# OPUS<sub>2</sub>

Grenfell Tower Inquiry

Day 110

March 22, 2021

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: +44 (0)20 3008 5900 Email: transcripts@opus2.com Website: https://www.opus2.com

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1	Monday, 22 March 2021	1
2	(10.00 am)	2
3	MR JOHN ALBON (continued)	3
4	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to	4
5	today's hearing. Today we're going to continue hearing	5
6	evidence from Mr Albon of the British Board of Agrément.	6
7	As usual, I'm joined by the other members of the	7
8	panel, Ms Thouria Istephan and Mr Ali Akbor.	8
9	MS ISTEPHAN: Good morning.	9
10	MR AKBOR: Good morning, everyone.	10
11	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think my first task this morning	11
12	is to check that Mr Albon is in touch with us. I think	12
13	he is, but could you confirm, Mr Albon, that you can see	13
14	me and hear me clearly, please?	14
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.	15
16	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much, good morning.	16
17	THE WITNESS: Good morning.	17
18	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We probably ought to just run	18
19	through the housekeeping for the form's sake before we	19
20	continue your evidence.	20
21	Can you confirm, please, that you're alone in the	21
22	room from which you're giving evidence?	22
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.	23
24	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.	24
25	Can you confirm that you don't have any documents or	25
	1	
	1	
1	other materials with you?	1
2	THE WITNESS: No, I don't.	2
3	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And can you confirm that your mobile	3
4	phone is in another room and that you don't have any	4
5	other electronic devices with you which can receive	5
6	messages?	6
7	THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.	7
8	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Lovely, thank you very much.	8
9	Well, the procedure will be essentially the same as	9
10	it was last week: we will have a break during the	10
11	morning and the afternoon, but if you want an additional	11
12	break, just make sure I know that and we will	12

13 accommodate you as best we can.

- 14 All right, is there anything you would like to raise
- 15 before we carry on? 16
- THE WITNESS: No, thank you.
- 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you. Then I will 18 invite Ms Grange to put some more questions to you. 19 Yes, Ms Grange 20 Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY (continued)
- MS GRANGE: Yes, thank you. Good morning, Mr Chairman, and 21
- 2.2 good morning, Mr Albon.
- 23 A. Good morning.
- 24 Q. I'm going to start with some questions this morning 25 about some of the specific wording that we see on the

2

Reynobond certificate from 2008. Then I'm going to come on to ask you some questions about the reviews that were carried out of that certificate . So focusing first on the wording for the certificate , can we bring that certificate back up, that's {BBA00000047}. In the bottom half of that page, under "Key factors assessed" and then "Behaviour in relation to fire", the third heading down, we see the wording: "In relation to the Building Regulations for reaction to fire, the panels may be regarded as having a Class 0 surface in England and Wales ...' Then we also see something similar, if we go to page 5 {BBA00000047/5}, at section 6.3, if we look in the middle of that "Behaviour in relation to fire" section, 6.3, it says: "As a consequence of sections 6.1 and 6.2 [those are the paragraphs above that we looked at last week], the products may be regarded as having a Class 0 surface in relation to the Approved Document B of The Building Regulations ... (as amended) (England and Wales) ... " Now, with that in mind, can we go to your second witness statement, {BBA00010723/17}, and I want to look at the bottom of page 17. We can see the Inquiry 3

question in bold, and the question you're asked is: "Did the 2008 certificate for Reynobond Architecture Wall Panels ... indicate that all such panels achieved national class 0? If not, why not? Please explain by reference to the language used in the certificate including under 'KEY FACTORS ASSESSED' on page 1 of the certificate . Your answer starts at paragraph 63, and if we go over the page {BBA00010723/18}, in a number of paragraphs there you're basically just quoting the certificate again. If we can pick it up at paragraph 66 on that page, you say this: "66. The BBA had no data to show similar Class 0/'low risk' classifications for the Standard product and this is clear from the text of the Certificate . "67. Diagram 40 of Approved Document B, Volume 2 sets out requirements for the reaction to fire Classifications of the external surfaces of walls. In doing so, it accepts the use of either British Standard (ie BS476 Parts 6 and 7) or European Classifications using BS EN 13501-1. A Classification to either system could be used to satisfy the requirements of the Approved Document for all situations."

