

Chris Powell - Request for Evidence under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 (“the Rules”)

C/O LHC

2 VINE STREET

UXBRIDGE

UB8 1QE.

1. In your response to question 2.a. in the Witness Statement you refer to “C6 documentation (drafted in 2011)”, please indicate if LHC00000023 entitled “Volume 2 of Section E ‘Specification and declarations for product and services’” is the complete document to which you refer, if not please provide further details.

No – LHC00000023 is not the complete C6 tender document referenced in my response but is the ‘Specification for Product and Service’ element only. However, the research for this element did form the basis of my response in 2a. The complete tender documentation will be available from LHC.

2. Please give details, including date and title, of the document that preceded LHC00000023 entitled “Volume 2 of Section E ‘Specification and declarations for product and services’” and summarise any differences between this and its predecessor in relation to fire doorsets.

The document you refer to (that preceded LHC 00000023) is document reference LHC00000033, which was drafted in 2007 by somebody else within LHC at the time. There are C5 declarations by Manse, which relate to fire doors, in document reference LHC00000038. The main differences that I can see from looking at these documents are that the C6 requirements (drafted September 2011) are more detailed than the C5.

3. In your response to question 3.a. in the Witness Statement you state that within the “C5 tender documentation, LHC would detail the requirements necessary to offer FD30/FD30S doorsets”. Please consider LHC00000033 which sets out the specification for external door assemblies and indicate:

a. if this is the C5 tender documentation to which you refer;

Yes – document reference LHC00000033 is the C5 tender documentation to which I refer.

b. if this contains all the requirements necessary to offer FD30 and FD30S doorsets, and if not, where the additional requirements were set out.

Looking at LHC00000033, it does not appear as comprehensive in fire door specification requirements as its successor - document reference LHC00000023. Clause C18.3 makes reference to

fire resisting and smoke check door assemblies. I note the Manse declarations presented in document reference LHC00000038 offer the details of construction for FD30 doorsets in Section G5. I'm not in possession of the complete C5 tender documentation or company submissions that may have included current certification and details, therefore I am unable to provide a more fulsome response.

**4. In response to question 3.b. in the Witness Statement you indicate that manufacturers are required to 'declare' conformity with British and European Standards supported by third party testing certification. In the case of fire doorsets supplied under a framework agreement between January 2011 and December 2014, please:**

**a. confirm that the provision of up-to-date third party testing certification would have been required by LHC;**

At the time of the C5 tender exercise (2007), I am sure up-to-date third party testing certification would have been required by my predecessor at LHC for a tenderer (in this case Manse) to be able offer FD30 products within the C5 framework arrangement.

The provision of relevant up-to-date third party testing certification would have been required to be supplied to and by KCTMO for satisfaction of proof of conformity for Building Regulations Part B.

**b. give details of the testing certification required for a FD30 fire doorset, in addition to the testing certifications required for any external door;**

For FD30 fire doors, a sample product has to be taken to an independent testing fire testing facility(eg BRE, Warrington Fire, Chiltern Fire) and tested under laboratory conditions to ensure that the particular product type – inclusive of hardware – withstands the passage of fire for a minimum of 30 minutes. That product type is then certificated to be used as an FD30 doorset. More precise and detailed information can be obtained from the particular fire testing facility that carried out the Manse product testing.

Additional testing certification may include security and safety glass.

**c. give details of the testing certification required for a FD30S fire doorset, in addition to the testing certifications required for any external door;**

This response would be the same as for Q4b above, with the addition of withstanding the passage of smoke for 30 minutes.

**d. give details of how LHC would have checked that any testing certification provided was adequate and explain how such checks were documented.**



For this response, I can only make assumptions of how I guess my predecessor would have carried out the task of checking the submitted C5 tender documentation. For fire doorsets, the independent certification described in 4b would have been forwarded by each tenderer offering fire doorsets as part of their product range. The certification would have been checked to ensure it was relevant to a particular doorset pattern being offered and that it was current at the date of the C5 tender submission. I assume the certification checks would have been recorded on an evaluation spreadsheet and a report prepared giving the results of the tender for submission to the Director of LHC for endorsement (or otherwise). Hardcopies of all documentation, including testing certificates, would remain on file throughout the duration of the C5 framework.

**5. Were you the person to approve Manse Masterdor Limited's ("Manse Masterdor") application to supply doors under a framework agreement and their later application to supply Suredor GRP fire doorsets;**

No – not for the C5 Framework which serviced the KCTMO programme.

Yes – for the later C6 Framework which was tendered in 2011/2012.

I think it's worth adding here that although Manse was servicing the C5 framework, this would have no bearing on whether the company would be successful (or not) in its tender application to become one of the C6 Appointed Companies.

**if not, who would have had that responsibility or would be able to provide information about the application?**

My predecessor, as stated above. LHC would have information about the C5 application.

**6. LHC00000038 is a "Section G Declarations and form of offer" form completed and signed on behalf of Manse Masterdor on 03/09/07. On page 31 in red writing it states "Suredor GRP fire doorsets not offered at this time". As far as you are able, please explain:**

**a. the process Manse Masterdor would have followed, in order to apply at a later stage to supply the Suredor GRP fire doorset under a framework agreement, indicating what paperwork would have been generated in the process;**

The procedure would have been that Manse would apply to LHC to supply an FD30 fire doorset product and would have to forward the third party fire testing certification described in my response to Q4 above.

