# OPUS2 

Grenfell Tower Inquiry

Day 94

February 22, 2021

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: +44 (0)20 30085900
Email: transcripts@opus2.com
Website: https://www.opus2.com

```
Monday, 22 February 2021 1
(10.00 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
    today's hearing. As always, I'm here with my fellow
    panel members, Ms Thouria Istephan and Mr Ali Akbor.
MS ISTEPHAN: Good morning.
MR AKBOR: Good morning, everyone.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Now, today we're going to continue
    hearing evidence from Mr Schmidt of Arconic, so the
    first task is to make sure that our interpreters are
    with us and can see and hear what they need to.
        So, interpreters, are you there?
MS KENNEDY: We're both here and we can both see and hear
        you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much, good. Good
        morning.
MS KENNEDY: Good morning.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Next, of course, I have to make sure
        that Mr Schmidt is there, and he can hear us and see us.
            MR CLAUDE SCHMIDT (continued)
            (Evidence via interpreter)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Hello, good morning, Mr Schmidt.
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Good morning. I can hear and
    see you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
1
    Now, essentially we shall carry on in the way that
    1
    we were taking your evidence last week, but I think
    2
    through the usual housekeeping matters with you.
        So would you mind confirming, please, that you're
    alone in the room from which you're giving evidence?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Yes, I confirm.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
            Can you confirm that you have no documents or other
    materials with you?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Yes, I confirm.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
            Can you also confirm that your mobile phone is in
    another room, and that you don't have any other
    electronic device with you which is capable of receiving
    messages?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Yes, I confirm.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
            Well, as I said, the procedure will be the same as
        it was last week. We shall have a break during the
        morning at around about 11.15, and in the afternoon.
            Is there anything you would like to raise with me or
        ask before we carry on with your evidence?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): No.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
```

In that case, I will invite Mr Millett to continue putting some questions to you.

When you're ready, Mr Millett.
Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY (continued)
MR MILLETT: Good morning, Mr Chairman, good morning, members of the panel, and good morning, Mr Schmidt.

On Thursday, I asked you about a meeting between Claude Wehrle and Frank Ritter, 3A, Alucobond, in Freiburg in June 2011. You told us that you were not aware that Claude Wehrle was having that discussion.
That was \{Day93/81:16-20\}.
Can we please go to $\left\{\mathrm{MET00053158} \mathrm{\_P04/27} \mathrm{\}}\right.$ in the English -- this is Claude Wehrle's exhibit, part 4, page $27-$ - and in the French, please,
\{MET00053158_P04/24\}.
Please follow in the French, while I read the English. This is an email of 30 June 2011 at 9.20 from Claude Wehrle to Guy Scheidecker. He says:
"Guy,
"We should be able to meet as soon as possible for a half-hour meeting about the fire tests carried out on the Reynobond PE in cassettes.
"In 2008, at a meeting, I stated that PE was in danger of becoming 'or' for architecture in
Western Europe.
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"In 2011... we're not there yet, but almost there!
"The classification obtained for the Reynobond PE cassettes is the same as that of the competitors, i.e. ' $F$ ', and therefore not suitable for use on building facades (M4 in France for example)...
"A meeting before Tuesday, if possible, would be good because that's the day I see F. RITTER in Fribourg to talk about it."

My question, having shown you that document, Mr Schmidt, is: if Guy Scheidecker was informed that Claude Wehrle was meeting with 3A, do you agree that it is likely that you would have known about that meeting as well?
A. (Interpreted): No, not necessarily .
Q. Can we go to $\left\{\mathrm{MET00053158} \mathrm{\_P04/34} \mathrm{\}}, \mathrm{please} \mathrm{This} \mathrm{is}\right.$. Claude Wehrle's exhibit, but there is no French version of this. The original is in German, and that, for those who want to see it, is at page 31 \{MET00053158_P04/31\}, but I don't want to go to it. English, please, and I' II ask Madam Translator, please, to translate.

This is an email from Claude Wehrle to
Peter Froehlich, as you can see, on 8 July 2011,
subject, "Visit - CE marking Freiburg", and he says:
"Peter,
"I need to show that to GSc/CS and RQ on Tuesday.

```
    "Can you please send me your comments?
    "Thanks,
    "Claude."
    At the next page, if we go down to page 35
    {MET00053158_P04/35} - - I'm sorry, I'll stop there and
    get it translated.
                (Pause for translation)
            If you look at the attachments, you can see that
    there is a visit report. Please go to the next page,
    page 35, where we can see what's attached. There it is.
    That's the visit report we looked at last week.
        Can we go back to the previous page and the email,
        please {MET00053158_P04/34}, where Claude Wehrle says:
            "I need to show that to GSc/CS and RQ on Tuesday."
            Can I ask you: is GSc Guy Scheidecker?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. CS is you, Claude Schmidt?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. And LQ, is that Laure Quiquerez?
THE INTERPRETER: It's written RQ on the email, not L.
A. (Interpreted): It's Robert Quattrocchi.
MR MILLETT: My mistake, and thank you
            Does this email tell us that the visit report of the
    meeting in Freiburg was shown to you?
A. (Interpreted ): No. Anyway, I don't remember it.
```
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Q. Now, you told us on Thursday that you believe that
products with the French classification M1 could be used
on a façade; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Just for our note, that's \{Day93/82:23-24\}. That's for
our purposes.
We saw in the email just now -- and we can go back
to it if you like. Perhaps we should: in the French
\{MET00053158/24\} - - sorry, this is the same email run as
we were in, this one here that we have on the screen
coming up. Looking at the paragraph that starts in the
middle, "The classification obtained", or in French, "Le
classement obtenu" -- do you see that? -- it says
\{MET00053158/27\}:
"The classification obtained for the Reynobond PE
cassettes is the same as that of the competitors, i.e.
' $F$ ', and therefore not suitable for use on building
facades (M4 in France for example)..."
How can you account for that?
A. (Interpreted): I can't explain it. Well, Reynobond
PE 55 was classified M1 throughout its existence, at
least to my knowledge.
Q. Would you agree that you were wrong when you said or if
you said that a class $E$ or $F$ product could be used on
building façades?
A. (Interpreted): I don't believe that I said that.
Q. Would you agree with me, to be clear, then, that a class E or F product could not be used on a building façade?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't know.
Q. Do you agree that the 2011 European classification test for Reynobond PE cassette demonstrated that Reynobond 55 PE in cassette form was unsuitable for use on façades of high-rise buildings?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't confirm that either. I think it depended on the regulations and, as I don't know all the regulations, I can't confirm that.
Q. How could Reynobond PE in cassette form, which obtained an $F$ classification in the European tests, be safe for use on any façade?
A. (Interpreted): The risk control can be carried out in different ways on a façade, I already mentioned that last week, depending on the products used and the system. Different countries in Europe address the risk in different ways.
Q. Do you agree with me that Reynobond PE in cassette form should never be used or should never have been promoted by Arconic for use on façades of high-rise buildings, whether or not the European standards, 13501, applied in a particular country?
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A. (Interpreted): Could I hear the question once again?
Q. Do you agree with me that Reynobond PE in cassette form should never have been used or promoted for use by Arconic on façades of high-rise buildings, whether or not the European standards, 13501, applied in a particular country?
A. (Interpreted ): I'm sorry, I still don't understand the question.
Q. Let me try it a different way, much more simply.

If Reynobond 55 PE in cassette form gets a European
$F$, how would it be safe to use at height anywhere?
A. (Interpreted): I'm not a specialist in façades or façade systems, but once again, I think controlling risks and choosing the right materials, even this kind of product could be used.
Q. Can we go back to the email, please, in the French \{MET00053158_P04/24\} \{MET00053158/27\} and look at the penultimate paragraph that I was showing you.
Claude Wehrle is telling Mr Scheidecker that the classification F for Reynobond PE in cassette form is "therefore not suitable for use on building facades", without qualification.

> Do you agree?
A. (Interpreted): I don't have an answer.
Q. Well, do you agree or do you disagree?
A. (Interpreted): I don't agree.1
Q. Why don't you agree?2
A. (Interpreted): Because I'm not sure what Claude Wehrleis writing in his email here.4
Q. Well, if Claude Wehrle is correct that, because ..... 5
Reynobond PE in cassette form obtained a European F, itcould not be suitable for use on building façades, thenwhy was Arconic continuing to sell Reynobond 55 PE incassette form for use in building façades afterJune 2011?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know whether Claude Wehrle was right in saying that.
Q. But if he was, which is the premise of my question, why was Arconic continuing to sell Reynobond 55 PE in cassette form for use in building façades from June 2011 onwards?
A. (Interpreted): Because, for example, the product in France was M1 and the French legislation accepted to use M1 products for façades.
Q. But he says it's M4.
THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, I didn't hear you.
MR MILLETT: He says in his email that it's M4.
A. (Interpreted): But he's the one that establishes that link.
Q. Was there any discussion that you can recall within
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Arconic at this time, June 2011, about whether or not
Reynobond 55 with a PE core, having obtained a European class $F$, should any longer be sold for use in façades?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't remember.
Q. Looking back at the email -- I'm sorry.
A. (Interpreted): [ FT ] ${ }^{* * *}$ So we're talking about a competitive environment, we're looking to see also what the competitors are doing, and later on, having looked at French technical opinions, there are some competitors who were saying that PE, FR, A2, could have M1 or M0 classification, without taking into consideration European fire classification until 2017. So I'm thinking in particular of a document that was a 2017 document. ***
Q. Looking back at the email, there is a reference to a meeting in 2008, if you look in the second paragraph. Do you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Do you recall being present at such a meeting?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't recall .
Q. I'm going to turn to a fire in Dubai in November 2012. Before I do, I ought to give a trigger warning: in this next section again we're going to be showing pictures of a fire in a tall building, so for those watching who don't want to see that, they should look away from the
images, please.
Can we please go to your exhibit 10, page 32 at \{MET00053157/32\}, and in the French it's page 28 of the same exhibit run \{MET00053157/28\}.

In the English, it's the bottom of the page; in the French, it's the middle of the page. We see an email from Robert Quattrocchi on 27 November 2012 to Alain Flacon, Claude Wehrle and others.

It's right, isn't it, I think, that Alain Flacon had become sales and marketing director on 1 August 2012; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, I'm going to show you these emails, and you will see from the French original that you are copied in on all of them. Your name doesn't appear as copyee on the English, but it 's important that people understand you are copied in on these emails.

The email subject is, "TR: Cladding Blamed in Skyscraper Fire - Sounds like something our customers make. FYI".

The text says, and if you follow in the French, please, I' Il read the English:
"For your information. ACM façade caught fire in UAE. Read the article. There is a link to BBC photos. There is a protective film, but there is no way to see
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the brand.
"I think it is worth digging into."
If you look at the very bottom of the page, there is an article embedded, and it says in English on both sides of the screen:
"Cladding Blamed in Skyscraper Fire.
"Monday, November 26, 2012."
Do you see that?
If we turn the page, please, on to page 23 in the English \{MET00053157/23\}, 29 in the French
\{MET00053157/29\}, you can see there is an embedded video, which we can't play because that's an image, and I want to look at the English text below, please, under the caption, and if Madam Translator could translate the English, please -- I'll start actually at the top:
"Exterior cladding may be responsible for accelerating a fire that ravaged portions of a 34 -[storey] residential building in Dubai, according to reports."

Underneath the image, if you translate, please, for the witness, it says:
"The fire at Tamweel Tower started near the top of the building and moved down, raining down flaming pieces of the building onto the ground."

If you look under the header "Fireballs Fall to

## Ground", it says:

"There were no reports of injuries. However, as the flames - which started near the top of the building scaled down the structure, they sent huge chunks of the building and debris to the ground."

Then if you look at the next heading down, it says, "Building Cladding as Fuel":
"While the cause of the blaze was under investigation, initial reports indicated the building's exterior cladding may have been the culprit behind the blaze's fierce spread."

Now, we've seen that this article was sent
internally in Arconic, including to you.
Although it's in English, would you have read it at the time, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, probably.
Q. Do you actually recall reading it at the time, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): Probably, yes. I may not have read it in detail, but I certainly read it over quickly.
Q. You would have understood the basic event and the cause of the fire from this article, wouldn't you?
A. (Interpreted): The cause of the fire, no, but what happened, yes.
Q. Now, can we go to page 32 of this exhibit in the English
\{MET00053157/32\} and 28 in the French \{MET00053157/28\}.
We can see Claude Wehrle's response. In the French, you
can see that Claude Wehrle responds to
Robert Quattrocchi and Alain Flacon, I don't think to
you, you're not on the email, but he says:
"Hello,
"This has to do with Gutbond PE - Knowing that all
PE composites react in the same way...."
We can see that Robert Quattrocchi and Alain Flacon receive it.