1	"68. The two Classifications require the use of
2	different test methods and are not equivalent; the
3	results achieved in one system cannot be used to infer a
4	result for the alternative system.
5	"69. For the situations where Class 0 is required,
6	Diagram 40 also accepts a Classification of B $-s3$ , d2 or
7	better. This means that, as defined in the Approved
8	Document, a product achieving Class $B-s2$ , d0 (as for the
9	Standard Reynobond product) could be used in all
10	situations where a Class 0 result is deemed to be
11	acceptable.
12	"70. In the case of the Reynobond materials, this
13	means that the Standard and FR grades could both be used
14	in the same situations as those requiring a Class 0
15	performance as defined by Diagram 40 of Approved
16	Document B
17	"71. It is for this reason that the Certificate
18	states that, in relation to the Building Regulations for
19	reaction to fire , the panels may be regarded as having
20	a Class 0 surface. This is in respect of their
21	permissible areas of use, as defined by Diagram 40 $-$
22	both versions of the product met the requirements for
23	situations where Diagram 40 accepts the use of a Class 0
24	material.
25	"72. This is not the same as stating that the
	_
	5
1	Standard product has a Class 0 surface, which had not
2	been shown to be the case."

1		Standard product has a Class 0 surface, which had not
2		been shown to be the case."
3		Now, I've shown you that long passage from your
4		statement, and you mentioned there that there is no
5		equivalence between the European classes and the BS 476
6		tests which are relevant to class 0. It's right, isn't
7		it, that that lack of equivalence is a point
8		specifically made in the notes to diagram 40? Do you
9		recall that?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Yes.
12		If we understand you correctly, in your witness
13		statement you're pointing out that in Approved
14		Document B and diagram 40 it's said that either class 0
15		or Euroclass $B-s3$ , d0 was acceptable on buildings over
16		18 metres; is that right?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	And that is what the BBA certificate means, is it, when
19		it says, "The panels may be regarded as having a Class 0
20		surface"?
21	Α.	I would like to point out, as I said on Thursday, that
22		I was not involved in the drafting of this certificate
23		and that my statement is what I have inferred from the
24		details on the file. So I can't be sure what was meant

- 24 details on the file . So I can't be sure what was meant, 25 but my interpretation is as described in this statement
  - but my interpretation is as described in this statement.
    - 6

1 Q. Yes, I understand that, and I understand what you've 2 said about your direct involvement with the certificate, 3 but can we agree that that is what it means when it 4 says, "may be regarded as having a Class 0 surface", 5 it's because of the equivalence point in diagram 40? A. That's what I believe to be the case, yes 6 7 Q. Can you help us: why doesn't it just say that? 8 A. I think it is a poor certificate wording and it could 9 have been improved. The later issue of the certificate 10 did remove that statement and made things much clearer 11 than in the original issue of the certificate . 12 Q Yes, and when you are talking about the later issue of 13 the certificate , you're talking about in 2017; yes? 14 A. Yes 15 Q. How would the average construction professional know 16 that that was what the wording meant as described in 17 your statement, is not that the products are class 0. 18 but that, for the purposes of diagram 40, they can be 19 recorded as such? 20 A. The certificate must be read in full . You cannot simply 21 look at one phrase on the opening page and interpret 2.2 from that single statement. 23 If a construction professional had read in full the 24 reaction to fire section of the certificate , then it 25 would have been clear that the standard product had not 7 1 been tested to achieve class 0. 2 Q. Right. But you accept that certain statements, 3 including on the front of the certificate , were misleading? Is that correct? Do you accept that? 4

- 5 A. I think if taken in isolation they could potentially be
- 6 misleading, but the certificate must be read in full.7 Q. Yes.
- Going back to the certificate, if we can have it
  back up again at page 5 {BBA00000047/5}, and if we look
  again at 6.3, it begins with these words:
  "As a consequence of sections 6.1 and 6.2, the
  products may be regarded as having a Class 0
  surface ..."
- 14
   Doesn't that suggest that the BBA has considered the

   15
   results and is declaring the panels as meeting class 0?

   16
   A. No, if we considered that it was a class 0 product, the

   17
   section would have read, "The products are class 0

   18
   surfaces", not "may be regarded".

   19
   Q. Right.

   20
   Can you help us as to where that wording came from.
  - Can you help us as to where that wording came from, "The panels may be regarded"? Was that something that
- 21 "The panels may be regarded"? Was that something th 22 was a common phrase used in the BBA at this time?
- 23 A. I'm sorry, I don't know.
- 24 Q. Have you yourself ever come across that phrase in
  - another certificate ?

25

- 1 A. I haven't, but this is an area I would not normally be
- 2 working in, and so it may appear in other certificates
- 3 that I have not seen.
- 4 Q. Right.

