

STATEMENT OF WITNESS

(Criminal Procedure Rules, r. 27, 2;

Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9, Magistrates Courts Act 1980, s.5b)

STATEMENT OF James Duncan (Jim) (retired)

Age of witness (if over 18, enter "over 18"): Over 21

This statement (consisting of 5 pages) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

1. My name is Jim Duncan. I have been asked by 'The Grenfell Tower Inquiry' to answer questions in the form of a Rule 9 Statement. I am happy to do so. I have previously provided two statements to the Metropolitan Police. When the statements were made I was questioned by the officers particularly about my role at the time in Masterdor.
2. I adopt the contents of those statements as being accurate and will supplement the information in accordance with the questions posed by the Inquiry team relating to the period of time between 2007 and 2013.
3. I will follow the numbering of the questions in the Inquiry letter dated the 16th December 2019, for ease of reference.

4. Inquiry Question 1.

I refer the panel to the statements of the Metropolitan Police dated 22/02/18 and the 29/03/18 for this answer.

5. Question 2.

L B Plastics were responsible for developing the fire integrity rating of the UPVC framework for the FD 30 GRP Door leaf. The assembly of the test samples was carried out at the LB Plastics workshop in Nether Heage Derbyshire. It was submitted for testing to British Gypsum, Loughborough.

6. Question 3.

I was employed by LB Plastics in 1979. In 1982, my role became Technical Service Manager. I was given the task in 2007 by directors to assist the intumescent supplier (Envirograf) to achieve 30min fire integrity with the existing Sheerframe upvc door profile incorporating a FD30 GRP door leaf, the types, amount and positions of the intumescents were advised by Envirograf, intumescents were applied to the framework, ironmongery and door leaf, the method of glazing the door leaf was demonstrated by the door leaf supplier (Distinction Doors) to the Masterdor operators, the method was the use of metal channels fixed around the perimeter of the glazing aperture, this was to prevent the glass sinking into the core of the door leaf under testing, the full perimeter gap between the glass and aperture was filled with an intumescent material, to my knowledge this was the method used to locate the glass. On completion of tests the reports including data sheets showing intumescents and positions were submitted to the appropriate directors and manufacturing.

7. Question 4.

My understanding of the Regulations requirements for the FD 30 and FD 30S doors sold between 2006 and 2014 was nil. I was guided by experts from the intumescent supplier Envirograf.

8. Question 5.

I was part of the Technical support during the dates above. I would arrange for the doors to go through the testing processes through a recognised and authorised provider. In 2007, this was The Building Test Centre, test No: BTC 14434F in accordance with BS 476 Part 20/22 1987.

The second was by Chiltern International, test No: Chilt/RF 07024..

Both tests were passed and therefore the Manse Masterdor could be manufactured. I provided the test results to the Directors whose ultimate responsibility it was to decide whether the doors should be offered for sale.

Both reports have been handed to the police during the course of this investigation, whilst I was still employed.

9. Question 6.

Between 2007 and 2013, my understanding was that there was no difference between the FD 30 and FD 30S doors. To my knowledge smoke leakage testing was not carried out on the FD 30S door at that time. At the time I was not asked to carry out that function.

10. Question 7.

I know both Mike Hudson and John Tapscott. I knew of John Tapscott but had very little dealings with him.

Mike Hudson was a Director of Masterdor and possibly Managing Director but I am not completely sure about that. It was Mr Hudson who requested the assistance of LB Plastics to develop the fire resistance of 30 minutes integrity with the Intumescent supplier Envirograf.

Mr Hudson had previous experience of fire testing with their timber door types. Mr Hudson, a representative from Envirograf and I attended together for the first testing at the Building Test Centre (Ref: BTC 14434F in accordance with BS 476 Part 20/22 1987). This test was successful to the required parameters.

11. Question 8.

I have made reference to the tests carried out above namely BTC 14434 F and Chilt / RF 07024. To my knowledge they are the only tests carried out up to 2013.

12. Question 9 & Question 10

My responsibility was providing test reports internally to our Directors and staff. I was not and have never been responsible for providing test reports to customers. I am unaware who had the responsibility for passing test results on to customers.

Masterdor had a sales and Marketing department who may have been required to perform that role within the business but I am not sure.

I am not aware of the process for supplying test results to members of the public.

13. Question 11.

The company did not direct me to carry out smoke leakage tests on the Suredoor fire doors. I was unaware of the requirement to carry out smoke leakage tests at the time.

14. Question 12.

I do not recall the Fire door FD30S having any additional testing to the FD30.

15. Question 13 & Question 14.

I am aware that the Suredoor brochure (TMO10037503) demonstrates a number of different glazing styles.

The test Chilt / RF 07024 was carried out incorporating the largest possible glazing area for the door leaf. This was the only size that I know of, being tested. To my knowledge the smaller glazing examples were not tested.

At the time of testing, I recall that the Fire Assessors, interested parties and testing companies all believed that this would be the 'worst case scenario' approach. Smaller glazing styles would, if anything, be permitted.

I was not requested to arrange for smoke leakage tests for these Suredoor fire doors. I was not aware that there was any requirement to do so either.

16. Question 15.

Suredoor doors tests were carried out with ironmongery listed in the test reports and data sheets already in the possession of the Metropolitan Police. It is my view that this is the material that should be used in the door unless, another suitably tested and correctly performing product replaced it.

I was never asked to comment upon the Ironmongery used in the doors at Grenfell Tower or anywhere else.

No further testing of the product took place on the Suredoor until 2013, when a better understanding of other tests was introduced. At this point in time combinations of locks door closers and glazing sizes were all considered.

I act on the instructions of the senior management to request additional tests. I was never given a direction to carry out further tests on the ironmongery.

When it came to the selection of ironmongery for the Suredoor, I was not involved. I was not shown certification by the manufacturers of the ironmongery neither was I asked to comment on the whether or not this would impact on the doors being described as FD30S doors.

17. Question 16.

The manufacturing processes, for the Suredoor fire doors, was not any part of my role in the company. This part of the process (manufacturing) was that of Masterdor staff having been supplied with the relevant test reports and data sheets.

I was not aware of any changes to the manufacturing between the commencements of manufacture until 2013.

The training documents were the responsibility of Masterdor. I was not involved in the preparation of training records or the delivery of training in the product.

I do not recall the number or if there were any changes to the intumescent strips. However, the data sheets provided will identify any changes. The same answer will apply to the bracketing and sealing of the glazing, the glass used in the glazing and the hardware used, including the self closing devices.

18. Question 17.

Finally, I confirm that I was not involved in any changes to the manufacturing processes for Suredoor from Manufacture to 2013. If any changes to the manufacturing process did occur I can only presume that it would have been decisions by the manufacturing team.

As a consequence of having no involvement in this aspect of the work I can add nothing further.

19. I am willing for this statement to form part of the evidence before the inquiry and published on the inquiry's website

This statement (consisting of 5 pages) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signed:  (Witness)

Date: 4-03-2020