Robert Quattrocchi was the plant manager, wasn't he?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. So can we take it from this that at a senior level within Arconic, within AAP-SAS, it was known that PE composites will burn like the Tamweel Tower fire?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, you say in your witness statement at paragraph 30.3 \{MET00053187/11\} -- I'm not going to take you to it -that it may be possible that these emails were discussed at a meeting but you cannot recall such a discussion nor seeing the emails before.
A. (Interpreted): Yes, I -- no, I didn't remember, but I can see that I'm copied in, so at least I must have seen them.
Q. Can we take it that you don't remember Arconic doing
anything in response to this fire ?
A. (Interpreted): In response to this fire specifically, no, probably no.
Q. We have seen no evidence in the record that Arconic did anything in response to this fire. Is that correct?
A. (Interpreted): Certainly.
Q. Why did Arconic not do anything in response to this fire?
A. (Interpreted): Well, I think that at the time we may have had some questions regarding the PE panels. It's difficult to explain, but we had certain perceptions of the different legislation and it wasn't always very clear, and it's something that I've already mentioned, we had competitors who carried on selling PE, and on the [ FT ] ${ }^{* * *}$ specific tower, on this tower, even if the product was known for being flammable and we were becoming aware of that fact, the fire remained limited to the outside of the building. ${ }^{* * *}$
Q. Did you conduct an internal investigation at Arconic into whether Reynobond 55 PE, in either cassette or rivet, might perform in the same way as we saw the ACM performed in the Tamweel Tower fire?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't think so.
Q. Why not?
A. (Interpreted): Because the product was known as being
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## flammable.

Q. Was it known as being that flammable?
(Pause)
A. (Interpreted): Well, in any case that's what the fire on the Dubai tower seems to suggest.
Q. So why not do an internal investigation to see if Reynobond 55 PE might perform in the same way?
A. (Interpreted): But it's because I think that was in any case written by Claude Wehrle in a previous email, all PE components behaved in the same way.
Q. Yes. So if all PE components behave in the same way, Arconic therefore realised, didn't it, that Reynobond 55 PE would perform in the same way as the Tamweel Tower fire?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. So why did you continue to sell it after November 2012, after you had seen the images and text of this article?
A. (Interpreted): Because this product could still be sold for usage on buildings.
Q. Why did you continue to sell this product after November 2012, having seen these images, for use at height?
A. (Interpreted): Because first the fire was confined on the outside of the building. Therefore, you may think that the way the façade had been designed was able to

Q
contain the risk
Q. I see.

Let's move to 2013. There was another cladding fire in the UAE in April 2013 at the AI Hafeet Tower in Sharjah.

Now, I want to go, please, to your exhibit 10 at page 48, $\{$ MET00053157/48\}. This is a long email on 9 May 2013, it's all in English, and you can see that Richard Geater of 3A Composites wrote to Barrie Wingrove on that date, 9 May, "Hi Barrie", and I'm going to read in English parts of it, and ask the translator to translate to you.

It starts:
"Hi Barrie,
"You may or may not have seen the recent press coverage of a building fire in Dubai clad in ACM?"

Then he links a $B B C$ website, and then says:
"Having taken the time to investigate with my colleague responsible for this market he has responded as follows ..."

Then he says in the second paragraph, in italics, and I will read it to you, and then I' II ask the translator to translate it to you:
"The trouble is that the cladding system here in particular but all over in general, using PE, is like
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a chimney which transports the fire from bottom to top or vice versa within shortest time. However, since most sprinkling units are never being tested, they for sure do not work when they are needed. If you buy a new car and only turn the key after 5 years, you will be surprised how little your vehicle will move. Here the same."

Then the next paragraph, he says:
"The worst of all: in our field of composite panels: YOU DO NOT GET WHAT YOU SEE!! The Mulk Holding ALUBOND[sic] people are responsible for the huge damage in this part of the world. They, since a very long time promote fire 'rated' composite panels with a white core which ......... when being tested ......... turns out to be recycled PE core burning like paper. Half of the country is full of this rubbish due to price. We have taken random samples and done a live test in Bangkok in front of architects, they almost fainted. Indeed, this panel is a whole cheat and burns fiercely."

Three paragraphs from the bottom, Richard Geater adds this:
"Again the perils of using cheap ACM alternatives have been exposed. As you are aware our standard core is the PLUS FR mineral core achieving Class $B, s 1, d 0$, according to EN 13501-1, unlike other ACM producers."

Now, let's go up to page 47 \{MET00053157/47\},
please, and again, I'm afraid there is no French translation for this, Mr Schmidt. Here we can see that, in the third email down, Deborah French sends this email on -- do you see? -- to you, to Peter Froehlich, Claude Wehrle, and Alain Flacon. Do you see that? She says:
"Just to make you aware I sent this link over to Claude W last week concerning a BBC report covering a fire in UAE using ACM.
"Richard Geater - Alucobond Rep in the UK is emailing all fabricators explaining that Alucobond is now using a fire core only as [standard]."

Then she embeds a BBC item, and then continues:
"Would welcome any comments/statement we have ref the fire and our [standards] so I can communicate this to our relevant customers."

Now, Mr Schmidt, I've shown you that in some detail so far. My question is: do you remember receiving this email?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Did you read the email she was forwarding, the one from Richard Geater?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. What did you think? What were your thoughts when you
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saw the email from Richard Geater which Deborah French was sending to you?
A. (Interpreted): My first reaction was I think to check what the person was saying, because I - - through experience, and also through comments emanating from the market, I knew that Alucobond was still selling a lot of PE on the market. I mean, here, for example, Alucobond, what's written is that for a commercial -- with a commercial intention, they put forward the fact that the standard product is a fire retardant product, but as I said before, they carried on selling PE.
Q. Now, Deborah French told us - - we don't need the reference, but it's \{Day89/49:22\} to \{Day89/50:3\}, we don't need to translate the reference -- that she had had conversations with people at Merxheim that Arconic was going to continue to sell PE. Do you know, can you remember, whether Deborah French did have conversations like that with anybody at Merxheim?
A. (Interpreted ): No. No, I mean, it's not a question of recalling it, but I don't think she had a direct discussion of this with me and I don't think she talked to other people about it. And I don't know - I Idon't know whether she talked with others.
Q. You have said before, you just told us, that Alucobond carried on selling PE. The question I have is this: it
looks from the email that Alucobond were now selling FR as standard. My question is: did Arconic discuss switching to selling FR as standard?
A. (Interpreted): So first we're not sure on the basis of that email that Alucobond decided to sell FR as their standard product, and I think that starting from the [ FT ] ${ }^{* * *}$ beginning of 2014, we officially informed all our salespeople, all ${ }^{* * *}$ the commercial people, to communicate on the performances of PE and the fire performances of PE.
Q. Why did Arconic not start offering Reynobond 55 in FR as standard from April 2013 onwards?
A. (Interpreted): Because it implied carrying out a more global reflection on the subject and understanding how the market was evolving.
Q. And why didn't you do that?
A. (Interpreted): Because we needed time to think about it, I imagine.
Q. Deborah French told us that commercial reasons were at least part of the reason why Arconic did not proceed after this fire to offer FR as standard. Do you agree?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. How much time did you need to think about whether starting to offer FR as standard?
A. (Interpreted ): On one hand, and I repeat, we don't know
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if Alucobond offered it as standard, and we always tried to respond to the needs of the client.
Q. Let's look at Debbie French's 13 May 2013 email.
$\{C E P 00049717\}$. Now, I'm sorry to say there is no French translation of this email, so I'm going to ask
Madam Translator to read the text in French to you, but
I' II tell you what it is. It's an email from
Deborah French, 13 May 2013, to CEP, Neil Wilson,
Geof Blades and Roy Fewster. Subject, "BBC Report ... ACM in UAE".

Before I ask for the translation of the text, I' II just tell you that other copies of exactly the same text went to other fabricators in the UK. I should tell you, just in case you didn't know, that CEP was a fabricator and in fact fabricated the ACM for Grenfell Tower.

Madam Translator, if you would please translate the text of the email.

> (Pause for translation)

My first question is: did you read this email in draft form before it was sent by Deborah French?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Were you involved in any discussion about the principles reflected in this email?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Were you aware of this email at the time?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Do you know from whom Deborah French -- well, let me put it a different way: do you know whether Deborah French needed authorisation to send this email?
A. (Interpreted): No. No, I don't know.
Q. Just --
A. (Interpreted): Go ahead.
Q. Just focusing on the penultimate paragraph, she says:
"At this stage we will continue to offer both PE \&
FR core and continue the close working relationship we have with our Approved Fabricators to make sure the right technical support, Reynobond Specification and Materials are being used and installed on Reynobond Projects."

Now, if we could leave that on the screen, please, Mr Schmidt, can we please go to your witness statement at paragraph 92, in the English \{MET00053187/29\}, and I' II read it in the English and then I' II show you the French as we can't have three documents on the screen at once.
THE INTERPRETER: Would you like me to interpret just the previous section?
MR MILLETT: No, that's okay, I want to show people paragraph 92, and I'm going to read the sentence or passage I want to put to him from paragraph 92. I think
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we need over the page, please, at page 30
$\{$ MET00053187/30\}. In the last part of the last sentence, it says:
"... AAP SAS is simply a supplier of one component product which may be used in the façade of a building."

If I could show him the French of that, please, the French original at page 13, paragraph 92, last half of the last sentence in that paragraph, $\{$ MET00048338/13\}. There it is. I want to ask him to look, please, at the French version. It is actually a full sentence in this French version, "AAP SAS est simplement ..."
A. (Interpreted): Where is it exactly? I found it. The last sentence, in other words?
MR MILLETT: Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: The very last sentence, right?
MR MILLETT: The very last sentence, yes.
A. (Interpreted): Yes, I can see it.
Q. Now, I've shown you that, and I've shown you the paragraph in the email.

Going back to the email, please \{CEP00049717\}, is what Deborah French says in the email, in the paragraph I read out to you which starts "At this stage", correct? Was that Arconic's policy at the time?
A. (Interpreted): No, it was never our policy. In fact, very simply we didn't have the competency internally to
Q. Now, we have seen from the record that Deborah French sent this message in identical terms at least to two fabricators: CEP, which is this one, and Simco.

We can also see that this message does not communicate anything about the dangers of PE evidenced by the fire in the UAE.

My question is: why? Why did her message not say anything here about the dangers of using PE core?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know.
Q. Do you know why this message did not tell fabricators that, in its cassette variant, Reynobond 55 PE had achieved a Euroclass E in a test in 2011?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Did Arconic continue to intend to sell Reynobond 55 with a PE core in cassette variant for use at height, even after this fire in April 2013?
A. (Interpreted): Well, I don't believe the question was asked. I think one can say that Arconic wanted to carry
on selling ACM PE, but one must remember that, from a general point of view, there are very few cases that we're aware of the final destination with regard to the usage of the product.
Q. Why not simply attach a health warning when selling Reynobond 55 PE, at least in cassette variant, after this time?
A. (Interpreted): I can't answer. Well, I don't believe that our competitors did it. Ten years later it is a legitimate question to raise, but at the time it wasn't so obvious.
Q. Why wasn't the fact that Reynobond PE 55 with a cassette variant had achieved a class $E$ in a European fire test sufficient to make it obvious, Mr Schmidt?
A. (Interpreted): I don't have an answer.

MR MILLETT: Is that a convenient moment, Mr Chairman?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, I think it is, Mr Millett. Thank you.

Well, Mr Schmidt, I think it's time we had a short break, so we'll take that now. We'll resume, please, at 11.35 our time.

As before, I must ask you, please, not to talk about your evidence or anything relating to it during the break. All right?

Thank you very much, we will see you at 11.35 .

```
    Thank you.
(11.20 am)
        (A short break)
(11.35 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We are
    ready to continue with Mr Schmidt's evidence, but first
    l'd better just check that the interpreters are with us.
        Are you there, interpreters?
MS DELAS-REISZ: Yes, the interpreters are with you, sir.
    We can see you and hear you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
            Mr Schmidt, are you there?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): I can see you and I can hear
    you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. And you're
    ready to go on, I hope?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
            Then, Mr Millett, when you're ready, thank you.
MR MILLETT: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
            Can we go, please, to {MET00064988/122} in the
        English; at the same time, please, to French page }11
        {MET00064988/119}, same exhibit.
            If we go to the bottom of page 122 in the English,
        top of page 119 in the French, we can see an email from
                                    27
    Isabel Moyses again, this time 25 April 2013. Can you
    see that?
        It says:
            "Claude,
            "Can you confirm for me that:
            "Under EN13501
            "PE riveted system = B-s2, d0.
            "Cassette: F.
            "FR riveted system or cassettes: B-s1, d0.
            "Thanks Isabel."
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, we can see the reply from Claude Wehrle at the
    bottom of page 121 in the English {MET00064988/121} and
    118 in the French {MET00064988/118}, please. We can see
    Claude Wehrle comes back to her at the bottom of
    page 121. Leave the French on the screen, because you
    can see that there, and in the English, please scroll to
    page 122 at the top {MET00064988/122}. He says:
            "Under EN 13501:
            "Reynobond PE is classified as 'E'.
            "Reynobond FR is classified as 'B-s1, d0'.
            "We do indeed have a historical report classifying
    the Reynobond PE riveted system as B-s2, d0.
            "But we no longer wish to use it on the market.
            "It should be noted that the class 'E' for the PE
```


## composite has become the market standard.

"For the national classification systems our competitors talk about PE as being 'M1', for example.
"Thanks
"Claude."
Then if we go up to English page 121
\{MET00064988/121\}, and little bit further at the top of the screen on 118 in the French, we can see
Isabel Moyses goes back to Claude Wehrle on Thursday, 25 April 2013, and she asks him the question - - and in the French it's "Mais la classification ", and in English it 's:
"But is the $B-s 2, d 0$ classification for riveted valid or not?"