- Let's look at another part of the certificate . If
- we go to page 2 {BBA00000047/2}, in the top section, 6
- 7 under, "The Building Regulations ... (as amended)
- 8 (England and Wales)", can you see that the second
- 9 requirement down is requirement B4(1) for external fire 10 spread, and we can see on the right-hand side that it
- 11 says this:
- 12 "The panels are judged to meet the Class 0
- 13 requirements.
- 14 Do you see that wording there?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. Doesn't that suggest that the BBA has considered data 16 17 relevant to class 0 and has judged that the panels meet 18 the requirements of class 0?
- 19 A. No, again, if that was the case, the statement would be 20 something like, "The panels are classified as class 0 as 21 defined in the national Building Regulations". It would
- 2.2 be a different statement.
- 23 Q. I see. So are you saying it would be clear to
- 24 construction professionals reading that not that the 25
  - panels are class 0, but that some form of equivalent

9

- 1 analysis has been done?
- A. Well, I would expect a construction professional to read 2 3 the entirety of that statement, which does refer them to 4 section 6.1 to 6.6, where the actual test data are
- 5 given
- Q. Do you accept that the consequence of saying those 6 7 things about class 0 was that the entire focus of this
- 8 certificate became class 0 right from page 1, when
- 9 in fact everyone associated with it should have
- 10 appreciated that the European classification results
- 11 were of key importance in terms of the use of the 12 product above 18 metres?
- 13 A. Again, you must read the certificate in its entirety.
- 14 At the time, the European classification system was new,
- 15 and the industry had for decades been used to using the
- 16 class 0 system. So I believe -- I don't know, but 17
- I believe -- we were attempting to use terms that were 18 familiar to the industry at that time.
- 19 Q. Right. What are you basing that on, that knowledge on, 20 that you believe you were attempting to use terms
- 21 familiar to the industry at that time?
- 2.2 A. From my personal knowledge of the fact that class 0 was
- 23 the term that everyone understood in the industry, the
- 24 European classification system was new, and perhaps
- 25 people were unfamiliar with it at this very early stage.

10

- 1 I would emphasise, though, that all of the 2 information is given in the fire section of the 3 certificate , if the reader took the time to read the 4 certificate in full 5 Q. Do you agree that a construction professional should be able to rely on what the BBA says about the technical 6 7 properties of a product without going into the details of equivalence and testing methods? 8 9 A. I agree that they should be able to rely on the content 10 of the certificate , yes. I'm not sure about the second 11 half of your question. Could you perhaps rephrase that? 12 Yes. What I was suggesting to you is that, for example, Q 13 here where it says, "The panels are judged to meet the 14 Class 0 requirements", do you agree that a construction 15 professional ought to be able to take that statement at 16 face value, rather than have to read that together with 17 another part of the certificate which is about 18 equivalence in diagram 40? 19 A. No, I don't accept that they should make any judgement 20 based on a single sentence within the certificate . They 21 must read the full certificate , they must understand it, 22 and read it in conjunction with the approved documents 23 themselves. The certificate only gives information to 24 form a judgement on the basis of the requirements of the
- 25 approved documents.
  - 11

### 1 Q Right

	•	8
2		I think you said at the beginning of your answers
3		this morning that it was a poor certificate wording, and
4		it could have been improved. In what way are you
5		accepting that the wording was poor?
6	Α.	I would not use terms such as, "The panels are judged to
7		meet class 0", I would give statements of fact, and this
8		was a $$ not a statement of fact, it was
9		an interpretation.
10	Q.	Right.
11		Now, if we look at your second witness statement at
12		page 28, so that's $\{BBA00010723/28\},$ I want to look at
13		paragraph 111. You say this:
14		"The front page of the Certificate states that the
15		panels 'may' be regarded as Class 0 materials. If all
16		colours of the product were covered, this would have
17		read 'the panels are Class 0 materials' or similar. The
18		use of the 'may' indicates that this is not always the
19		case. The space available on the front page is limited
20		and it is not possible to give full details there $-\ \mbox{the}$
21		reader is directed to Section 6 which gives all of the
22		necessary information."
23		Then you tell us the wording was revised in the
24		second issue of the certificate to further aid clarity ,
25		and we know that that was in 2017.