It's important to add here that various patterns of the Suredor FD30 product may have been offered to KCTMO for their consideration through the C5 Framework. In accepting the product for use,

KCTMO would have to ensure the appropriate fire testing certification was valid and current at the time of use, which Manse would have been obliged to supply as proof to ensure Building Regulations Part B conformity (as referenced in my response to Q4c above).

**b. whether at any stage Manse Masterdor did apply to supply the Suredor GRP fire doorsets under a framework agreement;**

I'm unable to provide an answer to this for the C5 Framework.

Yes – I believe the Suredor GRP FD30 product was submitted for consideration on the C6 tender in 2011/2012. LHC would have the records and details.

**c. whether Manse Masterdor at any stage provided third party testing certification in relation to fire resistance or smoke leakage for the Suredor GRP fire doorset,**

I'm unable to provide an answer to this for the C5 framework. Please also refer to my response to Q6a above. KCTMO would have further project specific details.

**if so: i. what certifications were provided;**

I'm unable to provide an answer to this for the C5 framework. Please also refer to my response to Q6a above. KCTMO would have further project specific details.

**and ii. what checks were carried out on the certifications provided;**

I'm unable to provide an answer to this for the C5 framework. Please also refer to my response to Q6a above. KCTMO would have further project specific details.

**and iii. how were checks on the certifications provided documented.**

I'm unable to provide an answer to this for the C5 framework. Please also refer to my response to Q6a above. KCTMO would have further project specific details.

**7. LHC00000039 is a document entitled "Section F Prices". It sets out the prices for Manse Masterdor's Masterdor range (known by the initials MF). There is no pricing given for Manse Masterdor's Suredor range (known by the initials SG). As far as you are aware was the pricing information for the Suredor range provided at the same time but in another document or was it provided at a later stage, and if so when?**

I'm unable to provide an answer to this. It would have been managed by my predecessor.

**8. Were suppliers required to provide on-going information to the LHC while they remained a framework supplier? If so, give details of how they were notified of this requirement and details of the types of information they had to provide, including whether they had to provide:**



**a. information about material changes to the manufacturing process or to the materials used;**

Yes – Any significant material change to a product being offered under an LHC Framework should be notified to LHC for information and recording. Of course, this information must also be forwarded by the Appointed Company to any users of the product in question, as referenced in my response to Q6a above.

**b. new or updated test reports;**

Yes – the same procedure as my response to Q8a.

**c. annual declarations that there had been no material changes;**

No – declarations would be on-going.

**d. information when they applied for an extension of the original two year arrangement, and if so, what information was required.**

Following satisfactory completion of the first two years, LHC would invite each Appointed Company within the framework to apply for a further year's mutually agreed extension and notify LHC of any additional / deleted product ranges being offered together with any requested changes in prices and rates.

**9. In your response to question 6.b.iii. and iv. you state that site visits to inspect doorsets were carried out to “monitor manufacturing and installation quality”. LHC00000042 is a site visit report conducted at Grenfell Tower on 11 May 2011. For the period between January 2011 and August 2014, in relation to the inspection of fire doorsets installed under framework agreements, please:**

**a. state whether the site visit report format was a standard document, used in all inspections, if not give details of any other standard site visit report document that were used;**

Yes – Document LHC00000042 does appear to be the standard report document.

**b. explain what the guidelines were for when an internal inspection was required or in what circumstances an external inspection was sufficient;**

I'm not sure what is meant by 'internal'. Most external doors fitted under the C5 framework would have been to properties with direct access to the street or an external walkway. The term 'internal'

would therefore mean inside the property itself. I'm assuming in this case, it also means from the living side.

Unless impossible to carry out, the recorded inspections would always be on both sides (internal and external) of the installation and the operation of the door leaf would be checked.

**c. give details of the standard specifications to be checked in a typical inspection;**

The checking details contained within the Site Visit Report – document reference LHC00000042 – does detail the standard specification items to be inspected and recorded. The contents and layout of the reports have been developed to provide clear and concise feedback on our observations for the client's attention.

**d. give details of any documents that set out the standard specifications to be checked in a typical inspection;**

The C5 standard specification (non fire doors) would be contained within documents LHC00000033 LHC00000038. The items to be checked and recorded in a typical inspection had been developed over the years of LHC offering external doorsets. Any queries would be checked against the Appointed Company's (Manse) original tender submission.

KCTMO would also have prepared its own performance specification as part of the project tender exercise carried out by the organisation.

**e. state whether there were any differences between the inspection of a fire doorset and a non-fire doorset, and if so, give details of the differences?**

The main points would be the presence of intumescent strips around the perimeter of the door leaf and/or door frame. Also, the use of an intumescent foam filler (usually identified as pink in colour) inserted in the gaps between the doorset frame and the walling. The choice of hardware may also differ from a non-fire doorset, depending on the manufacturer and door type.

Sometimes the fire doorset could be identified as FD30 by a sticker or stud attached to the leaf. I don't recall whether this identification method was mandatory in 2011/2012.

In summary, all fire resisting products must conform to the requirements of Building Regulations Part B.

**I confirm that the responses within this statement are true to the best of my knowledge and recollection. I'm willing for the statement to form part of the evidence before the Inquiry and published on the Inquiry's website.**

**Signed**



**C J POWELL** 11 Dec 2109