That's her question.
If we go above that, still on page 121 in the English, still on page 118 in the French, Claude Wehrle tells her by response:
"It's valid because it's contained in an official report.
"However the tests that we conducted are not really reflective of the riveted system in general.
"So, Alcoa aligns with the 'market' classification and does not use it any more, preferring a class 'E' regardless of the system."
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Above that, you can just see that Isabel Moyses

$$
\text { comes back to Claude Wehrle, same day, } 25 \text { April, or the }
$$

date is cut off on the French, and she says:
"Is this official, as we are still talking about B-s2, d0?"

At the top of page 121, and in the French at the bottom of page 117 \{MET00064988/117\}, you can see that Claude Wehrle responds at $17.57--$ the top of page 121 , bottom of page $117--$ he says:
"No, we have not communicated B-s2, d0 from the beginning of the year at the request of CS."

In the French, just look at it together, if,
Madam Translator, you could just read the French text out.
(Pause for translation)
Now, just pausing there, is CS you?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Did you request that $B-s 2, d 0$ should not be communicated from the beginning of 2013, Mr Schmidt?
A. (Interpreted ): I do not remember. We're in 2013 and I think it follows an exchange of mail that took place in 2012 in which Claude Wehrle was trying to meet me, and, well, I know --I don't know whether an exchange took place, but I know that I didn't meet him. That I know. There was no meeting. exploiting or continuing to make use of a gap in the certification. Can you explain that?
A. (Interpreted): I don't understand the whole chain of the
email, but I think we're talking about Spain or Portugal
maybe here, and what I understand is that the DIT, which
is probably some accreditation system in one of these
countries, published something saying that PE got the
classification B in the rivet form, and I imagine that
Miguel is probably a client, Miguel relies on that DIT
for the riveted system.
Q. Do you know why Arconic was permitting the sale of PE
rivet as if it was a class B in light of your request,
as we've seen, that Arconic not even communicate that
rivet - fix PE had a Euroclass B?
A. (Interpreted ): But I don't think there is any
communication taking place in that chain of emails.
Q. From memory, can you tell us the answer to my question?
THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, sir, I couldn't hear your question.
There was a weird sound.
MR MILLETT: From your own recollection, are you able to
answer my question?
I' II ask it again: from your own recollection, do
you know why Arconic was permitting the sale of PE rivet
as if it was class B in light of the request we had seen
earlier from you not to say that it had a class B?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Hello, interpreter, did you hear
that last answer? 33

MS KENNEDY: Yes, I'll take over, I think there might have been a technical issue.
A. (Interpreted): I would just like to say that we don't sell the product in a riveted form, we sell it in a flat form.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Carry on, Mr Schmidt.
A. (Interpreted): And I don't believe once again that in that email the $B-s 2, d 0$ is promoted for Reynobond PE.
MR MILLETT: Just at [draft] line 7 there, the witness said "flat form" not "platform", just to be clear.
THE INTERPRETER: Yes, that's right.
MR MILLETT: Moving on, Mr Wehrle says in his witness statement at paragraph 65 \{MET00053190/19\} - - there is no need to go to it - - that, by early 2013, he wanted to have a low classification for Reynobond PE, namely a class $D$ for both rivet and cassette. He says that he wanted to do that in order to differentiate more clearly between the FR product and the PE product to be able better to market the FR product.

My question is: were you aware of that testing strategy as described by Claude Wehrle?
A. (Interpreted): No. I believe that if it was discussed with management, it would have been discussed with the commercial management.
Q. Do you know why the policy was not followed quite simply
A. (Interpreted): Well, I think that this development took place even beginning of 2014.
Q. We will come to that.

I want to turn to another test on the PE cassette in 2013, Mr Schmidt. Can we please go to
\{MET00053158_P02/38\}, and at page 36 in the French \{MET00053158_P02/36\}. Same exhibit run, two separate pages. If we look at the English version at the bottom of page 38 and the French version at the bottom of page 36 at the same time, please.

Now, we see here an email from Benoit Forest of CSTB on 7 November 2013 to Philippe Vonthron, who I think is a technician, isn't he, at Arconic? Yes?
A. (Interpreted ): He works in Claude Wehrle's team.
Q. Yes, and if you just follow in the French while I show the English, he says:
"Hello Mr VONTHRON,
"The first SBI tests on the product 'REYNOBOND PE' have been completed."

Then he sets them out in the box you can see on the right in the French, and if we turn the page to page 39 in the English \{MET00053158_P02/39\}, we can see the equivalent in English. We can see the SBI test there, and the table at the top there in the English, bottom of the page in the French, is the results of the rivet - fix

PE.
Underneath the SBI test we see "Behaviour". Can you see -- and you will need to flip the page in the French \{MET00053158_P02/37\} to the "Comportement" there at the top of the page, "Behaviour: C-s2, d0 on a test". And that's the riveted system, as you can see; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. So it's clear that at that stage, under the single burning item test, Reynobond 55 PE with rivet-fix has obtained a class C; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Were you aware that, from November 2013, rivet-fix had tested as a C class product, not a B?
A. (Interpreted): No. I don't know whether we asked for class $C$ or whether it was the result of a test that made it C .
Q. You can see the results of a test set out on the page here, can't you? Have you any reason to believe that the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{s} 2$, d0 is not the result of a test?
A. (Interpreted): Well, very simply, at this time, Claude Wehrle I think wanted to obtain a more -- how can I say it? [ FT ] *** - - a more negative result than $B$, but I don't know if it relates specifically to that test. ${ }^{* * *}$
Q. Did you have a discussion at the time with Claude Wehrle
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about seeking a more negative result?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Underneath the C2 behaviour result, we see another box,
"Reynobond PE 'Cassette system'", and it says in the long rectangular box on the right of that, underneath the FIGRA, THR and SMOGRA figures:
"Stopping the test at 800 s out of 1260 s for widespread ignition. Best possible classification : E (ignition test)."

Then you see underneath that, Benoit Forest says:
"Following these results, can you tell me what you want to do?"

If you could read the text underneath the box there, Mr Schmidt, to yourself in the French. He says:
"You have the possibility to continue with the ignition test in order to envisage an E classification for both systems or to continue with SBI but only in order to obtain a C classification for the 'riveted' system since 'cassette' does not pass. Lastly, you can also decide to stop.
"We remain at your disposal for any further information and await your decision."

Were you aware at this time that, for the third time now -- we saw it in 2005, we saw it in 2011 -- the cassette test was stopped for widespread ignition? Were
you aware of that at the time?
A. (Interpreted): I can't be affirmative. I can't remember.
Q. Did you know that Arconic in fact decided to proceed with that ignition test and obtained an $E$ classification?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Now, take it from me that the $C$ classification was not recorded in any final classification report at the time, as opposed to the test report, the results of which we have here.

What looks to the Inquiry to have happened on the records is that, at this point, Arconic decided to classify all PE-cored Reynobond, whether rivet or cassette, as class E .

My question to you is: is that correct? Is it correct that Arconic decided to classify all PE-cored Reynobond, rivet or cassette, as class E?
A. (Interpreted): Once again, it's a decision that was taken at a commercial level, but I think it is right.
Q. You say you think I am correct in what I'm putting to you factually?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, I think so.
Q. Let's turn to January 2014 now, and we go to

Claude Wehrle's exhibit, part 4, at page 135,

## 39

\{MET00053158_P04/135\}, that's the English, and if we could also have up at the same time the French version at 140 \{MET00053158_P04/140\}. Same exhibit number, different page, page 140.

We can see -- English on the left, French on the right -- that here is a certificate, RA13-0333, to European Standard EN 13501, and if you look down to the text, you can see the commercial brand, Reynobond 55 PE, without identifying whether it's rivet or cassette. Can you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Look at the date, "Date of issue: January 31st, 2014", can you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Go to the bottom of the page. You will have to scroll up a little bit on the French version because it's cut off on the screen at the moment. I'll read the English, if you follow along, please, in the French, Mr Schmidt. It says:
"The document RA13-0333 dated January 31st, 2014 cancels and replaces the document RA11-0032 dated February 09th, 2011 and the document RA05-0005A dated January 07th, 2005."

That last reference is of course the reference to test 5A from January 2005 on the riveted system.
Q. Did anybody tell you at the time, January 2014, that Reynobond 55 PE was now classed as an E according to the European Standard?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Is that something that you would have expected at the
time to have been told?
A. (Interpreted): So my answer is not necessarily. What I understand is that there was a desire from the commercial management to make it known that PE had that E class for both systems, so I believe that is something that emanates from Merxheim, from the Merxheim management.
Q. At this time, end of January 2014, Mr Schmidt, it's

## point there says:

"Riveted or screwed system and cassette system on metal substructure."
Now, I've shown you this classification report. My question is: do you agree that the effect of this classification report is that, from 31 January 2014, Arconic had a formal classification report stating that all Reynobond PE, whether rivet or cassette, was classified as an E according to the European Standard?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.

If we scroll down to the next page in the English, page 141 \{MET00053158_P04/141\}, please, we can see the product description, and it says, just follow along with me:
"Composite panel consisting of a low density polyethylene core covered on both sides with a thermally bonded precoated aluminium sheet.
"Systems: riveted or cassette."
Can you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. If you scroll down to the next page, please, page 137 in the English \{MET00053158_P04/137\}, page 142 in the French \{MET00053158_P04/142\}, we can see the classification under section 4.2, and it says:
"Fire behaviour: E.
"Smoke production: Not applicable.
"Flaming droplets or debris: Not applicable."
Then the large box:
"Classification: E."
Then underneath that it says:
"This classification is valid for the following product parameters."

Then underneath that we can see "the following end use conditions". Underneath that, the first bullet
right, isn't it, that the BBA certificate $08 / 4510$ for Reynobond 55 was still in circulation; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. And it's right that that certificate still represented that all Reynobond PE achieved class B in the European tests?
A. (Interpreted): I believe that the certificate was still reminding of the original test in 2005.
Q. Yes, and my question is: why? Why was it not updated to state now that Reynobond 55 in PE had a class E?
A. (Interpreted): I find it difficult to answer. I don't believe that there was a desire to hide anything.
I think it's just something that was forgotten and nobody thought of establishing a link with the BBA certificate.
Q. Have you yourself conducted any kind of investigation within Arconic to seek to understand how it could have been the case that, notwithstanding the classification E from January 2014, the BBA certificate remained unamended?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Why is that?
A. (Interpreted ): Because we didn't establish -- we didn't express a link between the two things, in my view.
Q. I don't understand how there could have been no link
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between the BBA certificate stating that Reynobond 55 PE had a class $B$ on the one hand, and your knowledge on the other, Arconic's knowledge on the other, that it didn't, but instead had a class E. Clearly there is a link between the two, isn't there?
A. (Interpreted): That question of link is not exactly what I meant, but I believe that on one side Arconic and the commercial team wanted to inform about the PE having [ FT ] *** a class E, but on the other end I think that no one thought of making the change at BBA level. ***

And besides, I think it's something that would have been very easy to update during a BBA audit on that sort of question.
Q. Mr Schmidt, was it not Arconic's responsibility to make sure that the BBA certificate remained up to date and accurate?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, according to the sales condition that we talked about last week.
Q. So please explain to us how it was that the BBA certificate was allowed to become inaccurate, out of date and, as a result, I suggest to you, fundamentally misleading, in the sense that it would lead the reader into serious error?
A. (Interpreted ): Well, I mean, there are two things I would like to say: first, I don't think that there was
any desire to do what you're saying; and, secondly, in the case of -- in the BBA certificate, there's a number of sentences that remind the reader that whatever fire certification the product has got, people still have to carry out various checks and controls.
Q. Let's move on then to 2014, a few days later, February 2014.

Can we go, please, to Claude Wehrle's exhibit, part 4, page 134 at $\left\{\mathrm{MET00053158} \mathrm{\_P04/134} \mathrm{\}} \mathrm{} \mathrm{There} \mathrm{is} \mathrm{no}\right.$. French equivalent of this, I'm afraid, so I' II take this slowly.

You can see that this is an email from Claude Wehrle on 3 February 2014, and it's sent to the RAF liste commercial externe, the liste commercial interne, and also to the RAF liste commercial Reynobond. Do you see that? The subject is, "New fire European fire class for Reynobond PE".

The email says:
"Dear colleagues,
"[In bold] Please find enclosed the new fire reaction test report for Reynobond Architecture PE in accordance with EN 13501 Norm. The fire achieved classification is ' E '."

Then he continues:
"The previous ' $B$ ' class report done for Reynobond PE 45
in riveted system can no more be used from now.
"Indeed, this new report cancel all the previous reports."

He says at the end:
"I stay at your disposal if you have any further question."

We can see the email has two attachments, and one is the test in English and one is the test in French. To be clear, the test is the certificate dated
31 January 2014 which we've just seen and which says that all Reynobond 55 PE is classified as an E.

My question for you is: would you have expected Deborah French, as Arconic's UK sales representative at the time, to have known that that certificate was relevant to her market?
A. (Interpreted ): I think that, from a general point of view, I would have waited for all the commercial team to start discussing that with their customers, because it was public and our desire was, through the sales representative, to inform the market.
Q. So does that tell us that you expected Deborah French at the time to communicate this message to her UK customers?
A. (Interpreted): Certainly .
Q. Are you able to explain why she didn't?
A. (Interpreted ): No, I can't explain, but, I mean, I did see a document, I believe it might be something that was a joint document to -- something from Claude Wehrle, it was an email, I think, that was sent to
Taylor Maxwell - -
THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, the interpreter made a mistake.
A. (Interpreted): It's a document you find in Claude Wehrle's witness statement, and I believe it 's an email that was sent to Taylor Maxwell explaining the new class, and I think, therefore, there was some [FT ] *** information that was passed on to the market in England, *** even if only partially.