2

3 later 4 Are you saying there in that paragraph of your statement that "may be regarded as class 0" means "may 5 or may not be regarded as class 0"? 6 7 A. That answer was in response to a specific question about colour. So the fire classifications given in the 8 9 certificate relate to the specific colours that were 10 tested, and I believe the certificate makes that clear. 11 Q. Right. So you're saying that the extent to which it may 12 not be regarded as class 0 is solely in relation to the 13 different colours, or are you saying that, more broadly, 14 the certificate means may or may not be class 0? 15 A. It certainly refers to specific colours.  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  The use of the phrase "may be regarded as class 0" on 16 17 the front page, which is what you're dealing with here. 18 and then you draw this distinction about colour, is the 19 use of the words "may be regarded as class 0" on the 20 front page different from the "may be regarded as 21 class 0" that we see in section 6.3, where it's said, 22 "As a consequence of sections 6.1 and 6.2 ... may be 23 regarded as class 0"? 24 A. Sorry, that was a long question. 25 Q. Yes. What I'm trying to get at is whether you're 13 1 telling us that the phrase "may be regarded as class 0" 2 means different things in different parts of the 3 certificate, because here you appear to be telling us 4 that the front page of the certificate is saying "may be 5 regarded as class  $0^{\prime\prime}$  because only some colours are 6 covered, whereas elsewhere in your statement you're 7 saying that the phrase "may be regarded as class 0" is 8 because of diagram 40 and the fact that B may be seen as 9 equivalent for diagram 40 purposes to class 0. 10 What I'm trying to get at is whether what you're 11 telling us is that that phrase, "may be regarded as 12 class 0", is actually being referred to in different ways in different parts of the certificate?

Now, we will come to colour in just a moment, and we

will also come to the second issue of the certificate

- 13 14 A. On the front page, where it talks about "may be", 15 I believe that relates to the two options within 16 diagram 40, ie the European and the British Standard 17 classification systems. The use in this answer relates 18 to the performance of different colours potentially 19 giving different classifications . 20 Q. Yes, but if you read what you say here in paragraph 111 21 you say: 2.2 "The front page of the Certificate states that the 23 panels 'may' be regarded as Class 0 materials." 24
- 24 Then if we go on to the third sentence: 25 "The use of the 'may' indicates that this
  - "The use of the 'may' indicates that this is not
    - 14

- 1 always the case."
- 2 A. Yes, but again, I was answering a specific question
- $3 \qquad \ \ \, \mbox{about the performance of individual colours. I was not}$
- $4 \qquad \ \ \, \mbox{regarding this as a question about the front page of the}$
- 5 certificate .
- 6 Q. I see
- 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Albon, before we leave
- $8 \qquad \qquad$  paragraph 111, I'm slightly puzzled by the second
- 9 sentence, which suggests that if -- well, it does say
- 10 that if all the colours were covered, then the 11 certificate would have read. "the panels are Class
- 11 certificate would have read, "the panels are Class 0
- 12 materials". I don't understand quite how you could make
- 13 that statement if you hadn't got the necessary tests to
- 14 demonstrate that they were class 0.
- 15 A. I think with hindsight perhaps I'm mixing the front page
- 16 and the fire section itself , where we do talk about the 17 fire performance of individual colours, and the fact
- 18 that a given performance as quoted may not be achieved
- 19 for all colours of the product. It may have been better
- 20 if I omitted the reference to the front page here.
- 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right. Thank you.
- 22 MS GRANGE: Yes.
- 23 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, Ms Grange, sorry to interrupt.
- 24 MS GRANGE: That's very helpful.
- 25 As we discussed, Arconic did not send any

## 15

1 information or data about test 5B to the BBA which dealt 2 with the cassette panels. I just want to see what you 3 say about this in your second witness statement, so this 4 statement, at page 30 {BBA00010723/30}. If we pick it 5 up at paragraph 122, you tell us this, at the bottom of 6 that page: "122. Had the BBA been aware that the cassette 7 8 fixing method for the product was in fact Classified as 9 E to EN 13501-1 rather than B as we were led to believe. 10 this Classification would have been given in the 11 Certificate in addition to the Class B for the Riveted 12 fixing method.  $^{\prime\prime}123.~$  The areas of use permitted for a Class E 13 14 material by Diagram 40 of Approved Document B ... are 15 different than those for a Class B, both in terms of 16 height and distance from a boundary. A Class E material 17 could not have been used on a building with a floor more 18 than 18m in height from the ground, in the absence of 19 any additional supporting evidence, such as a full scale 2.0 fire test and compliance with the requirements of 21 BR 135. As far as the BBA is aware, no such additional 2.2 data were available, as none has been provided to the 23 BBA 24 "124. Had the BBA been made aware that the cassette 25 fixing method was in fact Class E, this, and the

