Message

From:

Chambers, Craig [/O=SGMAIL/OU=ZA-ADMINISTRATIVEGROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CHAMBERS]

Sent:

19/02/2015 03:34:24

To:

Berger, Debbie [dberger@celotex.co.uk]; Evans, Paul [pevans@celotex.co.uk]

Subject:

Re: Knauf - RS5000

Paul / Debbie

Firstly we just need to be very careful how many people circulated on e mails on this topic - otherwise a danger that things get miscommunicated / misconstrued.

As I have said before I am not comfortable progressing this with Knauf. I really feel that we need to learn more ourselves before working with any others and carry out the bench exercise with Warrington etc first.

We have to bear in mind that Knauf have an insulation business and despite an NDA things will leak and we cannot afford this to happen if test proved negative.

Regards

Craig

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Feb 2015, at 15:35, Berger, Debbie < dberger@celotex.co.uk> wrote: Hi there

I have some thoughts on the subject. I can't help but feel concerned with Knauf replicating the system we tested to BS8414:2

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->The façade we used was 12mm Marley Eternit. The orientation of the board when installed means fewer air gaps between boards meaning less ventilation to 'fuel' the growth of the fire. This was favourable to our pass. The NHBC saw straight through this.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Knauf may replicate our system but if it is installed differently. EG Has more gaps between boards allowing more ventilation it might fail.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->The lack of gaps when tested was pure luck and not something that can be engineered.

In order to gain **NHBC** confidence and to widen the field of application any re-testing in the future should take in the following considerations

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Outer cladding panel needs to perform similar to the 12mm A2 Marley Eternit panel successfully tested.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->A vertical joint should be included in the construction in the centre of the main board
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Sheathing board is less key, and can change from 12mm to 10mm or even to a Cement Particle Board. (Sheathing board is more key to BS476:21 which tests fire resistance of load bearing construction materials)

<!--[if |supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Fire Barriers must be tight to allow the intumescent to expand across to the façade panel and close the cavity preventing fire spread. The siderise barriers used in our successful test worked well.

I would suggest that Knauf come up with their own system design and not replicate ours as there is no certainty of a pass and what would that mean to us.

We could work with Knauf and share what we have learn't from our own testing experience. Taking into account what we learn from Hadley's test and Warrington Fire assessment of our 32 page test report.

But there is always going to be an element of uncertainty either way.

Kind regards

Debbie Berger

Product Manager

dberger@celotex.co.uk

Ext:

Mob:

<image001.jpg> From: Evans, Paul

Sent: 18 February 2015 10:37

To: Reid, Paul; Chambers, Craig; Berger, Debbie; Milward, Richard

Subject: Knauf - RS5000 Importance: High

I have spoken to Charles Johnston at Knauf. Charles has confirmed the following information to me...

- <!--lif !supportLists]--><!--lendif]-->Knauf are looking to replicate our test procedure but will substitute the sheathing board we used behind RS5000 with their Knauf Gypsum Wind Liner Board. I have requested a data sheet so we can compare the products.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Knauf are happy to sign an NDA with us and would then like us to forward the build-up detail of the test we constructed at BRE which led to our test pass.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Knauf need to move quickly. They are due to test 19th March and would start building the rig w/c 16th. Failure to meet the test date of the 19th means they will encounter penalty clauses of £1000 per week
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->They are keen to meet to discuss and have offered 9th, 11th, 12th or 13th but this would not leave us long.

My proposal...

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->We assess the Knauf sheathing board against the sheathing board we used in our test to provide what level of confidence we have of passing.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->We use the Hadley NDA that has been put together and amend where necessary and issue to Knauf. Upon receipt of signing we can issue the relevant sections of the report that shows our test build up.

Can we please agree that this is the route we wish to take with Knauf. I feel that only changing one aspect of the test rig provides us with greater confidence before testing of the likelihood of passing.

Debbie, Paul, Richard... please let me know which dates above suit. At the moment only the 9th works for me but I could also do the 10th. Ideally we should do sooner if we can. Happy to arrange this meeting at East Midlands to suit travel plans. Charles is based in the Midlands as well.

Please can you come back to me by the end of tomorrow on this so we can finalise.

Thanks Paul

Paul Evans

Head of Marketing

PEvans@celotex.co.uk

Ext Mob
DDI:
Tel:
Fax:

Web: celotex.co.uk
Follow: @Celotex
<image001.jpg>

Celotex Limited, registered in England, Company Number 02183896. Registered Office Saint Gobain House, Binley Business Park, Coventor, CV3 2TT

The information transmitted including any attachments is intended only for the exclusive use of the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and privileged material that may be subject to legal privilege. Any perusal, review, retransmission, dissemination, distribution, reproduction or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entitles other than the intended recipient without the sender's prior consent is unauthorised and strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your computer without making any copies. Any personal views and opinions expressed in this e-mail message are the sender's own and do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the Company.