I believe that the attachment to that email was that fire test you've just shown previously.
MR MILLETT: Now, Deborah French told us in her evidence that she did not appreciate the relevance of this information to her market and carried on using the BBA certificate because that was what she had understood the message from Merxheim to be. That's what she told us at $\{$ Day88/140:22 $\}$ to $\{$ Day88/141:16\}.

My question is: to the best of your recollection, was Deborah French told by Merxheim to continue to use the BBA certificate in and after February 2014?
A. (Interpreted): I wouldn't be informed in detail about all of this, but I find it really difficult to
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understand how on the one side the commercial management would inform that the product has got
a classification $E$, and in the same time the same
commercial management would ask one of the salespeople
to carry on using a document that pretends it's --
THE INTERPRETER: Sorry.
A. (Interpreted): -- to knowingly carry on using
a BBA certificate that gives a classification B.
MR MILLETT: So can you account for why it was that
Deborah French was not told expressly not to put forward the BBA certificate anymore?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Now, we know from many documents seen in the Inquiry and from Ms French's evidence that, on 23 April 2014,
Deborah French sent the Reynobond BBA certificate to the cladding subcontractors, Harley, working on the Grenfell Tower project.

My question is: would you have expected that at that point Deborah French would have noticed the claim that Reynobond 55 PE had a class B?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, it 's probable.
Q. Would you have expected Deborah French to have told her customers that, although the certificate said class $B$,
in fact the product now had a class E?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. What system did Arconic have in place for ensuring that all sales representatives knew and understood that the European classification for this product had been significantly downgraded from a B?
A. (Interpreted): Well, we had the Claude Wehrle mail that sends a message to the whole sales team saying that it had a class E and that he was available for further information. And I believe the management, the management of the sales team, was also available in order to be able to answer any questions.
Q. What system was in place for catching up and keeping up with sales representatives so as to make sure that they understood that the European classification for this product had been downgraded?
A. (Interpreted): I don't think there was a system, but I think that Claude's mail saying that we had a B and then it was downgraded to E was sufficiently explicit.
Q. You see, it wasn't enough simply to tell Deborah French the results of this test; why not also tell her not any longer to use the BBA certificate?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know.
Q. I want to move forward in time to October 2014, because we can see that the designation for all Reynobond as PE did not last for the whole of that year. Just translate.
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## (Pause for translation)

Can I show you what Claude Wehrle says in his witness statement, please, $\{$ MET00053190/21\}, paragraph 70, in the French version of his statement at page 26 \{MET00048342/26\}. Paragraph 70 in both cases, please.

Let's just look at the very start of that paragraph together, you in the French, I' II read the English.

It says:
"The next EN 13501 testing that I organised on Reynobond 55 PE was later in 2014. It had become clear from discussions within AAP SAS and the wider market that, there was a desire to again have separate classification reports for the PE rivet and cassette variants to more accurately reflect the classifications that each had in practice obtained."

I just want to ask you about that sentence or two sentences.

First question: who in the wider market had a desire for a separate classification of rivet and cassette PE respectively?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know.
Q. Did Arconic have the same desire to separate out again the classifications as between cassette and rivet, do you know?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't know.
Q. Were you involved in this decision at all? I'm sorry, discussions. I will rephrase the question.
A. (Interpreted): No. I don't believe so. Absolutely.
Q. Do you know whether the classification of rivet PE as class E was affecting sales?
A. (Interpreted): I have no idea. I never saw the link.
Q. Let's look at the classification report, please. The English is at $\{$ ARC00000397\} and the French is at \{ARC_T000013\}.

We can see on the first page that it's classification RA14-0339 to the European Standard, and if you look at the bottom of that page, it has the date of issue: December 4, 2014. Can you see that?

The test report that forms the basis of this classification report is at \{MET00053158_P05/155\} and \{MET00053158_P05/146\} respectively in the English and French. There is no need to go to those, for our reference purposes.

If you look at page 4 in this document, please, in both languages $\{$ ARC00000397/4\} \{ARC_T000013/4\}.

Before you leave the document, I should have pointed out "Commercial brand(s)", it says "REYNOBOND 55 PE (riveted system)", can you see that?

Now, if you go to page 4, please, in this document,
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you will see the classification . Under paragraph 4.2,
"Classification ", there is the box:
"Fire behaviour: C.
"Smoke production: s2.
"Flaming droplets or debris: d0."
And underneath that:
"Classification: C-s2, d0."
And then underneath that, 4.3, "Field of application":
"This classification is valid for the following product parameters ..."

If you look at the last bullet point, do you see there it says, "Various colours"? Again, "plusieurs couleurs" in the French, so it could be various colours, some colours; do you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Under the second.

Beheader, end use conditions, it says:
"This classification is valid for the following end use conditions:
"- Riveted or screwed system on metal substructure."
Now, again, did you see this classification report at the time, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't believe so.
Q. Would you accept that what this would mean for the UK

$$
1
$$

applies to the cassette-fix. Do you accept that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Can we look at the classification report now for
completeness at \{MET00053158_P02/105\}. It's the same exhibit run, page 105 in the English and page 109 in the
French \{MET00053158_P02/109\}. On the left-hand side
English, right - hand side French. Just follow along in the French, please.
We can see here is the report number, RA13-0333, and the date, towards the bottom of the screen there, again is 4 December 2014. "Cassette system", it says in the middle of the page, "Commercial brand(s): REYNOBOND 55 PE (cassette system)". Can you --
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Go to page 107 in the English \{MET00053158_P02/107\}, 111
in the French $\{$ MET00053158_P02/111\}, we can see the
classification again under paragraph 4.2,
"Classification". In the box:
"Fire behaviour: E.
"Smoke production: Not applicable.
"Flaming droplets or debris: Not applicable.
" Classification : E."
Do you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, we don't see any record, any document, to show that
market at the time is that neither cassette nor rivet
would meet the European classification requirement for surface spread of flame, namely class B?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Do you know why the classification result was not immediately disseminated to the UK market?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. There was also a further test on PE cassette alone in 2014, and we can go to the test report. It's at \{MET00053158_P02/119\} in the English, and in the French page 113 of the same exhibit \{MET00053158_P02/113\}.

You can see that this is a fire reaction test report, also dated 4 December, and you can see at the very bottom of the page, it says:
"Modification of the document for elimination of the riveted system. Document RA13-0333 of 04 December 2014 cancels and replaces document RA13-0333 of 31 January 2014."

Can we go to page 121, please, in the English
\{MET00053158_P02/121\}, and 115 in the French
\{MET00053158_P02/115\}. We can see there that there's a reference to the November 2013 test on the cassette system. Do you see that?

It appears to be a re-issue of a 2013 class E test report for cassette, but this time to state that it only
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this classification test or the test data was provided to Deborah French, but she left in December 2014 and wasn't effectively replaced until 2015.
Peter Froehlich, I think, operated in her role during that period.

Do you know from your own knowledge whether this classification report was sent to the UK marketing team?
A. (Interpreted ): No, I don't know.
Q. Do you know --
A. (Interpreted): But I'm not sure if it would have been sent if the previous test had already given rise to a class E .
Q. Well, can you help me, what was the point, do you know -- and if you don't know, you don't know -- of separating out the two classifications for rivet and cassette respectively and then not sending the new classification reports for each product out to your sales teams?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't know.
Q. Now, I want to look with you at the documents in circulation in the Grenfell supply chain in the early part of 2015 now.

Can we go to $\{C E P 00053374\}$. This is an email from Neil Wilson of CEP, who was the fabricator of the cassette panels for application on the façade at
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Grenfell Tower. He sends this email to Mark Stapley of Harley, the subcontractors, on 7 January 2015. You can see that there are some attachments, and do you see that as the third attachment it says, "Reynobond BBA"? Do you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. The text of the email says:
"Please find attached details of the KH35 cassette system we use and all the other info we have for Reynobond."

The attachments that he sends -- we can see this from a document reference I shall give you, but we can see that it is still the same 2008 original
BBA certificate, take that from me, and that's
\{CEP00053377\}. There is no need to go to it.
My question is: can you explain why the original BBA certificate which says that Reynobond 55 PE had European class B was still circulating in the market as late as January 2015?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Can we look at another of the attachments which he sends, which is the Reynobond brochure. This is at \{CEP00053376\}, please. This is the "Discover new perspectives" brochure, which doesn't have a French translation. We have already seen a copy of this,

Mr Schmidt. It is the 2008 version, and we see that from page 16 \{CEP00053376/16\}. If we could just go down to page 16 to confirm that. It's written vertically on the right-hand side. It says, "BARC-RBAR-GB08."

If we go back to page 13 \{CEP00053376/13\} now, please, of the document and look at the right-hand side of the page, and blow that up so everybody can see that, we can see that at the top under "Certification" -- and again, Mr Schmidt, this is a document we saw last week -- it says that Reynobond PE obtains a B-s2, d0 classification pursuant to certificate RA05-0005A, which is the 2005 5A rivet test.

Do you agree with me -- here is my question -- that claims made in this document for European classification for PE as class B were, by January 2015, substantially out of date?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, as the document dates from 2008.
Q. Can you explain why your customers are still using this ancient piece of marketing literature that is not only substantially out of date, as you have agreed, but now materially wrong?
A. (Interpreted ): No, I didn't think that document was [ FT ] ${ }^{* * *}$ still available somewhere in house. ${ }^{* * *}$
Q. Do you mean by that answer that you didn't know that substantially out of date and materially wrong marketing
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literature was still in circulation in the UK market?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know at what time that literature was given to CEP, in that specific case, but I can't believe that this -- I can't believe that it was given at that time to CEP, when CEP sent it to its client, to Harley, Harley Façades.
MR MILLETT: Well, Mr Chairman, it's now just gone 1 o'clock. There are a few more questions on this topic to pursue with this witness, but I'm not going to finish that in a reasonable time before the necessary break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Should we stop there, then, Mr Millett?

Mr Schmidt, we will have a break now so we can all have some lunch. We will come back at 2 o'clock, please, our time, and please don't talk to anyone about your evidence over the break.

See you at 2 o'clock. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Thank you.
(1.03 pm)
(The short adjournment)
( 2.00 pm )
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to continue hearing evidence from Mr Schmidt this afternoon.

First, of course, I must check that the interpreters
are with us.
MS DELAS-REISZ: We're with you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you very much.
I can see Mr Schmidt in the thumbnail, so I hope he
can see me and hear me properly?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): I can hear you and see you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you very much.
So, Mr Millett, when you're ready, I think you can continue.
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, thank you very much.
Mr Schmidt, I'm going to take a short detour to cover something that needs to be corrected.

Now, if Madam Translator could translate as I go,
let me tell you what I want to do.
We have been informed by Arconic's lawyers that in some places in your evidence the interpreters did not translate the word "misleading" correctly. That is a matter of debate, but we need to be clear to avoid any dispute about the record of your evidence.

In order that we can be as clear as possible about what I intended by that word in the context of the questions, I'm going to put the questions again. There are three examples or three exchanges I want to go through with you, please.

What I'm going to do is to show you the transcript
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in English, and your original French, or the original
French will be read back to you, taken from the audio, and the question will be retranslated so that where the word "misleading" appears, it will be translated as
"wrong such as to lead a person into error".
Now, I'm going to show you the first of these exchanges. Can we please have the transcript for $\{$ Day $92 / 16\}$. This corresponds with the video and audio of your evidence on Day 92, part 1 of 2, at 1.01.14. I would like you to look, please, at the English at lines 12 to 17 . I will read the English and you will be read the French version of the question and answer.

Question at line 12 :
"Question: Do you accept that any certificate that allowed the reader to believe that the product performed the same in a fire whether it was rivet-fix or cassette-fix would be misleading?
"(Pause)
"Answer: (Interpreted): Yes."
I want to ask the interpreters to translate my question using the new French word for "misleading" in the sense in which I intended it. Could you please do that?
THE INTERPRETER: It's been done, Mr Millett.
MR MILLETT: With my question retranslated with the new

## phrase for "misleading" --

## THE INTERPRETER: Yes.

MR MILLETT: -- is your answer the same?
(Pause for translation)
THE INTERPRETER: So Mr Schmidt would like to hear the question asked again, and he would also like -- or I'm to clarify the interpretation of "misleading".
MR MILLETT: I'm not going to do that. I'm going to pursue my course, Mr Schmidt. I'm going to put the question I put to you on Day 92 again, and I'm going to ask for the translator to translate the word "misleading" in the way she translated it before, and we will see how we go.

Now, the question is -- can we have the transcript back, please -- line 12 :
"Question: Do you accept that any certificate that allowed the reader to believe that the product performed the same in a fire whether it was rivet-fix or cassette-fix would be misleading?"
(Pause)
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. \{Day92/46:20-24\}, the same process again, Mr Schmidt, please. The question at line 20, in English, was:
"Question: Do you accept that in presenting the rivet test 5A only to the BBA as representative of the fire performance of Reynobond 55 PE, Arconic was telling
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the BBA a misleading half truth?"
If the translation could be given again using the more appropriate word, please.
(Pause for translation)
The answer was, "Yes, you can see it like that".
With the new translation of the question, Mr Schmidt, is your answer the same?
A. (Interpreted): And what was the previous interpretation?