20

1		corresponding restrictions , would have been made clear	1		the certificate , at 6.4 in the middle of that page. It
2		in the Certificate text."	2		says:
3		Now, you tell us that in that part of your	3		"These performances may not be achieved by other
4		statement, and you say something similar on at least	4		colours of the product and the designations of
5		four occasions in your second statement, but nowhere in	5		a particular colour should be confirmed by"
6		that second statement dealing with the certificate do	6		For England and Wales it says:
7		you tell us what the BBA would have said on the	7		"Test or assessment in accordance with Approved
8		certificate about the class 0 if you had known that the	8		Document B, Appendix A, Clause 1."
9		European classification of the cassettes was class E.	9		Now, if we can look at your second witness statement
10		Can you explain to us, can you help as to what	10		again, at page 27 {BBA00010723/27}, from paragraph 104,
11		impact that would have had on the class 0 statements in	11		where you're dealing with this colour point, you tell
12		the certificate ?	12		us:
13	Α.	Where there are, if you like, contradictory ratings	13		"104. The performance achieved in reaction to fire
14		between the British Standard and the European Standard	14		testing is known to be influenced by the colour of the
15		classification systems in relation to permissible areas	15		coating finish chosen, as the pigments and other
16		of use within diagram 40, we would always take the worst	16		component materials can have an effect. Where the
17		case and quote that worst case. So in this case, we	17		numerical result achieved places a product close to the
18		would have quoted the Euroclass B and omitted reference	18		transition point from one Classification to another, as
19		to class 0.	19		defined by the Classification system, it is possible
20	Q.	I see. So all references to class 0 would have been	20		that two different colours tested could achieve
21		omitted, would they?	21		different Classifications .
22	Α.	Certainly for the cassette version, yes.	22		"105. This is a general consideration for all
23	Q.	Right. Even though you have still got the rivet	23		materials and is not specific to ACM products.
24		version, which has the B, and which for diagram 40	24		"106. For this reason the fire Classification
25		purposes would be treated the same as class 0?	25		quoted in any BBA Certificate is colour specific , unless
		17			19
1	٨	It's slightly hypothetical, but if we had been aware of	1		the laboratory correspondent the fire test has confirmed
2	А.		1		the laboratory carrying out the fire test has confirmed in their report that the Classification given covers all
∠ 3		that, I would have expected different classifications to	2		
4		be given for rivet and cassette. Potentially we could have given both class 0 and class B for the riveted, but	4		of the colours in the range.
4 5		certainly not for the cassette.	4 5		"107. The BBA had only Certified the fire performance of the product/colour combinations given in
6	0	Yes. You say, "Potentially we could have given both	5		,
7	Q.		8 7		sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the Certificate. This meant
		class 0 and B for the riveted"; would the BBA still have	8		that the Classifications given in the Certificate were
8		said that the rivet – fix panels may be regarded as having			only applicable to the specific colours quoted in
9		a class 0 surface? Is that what you would have	9		Sections 6.1 and 6.2. These classifications could not
10		expected?	10		be extrapolated to apply to any other colour.
11	А.	No, in that case, because we had test data specific to	11		"108. Please see section 6.4 of Certificate
12		the BS 476 methods, I would expect us to give the	12		"109. As far as the BBA is aware, no such testing
13	~	classification .	13		or assessment was carried out on the colours chosen for
14	Q.	Well, no, you had test data specific to the FR panel for	14		installation on Grenfell Tower. The fire performance of
15		BS 476, but you didn't have test data relevant to the PE	15		the products installed on Grenfell Tower were not
16		panel.	16		covered by BBA Certification."
17		Yes, you're right.	17		Now, you tell us there that the BBA only certified
18	Q.	Yes. So can I ask the question again: what would you	18		the product/colour combinations in sections 6.1 and 6.2.
19		have said about the class B for the rivet? Would it	19		If we go back to those in the certificate , page 5
20		still have said, "may be regarded as class 0"?	20		{BBA00000047/5}, where you were talking about product,
21		Possibly, at that time, in that context, I don't know.	21		are you being specific about whether the product is
22	Q.	Yes.	22		a standard sample, the PE core, or the FR core?
23		Just some more detailed questions about what you say	23		It would apply irrespective of the core.
24		about the colours that the certificate deals with.	24	Q.	Well, at 6.1 it says:
25		Let's just look back at {BBA00000047/5}, page 5 of	25		"A standard sample of the product, with a grey/green

