sub-contracted to cladding contractors such as Simco, H A Marks, Stanmore etc, they value engineer that system to be competitive at tender. This means changing fire barriers, changing panels. The architect's only guarantee is that K15 will be used because there is no other alternative available.

An architect will be told that K15 is applicable for above 18m in accordance with ADB and that suffices from their perspective. Kingspan have done a great job at the spec end and according to Simco are specified much more than Rockwool Duo Slab for thermal performance. As discussed above, contractors opt for more cost effective solutions and although they are liable for what goes into that building, they do not know enough about the fire test to challenge. The only figure who might possibly challenge a product's eligibility for use in buildings above 18m is the building control officer. Kingspan I would suggest do not have a piece of paper that states they can specifically be used behind any cladding panel. What they have done is got BBA certification stating the fire test method and taken that to LABC to get a registered document detail which states that K15 can be used in a variety of cladding systems and complies with ADB through passing BR 135. A building control officer is unlikely to challenge a document that is approved from the head of building control.

What does all of this mean for us ? System approval limits us hugely as the market is so fragmented and its extremely difficult to grasp who is being most commonly used. The likes of Marley, Alucobond & Trespa are spec'd a lot but value engineered out for standard aluminium panels. Trying to do the right thing requires a complete re-education of the mkt and this would require a huge campaign and probably a lawsuit. Two options proposed below :

1. Test a standard A2 limited combustibile panel of which there are a few (Alucobond A2, Marley Eternit) with a standard fire barrier system. If challenged on what system to use, we can happily state that our test used an A2 panel with a particular commonly used fire barrier. Still not 100% confident in passing as A2 is a euroclass classification derived from test data on reaction to fire testing.
2. Opt for the K'span route and put a cement particle board as the cladding. Use a standard fire barrier. Good chance of passing knowing they have and cp board is good in terms of resistance to fire.

However, what we do need to consider is if we have two potential systems that could pass, how do these dictate route to market. What does an ASM/CTC state to somebody who enquires ? If we simply have the test report, we don't want to have to provide this as evidence. Do we in fact need to spend £25k/£30k for a BBA to be able to gain this document from LABC which in my mind gives us very little chance of being challenged from building control. Do we partner with a few fire barrier manufacturers who have tested with K15 currently to gain confidence in the mkt that way ? Or do we take the view that our product realistically shouldn't be used behind most cladding panels because in the event of a fire it would burn ?

What K'span have done extremely well is say very little but build confidence if challenged by having fire barrier manufacturers showing tests with K15, achieve BBA validation and subsequently gain LABC approval. There is always the chance they do have the piece of paper in the top drawer from somebody that states for use with any system but I doubt it. !

Jon

Jonathan Roper
Product Manager
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Extension: [REDACTED]
Email: jroper@celotex.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

-----Original Message-----

From: Evans, Paul
Sent: 31 October 2013 19:01
To: Roper, Jonathan
Subject: Re: RE:

Thanks. Decent margin based on the 1-9 sheets then and this is a promotional offer so would be higher.

Seen the invite for Monday so good to get that discussion going and agree way forward. Is it good news?!!

Sorry, forgot to ask on the phone Monday if you had a good few days off. Hope you did? Catch up next week when I'm back.

Thanks
Paul

Sent from my iPad

> On 31 Oct 2013, at 16:03, "Roper, Jonathan" <jproper@celotex.co.uk> wrote:
>
> 27% at £32.50
> 19.5% at £29.50
>
> Standard TP margin would usually be 25%.
>
> P.s need a catch up on above 18m when back. Will send an invite to you, RW, CC & JH for an update on project. In a position where decisions need to be made.
>
> Catch up Monday.
>
> Enjoy rest of your week off
>
> Jon
>
>
> Jonathan Roper
> Product Manager
> Mobile: [REDACTED]
> Extension: [REDACTED]
> Email: jproper@celotex.co.uk
>
> Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail
>
>

Paul Evans
Head of Marketing
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Extension: [REDACTED]
Email: pevans@celotex.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

-----Original Message-----

> From: Evans, Paul
> Sent: 30 October 2013 21:44
> To: Roper, Jonathan
> Subject: FW:
>
> Based on this, what intel do we have on typical margins a TP branch would make on a sheet of 100mm at both price points.
>
> Thanks
> Paul
>
>
> Paul Evans
> Head of Marketing
> Mobile: [REDACTED]
> Extension: [REDACTED]
> Email: pevans@celotex.co.uk
>
> Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bleackley, Ritchie

> Sent: 29 October 2013 21:31
> To: MARKET INTEL
> Subject: FW:
>
> Hi All,
>
> Please find attached Travis Perkins Trade Offers for November and December.
>
> The promotion is on Celotex and Xtartherm 100mm board.
> 1-9 sheets £32.50+vat
> 10+ sheets £29.50+vat
>
>
> Kind Regards
>
> Ritchie
>
>
>
>
>
> Ritchie Bleackley
> Area Sales Manager
> Mobile: [REDACTED]
> Extension: [REDACTED]
> Email: rbleackley@celotex.co.uk
>
> Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail
>
>
>