MR MILLETT: Well, Madam Interpreter, can you assist?
MS KENNEDY: Sadly not. I think maybe this was "induire en erreur" was used this time.
MS DELAS-REISZ: I think it was.
MS KENNEDY: My colleague is confirming --
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm sorry to interrupt. I think this is becoming quite confusing for Mr Schmidt, because he is trying to understand the words that were used last time and what's used this time.

I wonder whether it would be sensible simply to translate the question using the new formulation and see what his answer is.
MR MILLETT: Thank you, Mr Chairman, but he had asked to be shown the earlier word.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'll explain to him.
Mr Schmidt, I think the way this is being put to you is a little confusing. So what I'm going to do is to
ask Mr Millett to identify the questions with which he's concerned, I'm going to ask the interpreter to translate them for you, and you just answer them again, without worrying how they were translated last time. All right?

## THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. Thank you.

## Mr Millett.

MR MILLETT: Can we go back to the transcript, please. Question in English:
"Question: Do you accept that in presenting the rivet test 5 A only to the BBA as representative of the fire performance of Reynobond 55 PE, Arconic was telling the BBA a misleading half truth?
"Answer: (Interpreted): Yes, you can see it like that."

That was the question. Your answer before was, "Yes, you can see it like that".

With the new translation, is your answer the same?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, the only thing for me is that it wasn't done consciously, because there was a doubt with regard to the fire certificate $5 B$.
Q. Thank you.

Now, I'm going to show you the last passage, which is quite long, $\{\operatorname{Day} 92 / 74: 3-25\}$, and also $\{$ Day $92 / 75: 17\}$. Let's start with the beginning of those two, please,
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line 3 at page 74. Follow the same process, please,
Mr Schmidt, if we can, and I'll stop after each
exchange.
Question in English:
"Question: Can you explain why the certificate does not state that the test result, Euroclass B-s2, d0 was achieved for PE only in the rivet form but not in the cassette form?"

Your answer was "No". I don't need that to be retranslated.

We now come to the question:
"Question: Do you accept that that omission made the certificate thoroughly misleading?"

Your answer was "Yes". Is your answer still the same with the new translation?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, but with the same comment that was made previously.
Q. Continuing --

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Millett, I wonder whether we need to continue, because the witness has said that his answer would be the same with the gloss that he's just put on it. In other words, as I understand his evidence, he did not misunderstand the thrust of the previous questions.
MR MILLETT: Well, Mr Chairman, I'm more than content to
rest on that basis, with the exchange. I should just draw to your and the public's attention the fact that this exchange continues over a number of pages, and the word "misleading" or "very misleading" occurs again in the transcript, but I think we have the thrust of it. I think the witness has understood the point.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Unless you think that the context is such that it requires a re-evaluation of the translation of the word "misleading", I think we've got the picture pretty clear.
MR MILLETT: I think that is right.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Schmidt, I should just explain for your benefit my intervention. It seemed to me from the answers you gave to the last three questions that your understanding of the word "misleading", however translated from English into French, was pretty clear.
A. (Interpreted): I believe there are two levels. Firstly, I said "no" to one question, which said do you know why test B wasn't mentioned. I believe, and this is just a belief, it's not based on facts, but I don't think it was at all deliberate not to mention it, but that there was a misunderstanding or bad understanding with regard to the results of the test. But at the same time, the certificate can mislead, especially if you look at the results of the test, the part relating to the results of
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the test, without reading the rest.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, that's very helpful, thank you very much.

Mr Millett, it seems to me that, insofar as there's concern over the translation of the word "misleading", the witness has not indicated that he would give a different answer to the different use of the French word. Whether it's important to explore the question whether any misleading was deliberate or just fortuitous is a different matter which doesn't turn on the word "misleading", and I'm not sure you need to follow that up any further than you have already.
MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I'm very grateful. I agree.
So can I then go back to where I left off at the lunch break.

Mr Schmidt, you will remember that at the lunch break we were discussing what had happened in early 2015 and why it was that the 2008 sales brochure for Reynobond was still in circulation among customers. That was the context.
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Do you agree that as soon as or within a reasonable time after the fire classifications for Reynobond RB 55 PE in both rivet and cassette were achieved, at the end of 2014, those should have been communicated immediately or
as soon as reasonably possible to the customers?
A. (Interpreted ): Yes, at the end of 2014?
Q. Yes.
A. (Interpreted): But we'd already done the necessary at the beginning of 2014 within the sales team.
Q. Do you accept that, as a result of the early December classifications for rivet and cassette, Arconic should have immediately updated its customer-facing literature and told the sales teams to distribute it?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't think that was the practice.
Q. It may not have been the practice, but would it not have been best practice at the very lowest?
A. (Interpreted): It would certainly have been a best practice, yes. But I'm assuming that the documentation on the site must have been up to date.
Q. What site?
A. (Interpreted): On Arconic Merxheim's internet site.
Q. Do you accept that Arconic should have taken positive steps to withdraw its marketing literature that stated the wrong fire performance and classification?
A. (Interpreted): No, I think it's impossible to do.
Q. Do you not accept that Arconic should have withdrawn all out-of-date and inaccurate marketing literature as soon as it discovered that the fire performance and classification was different for Reynobond 55 PE from
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the performance or classification represented to the market?
A. (Interpreted): But I think that anyway this update was made in the inventories, but I don't think we necessarily have traceability for marketing documents for current clients or potential clients.
Q. No, Mr Schmidt. I understand that. But you should have done, is what I'm suggesting.

Let me be clear: I'm suggesting to you that Arconic should have had a system in place whereby all of its sales representatives ensured that their marketing literature that was in circulation in their markets was up to date and accurate. Do you accept that?
A. (Interpreted): It's difficult.

> (Pause)

No, I don't accept that.
Q. Are you telling us that you were prepared to accept a situation where your marketing and salesforces selling Reynobond 55 were allowing out-of-date and inaccurate marketing material to circulate within those markets without correcting them?
A. (Interpreted): These documents were completely available on request and I think that the up-to-date documents were available on our internet site. If since 2008 there had been a few iterations, nevertheless the
up-to-date documents were on our site.
Q. Could we then go, moving on, please, to your exhibit 10 at page 260. This is $\{$ MET00053157/260\}.

Now, this is an email from Diana Perreiah on
24 June 2014 to you. It's in English, Mr Schmidt, and there's no (inaudible) French original.
A. (Interpreted): It's 2015.
Q. You're quite right. 2015. Do you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. There is no French version of this. It didn't come to you in the French version, it came in English to you.
Did you read and understand it when it came to you, do you think, looking at it?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. It says - - and I'll read it in English, but just because

I'm asking you questions about it, it will be translated into French:
"Nick and Claude,
"Could I impose on you both to send me your definitions of PE, FR, A1 and A2? I want to make sure I have them correct if comes up next day or two regarding investments and work on low cost FR core I am also not certain if the definitions are regionally based on universal.
"Thank you.
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"Diana."
If we go up to page 259 \{MET00053157/259\}, please, we can see your response, in English, Diana Perreiah, same day, 24 June 2015, and you say:
"I've asked Claude Wehrlé, sales technical support, to prepare you an answer. The definitions will be the same. The only difference will be the suitability of the fire rated products to country laws.
"CS."
I' II not have that translated back into French because that's risky. You replied in English and I shall leave it there.

If we go up to the email second from the top dated 24 June 2015 again, this is from Claude Wehrle to you, and it's also in the French, and we have that at page 257 in the same exhibit \{MET00053157/257\}, if we can have those up side by side. You can see that Claude Wehrle says to you:
"Claude, Robert,
"I propose the attached table in answer to Diana's question."

You can see that on the right-hand side in the French as well.

Then above that, Claude Wehrle follows up, again asking you if you have any questions. He says to you,

Mr Schmidt:
"Claude,
"We have just reread the document together with
Robert and are proposing this last version to you.
"We are at your disposal if you have any questions."
You can see the French version on the right --
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. -- of the screen.

Then if we go to page 261 \{MET00053157/261\} we can see the attachment that he sent you. Again, this is only in English.

When you received this attachment from Mr Wehrle,
did you read it, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, certainly, yes.
Q. And are you certain about it now because this was something your American senior or boss, perhaps, was asking you about?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, let's look at the attachment. As I say, it 's only in English, we don't have a French version.

At the top left of the table, we can see that this is about "AAP Product", we see that in the top left-hand of the column there. If we look at the top row the headers are, "Other equivalent products", "Fire class according", "Criteria", "Typical application".
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Then if we look at the bottom two rows, it says,
"Reynobond B1 (Called FR)", and in the third column it says:
"Very limited contribution to fire.
". B (Euro class EN13501) B1 DIN4102 Germany)."
Do you see that?
Then in the right-hand column it says:
"Maximal building height of 28 m to 35 m depending the country."

Then in the very bottom row it says:
"Reynobond B2 (Called PE).
"Plastic based insulation products."
Then fire class was:
"Flammable.
". C to E (Euro class EN13501 B2 ...)"
With the German classification too. Criteria :
"Limitations given by the smoke production and flaming droplets."

Typical application, do you see this:
"Maximal building height of 8 m to 12 m depending the country."
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Can we take it from your receiving this document that you knew at this time, mid-2014, as a matter of
principle, that PE should not be used on buildings

> higher than 12 metres?
> A. (Interpreted ): Well, to give you the position of this document, it's something that Diana needed and she says -- it's clear in her original mail, she explained that she needs it. She became the head of that division, I think, around that period or maybe a few months earlier, and she wanted to have the main ideas, the main axis(?), the main orientations for the various products and their application. But it's not very [ FT ] *** specific, and it just gives a general overview of the different products. ***
> Q. Who produced this document, was it Arconic in-house?
> A. (Interpreted): I think it's Claude Wehrle that produced it, yes.
> Q. So, Mr Schmidt, however general or non-specific you think now this document might be, this document was telling you, wasn't it, that for PE, its application was limited to buildings that did not exceed a certain height? Now, you knew that from this document, didn't you?
> A. (Interpreted): Yes, I think that we -- I'm not sure whether it's really in this period, but it must be around that time, I believe that we also changed our marketing documentation to reflect these general rules.
> Q. Sitting there today, can you remember a single piece of
marketing literature which told customers in the UK that
Reynobond 55 PE should not be used above 18 metres?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know exactly when that document was distributed, but I know that at some point we had a marketing document where you could see a drawing, the picture of a building. I mean -- so it wasn't specific in fact to the British market, this document, but it showed clearly that there were two levels, that a PE product could be used up to a certain level and an FR product could be used to a certain level again, and beyond a certain height you had to use an A2 product. And I remember the drawing.
Q. Let's see if I can put my finger on the document, to give you a fair chance to identify it rather than us guessing.

Could you please be shown $\{$ ARC00000465\}. The French version of this document, I think we've got it at \{ARC_T000001\}.

Now, take a moment to look at that document. If it can be expanded a little bit, we can work with the French and the English, I think, and expand them, so that we can look at the text.

If you turn to the next page \{ARC00000465/2\} \{ARC_T000001/2\}, I think you see the little building in the document. Is this the document that you're
referring to, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): Yes. Yes, that's what came to my mind.
Q. This document is dated December 2016, and we can see
that if you -- I'm afraid it's too small on my screen to be able to see that, but I think it's at the top. If you go to page 1 \{ARC00000465/1\} \{ARC_T000001/1\} and go to the middle of the page --it's not that easy to see. It's very difficult to see. But it's in the middle. If you zoom into the top right-hand of the page, there is some print going up, and I just want to quickly show you where the date is. I don't know if that could be expanded at all.

Let me ask you: do you remember seeing this document before December 2016?
A. (Interpreted): No, I've absolutely no historical or specific reference.
Q. Right. I'm afraid it is actually very difficult to see it, but take it from me that it is the last set of digits on the run of tiny text running up from the bottom to the top of the page below the blue mark that says "Arconic". I'm afraid I can't show it to you. You'll have to take it from me, I'm afraid, and if that's wrong, we will have to work on the basis that that's wrong, but the document shows it to be December 2016.
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My question for you is: do you have a recollection
that you saw this document any earlier than December 2016?
A. (Interpreted): No, I mean, I couldn't say specifically once again. I mean, I know that the document existed, but I couldn't tell you very specifically, very precisely, when it was launched.
Q. No, quite.

Could we just go back, please, to the attachment to Mr Wehrle's email to you which had the table in it \{MET00053157/261\}. If you just look at that, my question there, getting the document back for you again, is: do you know whether that table was sent to Diana Perreiah?
A. (Interpreted): Well, it's a bit difficult to be $100 \%$ certain of anything, but I'm practically sure that it was done.
Q. Yes.

Now, I want to move forward a few days in June 2015, Mr Schmidt. Can we please have \{MET00053158_P05/14\}. In the French, it's at page 12 \{MET00053158_P05/12\}. At the very bottom of page $14--$ if we can have the French up as well, please, at page 12, same exhibit run. Yes, it is actually the same email -- no, it's not. Right.