1		Duragloss coating "	1	Q.	Right. Well, let's just test that a little and just
2		So are you saying that you're only certifying the PE	2		look at some other points.
3		version of the product with a grey/green coating and not	3		If we go to page 3 of the certificate
4		the FR version of the product with a grey/green coating?	4		{BBA00000047/3}, under the second heading down,
5	A.	Yes, in terms of fire classification , that's the only	5		"Technical Specification", at 1.1, we can see that it
6		classification that we had.	6		tells us $$ yes, if you look in the third line down,
7	Q.	Yes, and so at 6.2 you're saying that for the	7		there's the word "A" at the very end of the line on the
8		fire retardant sample of the product, it's only the	8		right—hand side. It tells us in this description that:
9		metallic grey colour that is covered by the certificate ;	9		"A Duragloss or PVDF coating available in various
10		is that right?	10		colours protects the exposed face."
11	A.	Yes.	11		We saw in the evidence of Mr Gregorian that this
12	Q.	We can see there are two different types of coating that	12		particular statement was inserted at the request of
13	•	are being quoted in the certificate : the PVDF coating	13		Arconic.
14		and the Duragloss 5000 coating.	14		Now, wouldn't the reader of this part of the
15		Can you clarify for us, do you mean that the colours	15		certificate understand this to mean that the Duragloss
16		also have to have the same coating to be covered by the	16		or PVDF coating, in whatever colour, was covered by the
17		certificate ? So for the top one in 6.1, it's not only	17		statements made in this certificate?
18		got to be PE grey/green, but it's also got to have the	18	А	Well, the performance in other aspects is covered by
19		Duragloss 5000 coating?	19	73.	this certificate . Its lightfastness, its structural
20	Δ	Yes.	20		performance and various other performance parameters are
21		And at 6.2, the FR sample of the product would have to	21		not affected in the same way as the fire classification .
22	ч.	be metallic grey and it would have to have the PVDF	22		Again, you must read the full certificate .
23		finish, not any other type of coating; is that right?	22	0	I see. So you're expecting somebody to read that
24	۸	Yes.	23	Q.	sentence there, "A Duragloss or PVDF coating available
24		So effectively the scope of the certificate is for three	24		
20	Q.	So effectively the scope of the certificate is for three	20		in various colours protects the exposed face", but to
		21			23
		21			20
1			1		
1		very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold	1		understand that in the fire performance section, what
2		very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else;	2		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very
2 3	А	very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?	2 3	А	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes?
2 3 4	A.	very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly	2 3 4	A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this
2 3 4 5	A.	very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as	2 3 4 5	Α.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or
2 3 4 5 6		very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.	2 3 4 5 6	A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product?
2 3 4 5 6 7		very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes. Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of	2 3 4 5 6 7		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes. Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes. Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes. Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance. Yes.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct? You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes. Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance. Yes. Just to clarify .	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> <li>Yes, it does. Very often a fire classification report</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> <li>Yes, it does. Very often a fire classification report is provided which does cover the full colour range. In</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	<pre>understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page,</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> <li>Yes, it does. Very often a fire classification report is provided which does cover the full colour range. In those circumstances, the certificate wording would be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page, this is from you to him, and we can see in the third
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> <li>Yes, it does. Very often a fire classification report is provided which does cover the full colour range. In those circumstances, the certificate wording would be different . This does require that, for a particular</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page, this is from you to him, and we can see in the third paragraph so you have said:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> <li>Yes, it does. Very often a fire classification report is provided which does cover the full colour range. In those circumstances, the certificate wording would be different . This does require that, for a particular installation , the colour and the configuration to be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page, this is from you to him, and we can see in the third paragraph so you have said: "Hamo
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific colour range. In those circumstances, the certificate wording would be different . This does require that, for a particular installation , the colour and the configuration to be used on a building must be tested in order to determine</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page, this is from you to him, and we can see in the third paragraph so you have said: "Hamo "I think that your wording is generally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific coatings?</li> <li>Yes, it does. Very often a fire classification report is provided which does cover the full colour range. In those circumstances, the certificate wording would be different . This does require that, for a particular installation , the colour and the configuration to be used on a building must be tested in order to determine its reaction to fire classification , and therefore its</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	<pre>understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page, this is from you to him, and we can see in the third paragraph so you have said: "Hamo "I think that your wording is generally appropriate."</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>very specific products: PE grey/green Duragloss, FR gold Duragloss, and FR metallic grey PVDF, and nothing else; is that correct?</li> <li>You said the scope of the certificate . That's slightly different . The scope of the fire classifications are as you describe, yes.</li> <li>Yes. I mean, sorry, when I'm talking about the scope of the certificate , I'm talking about it in terms of its fire performance.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Just to clarify .</li> <li>So you're saying that the certificate is just for those three very specific products; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Doesn't that limit the certificate enormously to the point of almost uselessness if it only applies to those specific colours and those specific colour range. In those circumstances, the certificate wording would be different . This does require that, for a particular installation , the colour and the configuration to be used on a building must be tested in order to determine</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	understand that in the fire performance section, what you're saying about fire performance only covers very specific products and very specific coatings; yes? I think, is it section 6.4 makes it very clear that this fire performance is not achieved by other colours, or may not be achieved by other colours of the product? I do think that is quite clear. Yes. You say in paragraph 104 of your statement {BBA00010723/27} we just looked at it that two different colours could achieve different classifications if the numerical result is close to the transition point from one classification to another. Do you remember where we just looked at that just now? Yes. Can we go to an email chain, this is {BBA00010693}. This is an email chain between you and Mr Gregorian in October 2007. If we go to the second email down on the first page, this is from you to him, and we can see in the third paragraph so you have said: "Hamo "I think that your wording is generally