What I want is the very bottom of page 14 , which you
will see is an email from Hervé Marichez, 29 June 2015,
to Claude Wehrle. I think you will need page 13 for the French. No, that's not correct. If we could just scroll back up, please, in the French and go a little bit higher up page 12. Yes. There it is.

So what we need, I think, is the email at the top of page 15 \{MET00053158_P05/15\}, and in the French stay on page 12. That's what I want. If you go to the bottom of page $12--$ yes, there we are. Sorry, it's my fault for getting the geography wrong here.

This is an email from Hervé Marichez on Monday, 29 June 2015 at 14.11 to Claude Wehrle, copied, as you can see, among others, to Lionel Marconnet. He says, and if you follow in the French, I' II read the English:

## "Claude,

"In the official Technical Data Sheet (attached), it is stipulated that PE \& FR are M1, but since PE is now $C-s 2, d 0$ (riveted \& screwed), it should be M2!
"We need to [respond] quickly - am I right?"
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, at this point, just correct me, I think Lionel Marconnet was not yet the director of sales and marketing; it was still Alain Flacon, wasn't it, June 2015?
A. (Interpreted ): I'm not certain. I don't know.
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[^0]Q (inaudible) specifically, but before June 2015.
A. (Interpreted): He'd already mentioned and expressed the fact that PE could be dangerous.
Q. If it was dangerous, why were you still selling it?
A. (Interpreted): Well, I go back to something I've already said, and I go back to the same reply: there are lots of
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products that are on sale and that are sold every day, and -- in a very general way, and these products may entail dangers or risks, and these risks and dangers can be controlled in various ways, in various manners.
Q. But, Mr Schmidt, here is Mr Wehrle expressing his opinion, which is that PE is dangerous on façades and everything should have been transferred to FR as a matter of urgency.

My question is: what business does Arconic have in selling products that it knows to be dangerous?
A. (Interpreted ): I can't say any more than what I have already said on this subject.
Q. Very well.

Going a little bit higher up the email in the second paragraph he says:
"I was told that, for the time being, in France, it is the French standard that is required (therefore NFP $92-\mathrm{M} 1) \ldots$ and that it would be excessive to communicate on the subject."

Do you know who told Mr Wehrle that it would be excessive to communicate on the subject?
A. (Interpreted) : No.
Q. When he says, "This Opinion is technical and anti-commercial, it seems", was Claude Wehrle told that his opinion was technical and anti-commercial?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. As a matter of fact, did the senior management team at Merxheim oppose discontinuing the sale of PE on commercial grounds?
A. (Interpreted): No. I don't think that it's that sort of reflection that took place, but there was still part of the market for which PE products were perfectly adapted and $I$ think that was the position of the management. There were possibilities of selling PE products, and they wouldn't push PE rather than something else, but there were still parts of the market where PE was perfectly well adapted and they were not going to stop all that part of the market.
Q. Did the management of Arconic choose simply to ignore Mr Wehrle's warning that PE is dangerous in façades and substitute his view for something more commercial?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Did you dismiss Mr Wehrle's warning on the basis that he was a prophet without honour in his own land?
A. (Interpreted): I don't really understand that saying.
Q. Well, let me try and ask you to interpret his smiley face then. What's that about?
"This Opinion is technical and anti-commercial, it seems [smiley face]."

I know you didn't put the smiley face there or see
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it at the time, Mr Schmidt, to be fair to you, but are you able to explain why Claude Wehrle thought it was appropriate to add a smiley face at the end of the sentence, "This Opinion is technical and anti-commercial"?
A. (Interpreted): No, I can't say.
Q. Was it that Mr Wehrle was a lone voice in Arconic who, by this time, was trying to tell senior management that the use of PE on façades was dangerous, but he was being ignored for commercial reasons? Is that what was happening?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Well, isn't the truth here that Arconic knew that PE was dangerous in façades but continued to sell it in those markets where it could?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Now, just a brief question about the communications between Arconic and the BBA between October 2013 and the spring of 2015.

Just in general terms, would you have expected Arconic's executives, when asked by the BBA for information, to have been responsive?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Would you have expected Arconic to provide all the information to the BBA that the BBA asked for?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Would you have expected Arconic's people to point out any information that they thought might be of relevance or interest to the BBA?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. If Arconic wasn't sure if information was relevant or of interest, do you agree that Arconic should have offered it to the BBA and let the BBA decide for itself?
A. (Interpreted): According to the level of information, yes.
Q. Now, moving on, then, into 2016, let's go to exhibit 10 , please, of your exhibits at page 267 \{MET00053157/267\}, and in the French it's at page 265 \{MET00053157/265\}. This is an email from Alain Flacon of 3 May 2016. The French is on the right, and you can see that there are a number of people it's sent to. If you just follow the French and I'II read the English:
"Good morning all,
"As you know, the fire classifications of Reynobond products for Architecture in France present a distortion between the NF P92-501 classification and its equivalent according to EN 13501."

Then it sets out:
"Reynobond PE.
" - Riveted ...
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"NF P92-501 M1 ...
EN13501 C-s2, d0 ... (M2 by equivalence).
". Cassette system.
"NF P92-501 M1 classification.
"EN 13501 E classification (M4 by equivalence)."
". Reynobond FR.
". All systems."
And then the classifications are set out there.
Then he goes on to say:
"This ambiguous situation is open to interpretation and in particular gives control offices the possibility to check the M classification as a priority, as the European classification is more complex to understand and to use.
"In your missions, either you or your customers regularly specify our Reynobond products on large-scale architectural projects. As such, Alcoa Architectural Products clearly positions itself as a 'knowledgeable' entity and therefore assumes its responsibility and image as a specialist."

If we could turn the page, please \{MET00053157/268\} \{MET00053157/266\}, he goes on:
"As a result, since we are aware of the very significant difference in the heating capacities of Reynobond FR vs. Reynobond PE and the associated
consequences, we have taken the proactive habit of favouring FR as the only solution in our specifications. As from today, [and this is in bold] I ask you to go even further and to systematically confirm in writing the requirement in FR for all projects on which a Reynobond specification is involved, regardless of the nature and size of the project for Architecture.
"If you have any questions about the application of these instructions, please contact Claude who will give you all the necessary information to justify this choice and advise the specifiers as best as possible towards this solution, which is by far the most secure.
"I am counting on your active cooperation on this matter."

This is 3 May 2016.
Now, it looks from this, do you agree, that there was ambiguity at the very least in France about understanding the two fire performance systems, the national system and the European system?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Can you explain why, although this policy was adopted or at least recommended in France, it wasn't adopted or recommended in the United Kingdom?
A. (Interpreted): No, I can't explain it. One of the explanations could be that the French legislation was
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better known than the English legislation or other legislations in Europe.
Q. But aren't the circumstances which pertained in France equally applicable to the situation in the UK, namely this ambiguity or mismatch, perhaps, as between the European system and the domestic system?
A. (Interpreted ): With the knowledge I have now, for sure, but I don't know whether that was the way of thinking at the time.
Q. What accounts for that difference? What accounts for the difference between the way of thinking at the time and what you know now?
A. (Interpreted): I was not at all -- I didn't know at all the English legislation at the time.
Q. No, but you knew that there was a difference at least between the French legislation and the European legislation. Why did Arconic not ever consider the position of each country where Reynobond 55 was sold and consider the relative positions as between the domestic legislation there and the European legislation?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know.
Q. Did anybody think, do you know, whether they should have another look at the BBA certificate, and the statement in it that because Reynobond 55 PE had a Euroclass B, it may be regarded as class 0 for the purposes of England

## A. (Interpreted): Yes.

MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, it's now 3.15. It might be an appropriate moment for the afternoon break. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Very well.

Well, I expect you would like a short break now,
Mr Schmidt, so we'll take a break. We will resume at
3.30, please. As usual, don't discuss your evidence
with anyone else over the break, please.
Good, see you at 3.30. Thank you.
(3.15 pm)
(A short break)
(3.30 pm)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We are going back to Mr Schmidt in just a moment, but first
I' II check that the interpreters are with us.
Hello, interpreters.
MS DELAS-REISZ: Hello, sir, we're here, we're with you, and we can hear you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you very much.
Then we had better check that Mr Schmidt is back
with us.
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THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): I'm with you, I can hear you and see you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much, Mr Schmidt.
Anything you want to raise before we carry on?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): No.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Thank you very much. Then
I' II invite Mr Millett to continue.
Yes, Mr Millett.
MR MILLETT: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.
Mr Schmidt, I want to ask you some questions now about the period after the Grenfell Tower fire on
14 June 2017. Can we start with your witness statement,
please, at paragraph 27, in the English at page 9
\{MET00053187/9\}, in the French at page 13
\{MET00048331/13\}.
If you follow in the French, the whole of
paragraph 27 is on the screen in front of you. We will need to flip to the next page in the English when we get to it.

Starting at the beginning of paragraph 27, if I may, you say this:
"As from 26 June 2017, AAP SAS made the decision to stop supplying Reynobond 55 with a PE core for architectural use in high-rise applications (a copy of the template letter used to inform its customers of this
is exhibited at page 6 and a press release confirming
the position is at page 9). This decision was effected
by AAP SAS ceasing to manufacture Reynobond 55 PE at
Merxheim (this was not a product of which stock was retained as it was always manufactured to order). Such decision was not made because AAP SAS believed Reynobond PE to be inherently dangerous, nor because there was any prohibition on its sale for use on buildings above a certain height. It does, however, have certain characteristics which, if it is used incorrectly, can increase the risk of fire spread. That is, the core is made of polyethylene, which is a plastic. If that is exposed to a heat source, it will burn. Incorrect use (for example in a poorly carried out refurbishment where its use in combination with other materials has not been properly assessed) can therefore mean that in the event of a fire, the risk of that fire spreading is increased. The company's assessment, made very quickly after the Grenfell Tower fire, was that its product had been used incorrectly. As such, the trust and confidence which AAP SAS had previously had that the supply chain was complying with relevant regulatory regimes, so that its product was being used in a way which was safe, was lost. As AAP SAS is a component part product manufacturer that does not exercise control on its
ultimate use, including what other materials it may be used in combination with, the most expeditious way for AAP SAS to prevent future misuse was to stop supply."

I've read that to you in its entirety.
You go on to say at the beginning of paragraph 28 $\{$ MET00053187/10\}, if we just look at the bottom of the page in the French:
"In addition to ceasing to manufacture Reynobond 55 PE at Merxheim, in the wake of the Grenfell Tower fire, AAP SAS started to request additional information from customers as a prerequisite for any order/product delivery of Reynobond."

And you give an example.
What was incorrect, as you call it, about how
Reynobond 55 PE cassette had been used at Grenfell Tower?
A. (Interpreted): We've learned very quickly that it had been combined with an insulating product that was flammable, inflammable, and I think at the time that's the essence of our reflection.
Q. Did you ever, or did Arconic ever market Reynobond 55 PE with a warning that those customers buying it and installing it had to take very careful account of what insulation product they were using it with?
A. (Interpreted ): No, I don't think so.
Q. No.

Did Reynobond 55 PE cassette not perform exactly at Grenfell Tower as the CSTB European tests on cassette had repeatedly shown for the previous 12 years?
A. (Interpreted): Well, maybe, yes, but nonetheless it didn't explain why the fire didn't remain contained on the outside of the building.
Q. I'm not asking you about the fire penetration within the building. When we're looking at external fire spread, I want you to tell me and confirm that PE 55 in cassette form performed exactly as the CSTB European tests showed it would.
A. (Interpreted): I wouldn't say exactly the same, but in a similar way, probably.
Q. What investigations did Arconic do in the 12 days between the fire on 14 June 2017 and 26 June 2017 to discover what you call the incorrect use of Reynobond PE 55 cassette at Grenfell Tower?
A. (Interpreted): I can't describe it in a very precise way.
Q. Did you have an expert's report or some technical investigation with a report to tell you that the external fire spread at Grenfell Tower was as a result of incorrect use?
A. (Interpreted ): No, I would say no, I don't think so, and
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most of the assessments were based on public information that was published day by day.
Q. Isn't the reality that Grenfell, so far as the use of Reynobond 55 PE in cassette was concerned, was an accident waiting to happen and, once it happened, only then did you withdraw it from the market?
A. (Interpreted): Maybe yes, but again, I mean, we were among the only ones to withdraw the products from the market, if we consider what our competitors were doing at the time, and it's because we felt we couldn't [ FT ] ${ }^{* * *}$ control, and we didn't have the necessary resources and means to control the whole chain. ${ }^{* * *}$
Q. If you couldn't control the whole of the supply chain, wasn't that all the more reason not to continue to sell PE, which all the tests told you was a dangerous product?
A. (Interpreted): I didn't understand your question, sir.
Q. You said in your answer that you felt you couldn't control the whole of the supply chain. Isn't that fact, the fact that you couldn't control the whole of the supply chain, a good reason to stop selling
Reynobond PE 55, at least in cassette form?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, did you know that just shortly before the fire, the BBA project manager had decided to remove the reference
$-25$

```
    to the cassette-fix from the BBA certificate? Did you
    know that?
A. (Interpreted): Just before, no, but I certainly don't remember.
Q. Are you able to tell us why the BBA did not decide to remove the reference to the cassette-fix variant of Reynobond 55 PE at any earlier time?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Now, do you remember that in July 2017, a month after the Grenfell Tower fire, you had communications with the BBA?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Let's go to \(\{\mathrm{MET} 00053157 / 397\}\). This is a letter dated 17 July 2017 to Simon Wroe at the BBA. If you turn to page 398 \{MET00053157/398\}, we can see a signature. That's your signature there, isn't it ?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Did you write this letter?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Who did?
A. (Interpreted): Our advisers.
Q. Which advisers?
A. (Interpreted): Our lawyers.
Q. When you signed it, did you read it first ?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
```
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Q. Did you read it in English or was a French translation 1 provided to you before you signed it?
A. (Interpreted): I read it in English and I don't believe there exists a French translation.
Q. No. Can we proceed, then, with this letter, on the basis that you understand the text in it well enough to answer questions on the text?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Now, we can see the date of the letter, and let's start on the second page of the letter at page 398, please. You say in the second paragraph there:
"We are not discontinuing the production and sale of Reynobond PE, however, because it has non-high-rise and other uses. We will continue to supply the product for those applications."

Now, my question is: is that when and the manner in which Arconic told the BBA that it was going to continue to sell Reynobond PE?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, we still had orders on our order book, and also [ FT ] ${ }^{* * *}$ we started sending our clients questionnaires to carry out extra checks on the use of PE because it was not yet clear whether we were going to entirely stop PE production. ${ }^{* * *}$
Q. Can we go to the same exhibit run at page 389 \{MET00053157/389\}, please. This is an email from

Claude Wehrle to Simon Wroe on 20 July 2017 at 13.23.
If you look at the text, he says:
"Dear Simon,
"Please find below the answer sent on behalf of M Claude Schmidt, our General Manager, out of the office today."

If you look at the text immediately below that, it says, "Dear Mr Wroe", and if you scroll down to the very bottom of that page, page 389, you will see there is a printed signature, which is yours there,
"Claude Schmidt, General Manager".
My question is: before Mr Wehrle sent this email to Mr Wroe, did you approve this text?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Did you do so in English or, again, was there a French translation?
A. (Interpreted): I think it was only in English --
Q. Let's look at it .
A. (Interpreted): - there again.
Q. Again, if I ask you questions about this without having it translated into French, I am assuming -- is this right? -- that you will be able to understand your own text in English; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, I hope so.
Q. If you're having trouble, of course, please say and we
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can have it translated.
You say in the second paragraph:
"Your intention to alter the certification process so that it no longer aligns with the operation of the building codes may indicate to the general public and industry in general that use of ACM PE above 18 m is not allowed under the current UK building codes. As you know, under those current codes, the product can be used over 18 m , provided that the cladding system achieves BRE 135 or desk top study compliance is achieved. We think this is important because there are a number of high rise buildings that we understand to have been reviewed by others and found to be compliant with the code using ACM PE as a component of their cladding system.
"For Arconic, this distinction is irrelevant because, as noted in our July 17 letter, we have nevertheless decided to discontinue supply of ACM PE for high rise applications. Our decision was taken out of an abundance of caution, due to the inconsistency of building codes across the world and the fact that the Company does not control the ultimate design and installation of final cladding systems. (As requested, please find attached our customer letter setting forth this decision.)
Q. Now, it went out under your signature. Is it right that at this point you had a very detailed understanding, or at least a detailed understanding, of the UK
Building Regulations, because you refer to, for example, BRE 135?
A. (Interpreted): For me, whether I had detailed understanding, no, but Claude Wehrle and his team had been much more into details as far as the British legislation is concerned, and I will attest that it was also carried out with the support of our lawyers.

## Q. Maybe.

Are you aware, or were you aware at the time, of any successful full system tests under BS 8414 to the BRE 135 criteria involving Reynobond 55 PE in cassette form?
A. (Interpreted): BS 8414, no.
Q. We saw earlier that Claude Wehrle thought back in 2011 at the Freiburg meeting that Reynobond PE could not pass 97
a BS 8414 test, didn't we?
A. (Interpreted): Well, if we saw it before, yes.
Q. So what was the point of your referring here to the cladding system achieving compliance with BRE 135 or a desktop study if in fact it had never been tested under a British Standard test in order to achieve the criteria under BRE 135?
A. (Interpreted): What I understand is that there are various ways of obtaining the validation of a given product for a given façade, and the BS 8414 is one of the possible tests. But it concerns a whole system and, as far as I know, we never carried it out at Merxheim.
Q. No. And never carried it out before the fire at Grenfell and never carried it out either afterwards, did you?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't think so, no.
Q. Let's trace through the story of the new certificate.

Can we please turn to page 399 in this run \{MET00053157/399\}. This is an email from Denise Flitton-Weinstein to Nicolas Remy, and she attaches a draft of the new certificate which we can see at page 400; I' II come to that in a moment. Just on this email, she says, you will note, that the certificate specifies a height limit of 18 metres for the installation of the product. Can you see that?

```
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. If you go down to page 400 {MET00053157/400}, first of
    all, there is the certificate she attaches. If you go
    down to page 411 {MET00053157/411}, we can see that on
    25 July 2017, Claude Wehrle responds to
    Denise Flitton-Weinstein, copying you in, as well as
    Simon Wroe. Do you see that?
            Did you read this email at the time, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): For sure.
Q. If we scroll down to the bottom of the page, please, we
    can see a list -- and there is no French version of
    this, I'll have it translated for you into French -- and
    there are five numbered comments. Can you see? Or five
    changes that Mr Wehrle suggests.
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Yes.
Did you, at the time, think that Claude Wehrle had read the draft certificate that was being sent carefully so that he was able to make these suggestions?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, I believe so.
Q. Let's look at the certificate, then, that was issued in August 2017, a few weeks later. \{BBA00000046\}, please, that's the English version. French version at \{ARC_T000002\}, please. If it could be expanded a little bit on the screen, we can see that on page 1 we now have
```
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```
a rather shorter building than the original building, and if you look down to "Key factors assessed" below the picture -- in the French it's "Facteurs clés évalués" -do you see two down it says, "Behaviour in relation to fire", "Comportement par rapport au feu"? Do you see that?
A. Oui.
Q. Read in the French, I' II read the English aloud. It says:
"Behaviour in relation to fire - the panels have a \(B-s 2, d 0\) or a \(B-s 1, d 0\) reaction to fire classification to BS EN 13501-1:2007 depending on the grade chosen. The use of both panel grades is restricted to buildings up to 18 metres in height, unless specific conditions are met (see section 7)."
Do you see that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. At the bottom of page 3 \{BBA00000046/3\} \{ARC_T000002/4\},
if we can turn to that, please, I' II just show you
a little bit more of the certificate so that you have it mostly in mind.
It says, at paragraph 1.3, under "Technical Specification", right at the bottom of page 3, but in the French I think it's page 4:
"The panels are mechanically fastened to the
```

aluminium sub-frame using aluminium rivets forming
an open-jointed cladding system. Details of panel mountings are shown in Figure 1."

Then if you go over the page, please $\{B B A 00000046 / 4\}$
\{ARC_T000002/5\}, to paragraph 1.4, we can see it says:
"The flat panels can be formed into cassettes with different flange widths and fixed to the aluminium subframe by means of T -slots fitting onto pins."

Do you see that?
If you look at footnote 1 underneath that, it says:
"The manufacturing and the use of cassettes, the
sub-frame and its attachment to the substrate wall are not covered by this Certificate."

We now see that the diagram is only for rivet-fix.
The diagram for cassette-fix has now gone. Yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. If you turn, then, to page $6\{$ BBA000000046/6\} and look at section 7 in the English, at the bottom of the page, and in the French I think you will need to go to page 7 \{ARC_T000002/7\}, it says, 7.1, under "Behaviour in relation to fire":
" Classifications for some colours of the Reynobond Architecture Wall Cladding Panels in accordance with BS EN 13501-1:2007 or as defined in the national Building Regulations are shown in Table 3. These
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performances may not be achieved by all colours of the
panels, and the classification of a particular colour
should be confirmed by assessment or testing by
a UKAS-accredited laboratory."
If you turn the page $\{B B A 00000046 / 7\}\left\{A R C \_T 000002 / 8\right\}$
we see a list of results in table 3 which separate out,
as you can see, European fire classification and
national class. Can you see that there?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. You can see:
"ST [standard] with grey/green Duragloss 5000
coating.
"Fire classification : B-s2, d0."
And nothing for "Standard or national Building
Regulation". Then the two FR underneath it.
Now, that reference there to standard with
a grey/green Duragloss 5000 coating, $B-s 2$, d0, that was wrong, wasn't it?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, but I think at that time we'd already decided not to sell any more PE.
Q. Maybe, Mr Schmidt, but do you agree with me that the reason it's wrong is since at least December 2014,
almost four years before, PE rivet was classified as
C-s2, d0; that's right, isn't it?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. And even before that, Arconic knew that PE rivet was at best a class C; yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. So when it says "[Standard] with grey/green Duragloss 5000 coating, Fire classification : B-s2, d0", do you agree with me that that is a very significant and obvious misstatement?
A. (Interpreted ): I think it's a mistake. I think it's very simply a mistake.
Q. How can you account for that mistake?
A. (Interpreted): We stopped the production of PE so there was absolutely no reason for that line to even -- that sentence to even appear. Once again, there was no will to sort of misinform, because we'd decided to stop with PE anyway.
Q. Was it not important to Arconic, in particular in the aftermath of the Grenfell Tower fire, to make absolutely sure that this new BBA certificate stated the fire performance classification of its products, particularly standard, correctly?
A. (Interpreted): Once again, we were no longer selling them.
Q. But, Mr Schmidt, that's not a very complete answer, is it? What about somebody who wanted to know whether the Reynobond 55 that they'd already put on their building
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above 18 metres complied with the European regulatory regime, and they looked at this certificate? Do you accept that that person, reading the certificate, would be misled into believing that standard PE with a grey/green Duragloss 5000 coating had a class B when in fact it didn't?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Have you any explanation for why this certificate continued to represent standard PE as having a class B when Arconic knew for a fact that it didn't?
A. (Interpreted): No, but I've never seen it before. It's the first time I'm seeing it on the screen today.
THE INTERPRETER: "Here", sorry. Not "today"; "here".
MR MILLETT: Can you account for why Claude Wehrle, who clearly studied this document and made amendments to it, did not amend that part of the certificate I've shown you which stated that standard PE had a class B?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Can we go to $\{$ META000000021\}, please. This is an email in English from Claude Wehrle to Shaun O'Neill at BBA, copied to you, Mr Schmidt. Did you read this at the time, do you think? It's dated 8 September 2017.
A. (Interpreted): Yes. I think so.
Q. Very good.

If you look at the second paragraph, Claude Wehrle

```
says to the BBA
            "In preparation for your visit, we would like to
share our intent to align our BBA certification with our
recently updated sales practices. Since we are no
longer selling PE in the UK for architectural
applications, [then it says in bold] we will remove PE
from our current BBA certification."
    Now, perhaps that could be translated to the
    witness, please.
            (Pause for translation)
            If we go to the certificate as amended, this is at
    {BBA00000049}, and the French version {ARC_T000003}.
    You can see that the date at the bottom is still August,
    4 August 2017.
            If we can go to page 7, please, in each version
        {BBA00000049/7} {ARC_T000003/7}, we have the table again
        under "Behaviour in relation to fire", and we now see
        that only the FR standards are referred to and the PE
        has now been completely removed.
            Now, my question is: had Arconic by that time
        decided to withdraw all PE from the market, not only for
        use on tall buildings?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Why was that?
        (Pause)
            105
A. (Interpreted): Because we no longer wanted to confuse
        the market and we wanted to standardise production here
        in Merxheim.
Q. When you say, "We no longer wanted to confuse the
        market", what confusion are you referring to?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know if that was the right word.
Q. Well, let me ask the question again: why did Arconic
        decide to withdraw PE from the market altogether, as
        opposed to only from the above-18-metre market?
            (Pause)
A. (Interpreted): To standardise the product.
Q. Is it because you realised that all PE was dangerous, as
        Mr Wehrle had been telling you?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Now, I want to ask you one or two questions about 2018
        and your dealings with the BBA.
            Can we go to your exhibit 10, please, at
        {MET00053157/440}. This is an email to Brian Moore at
        the BBA, copied to your solicitor, I think. It's in
        English. We don't have a French version. Again, your
        text in English, you can see your signature at the
        bottom, or your name at least. Again, was this drafted
        in English by your solicitors or was this one you
        drafted yourself?
A. (Interpreted): It was drawn up by the lawyers.
Now, perhaps that could be translated to the
```


## (Pause for translation)

```
If we go to the certificate as amended, this is at \{BBA00000049\}, and the French version \{ARC_T000003\}.符 If
If we can go to page 7, please, in each version \{BBA00000049/7\} \{ARC_T000003/7\}, we have the table again under "Behaviour in relation to fire", and we now see that only the FR standards are referred to and the PE been completely removed.
Now, my question is: had Arconic by that time decided to withdraw all PE from the market, not only for use on tall buildings?
Q. Why was that?
(Pause)
105
A. (Interpreted): Because we no longer wanted to confuse in Merxheim.
Q. When you say, "We no longer wanted to confuse the market", what confusion are you referring to?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know if that was the right word.
Q. Well, let me ask the question again: why did Arconic decide to withdraw PE from the market altogether, as opposed to only from the above-18-metre market?