Day 110

	cladding panels. Then you say something about	1		
	durability in the second line.	2		t
	Then in that third paragraph, you say:	3		c
	"I don't know what statement you are making on fire	4		n
	performance but it is now our policy that reaction to	5	Α.	
	fire testing is colour specific (ie that if you have	6		f
	a fire test report for a particular colour then the	7		â
	results only apply to that colour, not the full range.	8		1
	You can't say that the whole range is Class 0/Low risk,	9	_	
	for example)."	10	Q.	
	Now, it's right, isn't it, that no one at the BBA	11		а
	considered whether these colours were close to the	12		•
	transition point between classifications , did they?	13		t
	No.	14		p
Q.	This was just standard wording that was inserted upon	15	Α.	
	your instruction, wasn't it?	16		h
	It was my advice, not my instruction, but yes.	17	_	5
Q.	Yes, your advice then. And it's not inserted for any	18	Q.	
	technical reason pertaining to Reynobond, it's just BBA	19		a
	policy to make that colour caveat clear at the time;	20		b
	yes?	21	Α.	Ν
	Yes.	22		а
Q.	What had led to the change in policy that you're	23		t
	referring to in that email? You say, "it is now our	24	Q.	I
	policy that reaction to fire testing is colour	25		
	25			
	specific "; what had led to that change?	1		a
A.	At this time, I was section head of a different	2		i
	department dealing with paint, coil coatings, products	3		t
	where colour was really quite important from	4		I
	an architectural perspective. I had been advised,	5	A.	١
	I think, initially by Exova Warrington, that colour	6	Q.	E
	could make a significant difference to the	7		с
	classification achieved by a product. I was surprised	8		v
	by that, and I subsequently raised it with BRE for	9	Α.	I
	confirmation, and they did confirm that this was the	10		ι
	case. So once I had that information from two UKAS	11		С
	accredited fire laboratories, I made the rest of the BBA	12		c
	aware of that position.	13	Q.	F
Q.	Right. Can you recall, who was it at the BRE that you	14		
	spoke to about this point?	15		le
A.	I can't be sure, it was 2007. Probably Sarah Colwell,	16		le
	but that's not a statement of fact. She was my usual	17		t
	contact, it may have been someone else.	18		
Q.	Can you help us, what kind of test or assessment was the	19		
	BBA recommending should be carried out by construction	20		у
	professionals on different colours of a product?	21		
Α.	It would be the process defined in the approved	22		
	documents, so the British Standard BS 476, parts 6	23		

- 24 and 7.
- 25 Q. I see.

1		So just stepping back from this, is it right that
2		the BBA was keen to limit the certificate in terms of
3		colour and fire performance, but not in terms of fixing
4		method, ie cassette/rivet?
5	Α.	Well, the certificate is an assessment of overall
6		fitness for purpose, of which fire is only a part,
7		albeit a very important part. The only applicable
8		restriction in this case would have been the fire
9		classifications .
10	Q.	Yes, but what I'm getting at is: isn't this
11		a potentially inconsistent approach, to be limiting the
12		certificate in terms of colour, but not making clear
13		that the results that you're quoting for fire
14		performance were for the rivet and not the cassette?
15	Α.	Yes, I think I acknowledged on Thursday that we should
16		have included the fact that those fire test reports were
17		specific to the riveted product.
18	Q.	Yes. So can we agree that this is an inconsistent
19		approach, to be saying on the one hand that it's limited
20		by colour but not to say it's limited by fixing method?
21	Α.	No, I think it's two different things: the colour is
22		a deliberate policy imposed across all product types by
23		the BBA; the failure to refer to riveting is an error.
24	Q.	I see.
25		Now, the reality is that Reynobond came in
		27
1		a plethora of colours and finishes . Now, it's right,
1 2		a plethora of colours and finishes . Now, it's right, isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known
		·
2		isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known
2 3	А.	isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing
2 3 4		isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature ; yes?
2 3 4 5		isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6		isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature ; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	Q.	<ul><li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li><li>Yes.</li><li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li><li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> <li>Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to the email chain that I was just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	<ul> <li>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right?</li> <li>It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'll change the text re fire and have a chat with</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'll change the text re fire and have a chat with you later.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'l II change the text re fire and have a chat with you later. "Regards</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'l II change the text re fire and have a chat with you later. "Regards "Hamo."</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'l II change the text re fire and have a chat with you later. "Regards "Hamo." As to that, do you recall reviewing or commenting on</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'll change the text re fire and have a chat with you later. "Regards "Hamo." As to that, do you recall reviewing or commenting on the text of section 6 of the BBA certificate prior to</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	<pre>isn't it, that the BBA project managers would have known that, having reviewed the Reynobond marketing literature; yes? Yes. But despite that, the certificate has extremely serious colour caveats reducing its usefulness to just three very specific products; is that right? It does have those caveats. I'm not sure it reduces its usefulness because it instructs a potential specifier to obtain the necessary fire classification for that configuration and colour. Right. If we go back to the email chain that I was just looking at with Mr Gregorian, {BBA00010693}, and just look at the top of the page, Mr Gregorian, in response to your advice, says: "Thanks John. "I'l II change the text re fire and have a chat with you later. "Regards "Hamo." As to that, do you recall reviewing or commenting on</pre>