> (Pause)
A. (Interpreted): To standardise the product.
Q. Is it because you realised that all PE was dangerous, as Mr Wehrle had been telling you?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Now, I want to ask you one or two questions about 2018 and your dealings with the BBA.
Can we go to your exhibit 10, please, at \{MET00053157/440\}. This is an email to Brian Moore at the BBA, copied to your solicitor, I think. It's in English. We don't have a French version. Again, your text in English, you can see your signature at the bottom, or your name at least. Again, was this drafted drafted yourself?
A. (Interpreted): It was drawn up by the lawyers.
```

Q. Again, did you sign it only having read the English, or was it translated to you in French before you signed off on this email?
A. (Interpreted): I don't think it was translated.
Q. Very well.

Let's look at the text. It says:

## "Dear Brian

"Thank you for your email. The CSTB does indeed have a number of classification reports for Reynobond PE, which have been made publicly available on the CSTB website. When the BBA carried out its last audit on site in September 2017, we provided binders with those classification reports and underlying tests data (for both Reynobond PE and FR) to the auditor who indicated to us that for the purposes of his audit, he was not interested in them. Those documents were kept in-house at our Merxheim facility and would have been available to the BBA during prior audits. I am happy to send those documents to you now if you would like.
"As for your other questions, I want to make sure that we are being as transparent as we can be and I would normally have no problem answering any questions you had. Given the ongoing public inquiry and other investigations in the UK, however, I want to make sure I am not breaching any confidentiality or other
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obligations that I or AAP-SAS may have. To avoid any problems, I therefore think it would be best for you to speak with our lawyer, Teresa Hitchcock, at the law firm DLA Piper (cc'd here). She will be in a better position to answer any questions that you have."

Now, we can see that you promised to provide the certificates to Brian Moore. Can we go back to -A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Can we go back to page 470 in the same exhibit 10. That's at $\{$ MET00053157/470 $\}$, the same exhibit run.

Here is Brian Moore coming back to you a few days later, thanking you for the email. In the middle paragraph he says, and this may need to be translated to you:
"As you have kindly offered, please can you send me the information you say was in the files shown to the Auditor. Please can you let me know which members of your staff showed these files to the Auditor and what was said to the Auditor about the significance of them. From this, I am assuming that you have not been previously formally corresponded with the BBA notifying us of changes to the fire rating in respect of the PE and FR products.
"Please can you confirm that this is the position."
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certificates and the classifications relating to both PE and FR?
A. (Interpreted ): Because I simply wanted to have the opinion of my lawyers, of my advisers.
Q. So is your evidence - - and I don't want to know the content of the legal advice, I just want to know the evidence - - that you didn't provide the documents that you had promised to provide to Mr Moore on legal advice?
A. (Interpreted): May we see the mail?
Q. Yes, of course. It's at page 440 \{MET00053157/440\}.
You say in the first paragraph there -- and we've read it before -- you're talking about "binders with ... classification reports and underlying tests data (for both Reynobond PE and FR)".
You say in the last two sentences:
"Those documents were kept in-house at our Merxheim facility and would have been available to the BBA during prior audits. I am happy to send those documents to you now if you would like."
That's what you told Mr Moore.
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Is your evidence that in fact you didn't send him all those documents on legal advice?
A. (Interpreted): Yes. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Do you accept, do you know, that the way the BBA
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Now, do you need that translated to you, Mr Schmidt, or are you happy working from the English?
A. (Interpreted): We will progress.
Q. It is right, isn't it, that as a matter of fact, Arconic did not provide these documents to Mr Moore at this time?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know.
Q. What did you do yourself in order to make sure that, as you had promised Mr Moore, Arconic would send the BBA the relevant certificates?
A. (Interpreted): I asked the advice of my lawyers, and I believe that's why Brian Moore made an appointment with Teresa.
Q. Did you know that, although Arconic did provide the documents relating to the FR-cored tests, it never provided any documents relating to the testing and classification of PE in cassette form to the BBA? Did you know that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes. Yes, because I think that at the time the certificate was only an FR certificate.
Q. Yes. But what Mr Moore wanted was a little bit of the history, didn't he? He wanted to see the certificates that you had promised him.

Given that you had promised him these certificates, why didn't you candidly just give him all the
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Do you accept that, even by 1 March 2019, the BBA had not received the key technical data that it had requested?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, but I don't know what they asked for .
Q. Did Mr Wehrle share this letter with you at the time?
A. (Interpreted): Well, I don't know exactly what's the logical -- the logic behind the various dates, but if that letter was sent by post, through ordinary post, well, it never reached Merxheim.
Q. Did you tell Mr Wehrle not to send the documents that the BBA had asked for?
A. (Interpreted): Well, no, because in any case, I mean, after Grenfell, we asked systematically the opinion of our lawyers. And, once again, I don't know what this letter exactly is and what address it was sent to. It seems to reach some address in Austria, but I don't know much about it.
Q. Did Mr Wehrle tell you that the reason the BBA had withdrawn the certificate altogether was because they had not received the key technical data that they'd asked for?

> (Pause)
discovered all the PE cassette tests was through
Dr Barbara Lane's supplementary report to this Inquiry?
Did you know that?
A. (Interpreted): No, I didn't know that.
Q. Do you accept that for the 12 years or so before the Grenfell Tower fire, and for the 11 years or so before the fire that the BBA had a contract with Arconic,
Arconic never told the BBA about any of the European tests on PE cassette at all?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Then if we look ahead in time to March 2019, please go to page 530 of this same exhibit run \(\{\) MET00053157/530\}, and this is a letter from the BBA to Mr Wehrle, 1 March 2019, in English.
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. Did you see this letter at the time, do you think?
A. (Interpreted): No, I don't think that letter ever reached Merxheim.
Q. Look at the first paragraph, and it will have to be translated into French for you as we go. Mr Moore of the BBA tells Mr Wehrle:
"I write to inform you that the above Certificate [that's 08/4510] has been withdrawn from the date of this letter, as we still have not received the key technical data that we requested."

111

112

\section*{Merxheim.}
Q. Never mind the mail for the moment and the Austrian address. The question is a simple one: did Mr Wehrle tell you that the BBA had withdrawn certificate 08/4510 because they had still not received the technical data that they had asked for? Did he tell you that?
A. (Interpreted): Yes, I think so.
Q. Again, what was the reason why the BBA was not provided with the key technical data that they'd asked for?
A. (Interpreted): I don't know.

MR MILLETT: You don't know.
Thank you very much.
Mr Chairman, l've come to the end of my questions.
There may be one or two that, on reflection, I may want to revisit, and there may be questions from others who are observing this and have assisted in putting questions to us.

Can I ask for the break now at this point?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, I'll just explain to

\section*{Mr Schmidt.}

Mr Schmidt, Mr Millett thinks he has got to the end of his questions, but it's necessary to have a short break now, both to enable Mr Millett to check that he has asked all the questions he needs to, and to enable others who are observing the hearing to propose other
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questions that should be asked. So we have to have a little break for that purpose now.

So I'm sorry to prolong the afternoon, but I'm going to ask you to come back at 4.50 , that's just over ten minutes' time, and then we will see if there are any more questions. All right?
THE WITNESS: Okay.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. Thank you very much indeed.
4.50, then, please.
(4.38 pm)

\section*{(A short break)}
(4.50 pm)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We'll now find out whether there are more questions for
Mr Schmidt, but before that I'd better check that the interpreters are with us.
MS KENNEDY: Yes, we are, we can see you and hear you, thank you very much for asking.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
Mr Schmidt, are you there?
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Yes, I'm there.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
Well, we'll now discover whether Mr Millett has any more questions for you.

So, Mr Millett, are you there?
```

MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, I'm here.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
Well, now, do you have more questions for
Mr Schmidt?
MR MILLETT: I do, Mr Chairman, but they are quite short.
Mr Schmidt, you told us in your evidence at a much
earlier stage that you reported first to Mr Belnap and
then to Glen Morrison, who were employed by
Arconic Global. Yes?
A. (Interpreted): Yes.
Q. At any time when you reported to them, did either of
them ever give you any direction in matters of the
fire safety of products produced at Merxheim?
A. (Interpreted): No.
Q. Did AAP - SAS ever take any direction in matters of
fire safety of products produced at Merxheim from
Arconic Global?
A. (Interpreted): Before Grenfell, no. After Grenfell
of course there were discussions, mainly between Diana
and myself, on the subject matter. In particular,
whether PE was going to be continued or not.
Q. You told us that you reported to Diana Perreiah in the
United States between 2016 and 2017. Did you sit on any
Arconic Global boards?
A. (Interpreted): No.

```
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\section*{Q. What was your role within Arconic Global?}
A. (Interpreted): I never had a role within Arconic Global.
Q. So do I take it from that that you were never employed by Arconic Global and had no sphere of operation within Arconic Global at all?
A. (Interpreted): I don't understand what you mean by Arconic Global. Well, for me Arconic Global at the time was a company of 30,000 to 40,000 people and I was not at all -- I didn't have a high level within Arconic Global at all.
Q. Very well.

My final question for you, Mr Schmidt, and it's a question we ask witnesses sometimes who have had a particular role or responsibility for an area of operation: we have spent the last four days going through a lot of history and a lot of documents, and you have answered a lot of my questions; looking at it in the round and looking at the whole of the history of your involvement at AAP-SAS with Reynobond 55 PE, is there anything that, looking back on it, you would have done differently?
A. (Interpreted): I believe that I possibly didn't sufficiently well master technical support in the course of sales, and it is a criticism that I make of myself. Probably sales technical support should have been in two
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
parts, two sections, and the part which was really & 1 \\
associated with fire tests, et cetera, I think it should & 2 \\
have been really placed within technical services in & 3 \\
order to make sure that the tasks were more clearly & 4 \\
attributed. That's something that I did, I believe, & 5 \\
a few months after Grenfell. And I believe that & 6 \\
I simply didn't have the presence of mind to realise & 7 \\
that this service was based upon two very different axes & 8 \\
and that they could be separated. & 9 \\
There. & 10 \\
MR MILLETT: Thank you very much, Mr Schmidt. & 11 \\
That concludes my questions, Mr Chairman. & 12 \\
It only remains for me to thank you, Mr Schmidt, & 13 \\
very much for coming to the Inquiry and assisting us & 14 \\
with our investigations. We are extremely grateful to & 15 \\
you. We are also extremely grateful to the interpreters & 16 \\
who have assisted us for the last four days. & 17 \\
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, thank you very much, & 18 \\
Mr Millett. & 19 \\
It's right, Mr Schmidt, that I too should thank you & 20 \\
very much for coming to give your evidence. I'm sorry & 21 \\
that it's taken longer than you were led to expect, and & 22 \\
I'm sure that caused you a certain amount of \\
inconvenience, but sometimes these things happen and & 23 \\
there it is. I should like you to know that it's been
\end{tabular}
parts, two sections, and the part which was really
associated with fire tests, et cetera, I think it should order to make pure that the task were more clear attributed. That's some5
a few months after Grenfell. And I believe that6

I simply didn't have the presence of mind to realise 8
that this service was based upon two very different axes 8
that they could be separated. 10
MR MILLETT: Thank you very much, Mr Schmidt. 11
That concludes my questions, Mr Chairman.
only remains for me to thank you, Mr Schmidt,
with our investigations. We are extremely grateful to you. We are also extremely grateful to the interpreters SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, thank you very much, Millett.
It 's right, Mr Schmidt, that I too should thank you
that it's taken longer than you were led to expect, and
inconvenience, but sometimes these things happen and
very helpful to us to hear what you have to tell us, and
I can thank you on behalf of the whole of the panel, my colleagues as well as myself, for making yourself available and telling us what you know.

So your evidence is now at an end, and you can go and go back to normal life. Thank you again.
THE WITNESS: (Interpreted): Thank you. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.

Madam Interpreters, thank you both very much indeed
for all the support you have given us over the last week
or so. I imagine it's been quite a challenging exercise
and we couldn't have managed, of course, without you.
So thank you very much indeed, both of you.
MS KENNEDY: Not at all.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, that concludes our hearings
for today. We will finish there, and we will start
again tomorrow morning with a different witness at 10 o'clock.

So thank you all very much. 10 o'clock tomorrow,
please.
( 5.02 pm )
(The hearing adjourned until 10 am on Tuesday, 23 February 2021)
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[^0]:    Q. If we go up in the English to page 14
    \{MET00053158_P05/14\}, please, and I want to look at the third email from the top. In the French it's page 11 \{MET00053158_P05/11\}. You will see an email on the same day from Jean-Philippe Baillon to Hervé Marichez and Claude Wehrle, copied to Patrice Audureau and Lionel Marconnet, "RE: Fire classification", and you can see the French on the right at the bottom of page 11, and in the English he says:
    "Claude.
    "I just had the SUNCLEAR agency in Paris (perhaps following Hervé's exchanges with GAYET) asking me the same question.
    "GAYET asks for the variant in FR as referred to in the equivalence table attached to this e-mail.
    "SUNCLEAR is looking forward to our response... They are using PE $=\mathrm{M} 1$ on all their com and sales tools!"

    You can see the email response from Claude Wehrle the same day, copying Lionel Marconnet. He starts,
    "Salut messieurs", do you see that, at the top of the page in the French, "Hello gentlemen" in the English.

    He says:
    "Hello gentlemen,
    "As I have already mentioned on several occasions, Reynobond PE is classified as M2 or M4 (European Norm