5

25

1	Α.	No, I	doubt I	would	have	done so.	
	-						

2	Q.	Why do you doubt you would have done so, given this
3		exchange?
4	Α.	Because I was working in a different team within the

- A. Because I was working in a different team within the BBA, and I was not advising on the detailed text of the 6 certificate , other than this email.
- 7 Q. Do you recall --
- 8 A. It was a general policy across the business and not 9 specific to this job.
- 10  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Do you recall having any other discussions with
- 11 Mr Gregorian about the text of section 6 of the
- 12 certificate before it was issued? 13 A. I may have done, but I don't recall.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 Now, I'm now going to turn to ask you about the reviews of the certificate that were carried out 16 17 subsequently 18 We heard in the oral evidence of
- 19 Ms Valentina Amoroso that there were a number of reviews
- 20 of certificate 08/4510 during its lifetime, and we've
- 21 understood the chronology, just to help you with that,
- 2.2 to be broadly as follows: there was a review which started in December 2010 and closed in April 2011, that 23
- 24 was the 2011 review; there was then a second review
- 25 which started in October 2013 and closed in April 2015,

29

- 1 we're going to call that the 2015 review; the BBA then 2 offered a re-issue contract to Arconic but this was not
- 3 processed by the BBA, despite being signed by Arconic;
- 4 then there was a review which started on 12 October 2016
- and went through to November 2016, that's the 2016 5
- 6 review; and then the BBA again offered a re-issue
- 7 contract to Arconic in 2016, and that was taken up. The
- 8 fire at Grenfell Tower occurred during the work being 9
- done on the certificate during that 2016 re-issue 10 contract. So that's the background.

11 Now, in terms of the terms that applied to these 12 reviews, can you just help us with this. We see in the 13 documents that have been disclosed about the reviews 14 that there were from time to time additional terms and 15 conditions that applied specifically to them. We have 16 sought clarification on this from the BBA, as to 17 precisely what conditions would have been applicable to 18 the reviews, and we understand the BBA's position to be 19 that there were additional terms and conditions for the 20 reviews, but that the original contract terms entered 21 into in 2007 would have remained in force for the 2.2 lifetime of the certificate .

23 Is that correct? Is that consistent with your 24 understanding?

25 A. Yes, I believe the review terms and conditions refer

30

1		back to the original .
2	Q.	Yes. So proceeding on the basis that the 2007 contract
3		terms applied to the reviews, can we just return to
4		those terms and conditions in the technical file for
5		this assessment. This is at $\{BBA00008042/2\}$ . So these
6		are the certificate terms and conditions. This is taken
7		from the file that we have for this Reynobond
8		certificate .
9		If we go to page 3 {BBA00008042/3}, we see the
10		clause 7 obligations upon Arconic. We can see those on
11		the left — hand side, on the left—hand column.
12		We can see that under 7(a) there is an obligation to
13		"disclose to the BBA full particulars of and relating
14		and to the Subject including", and then there is a whole
15		list of particulars that have to be provided.
16		Then if we look at clause 7(g), further down in that
17		column, we can see that it was an obligation of the main
18		contract to:
19		"Immediately notify the BBA of any change in the
20		particulars supplied to the BBA or any third parties and
21		also of any new or additional information concerning the
22		Subject or its suitability for the Specified Use
23		including, without limitation to the generality of the
24		foregoing, details of claims by users of the Subject

that it is or may be unsatisfactory for the Specified

31

1		Use"
2		So those are the main contract terms.
3		If we could also look at page 4 of this contract
4		{BBA00008042/4}, we can see on the left-hand side at the
5		top is clause 13, and this deals with "Withdrawal or
6		suspension of the certificate ", and it makes clear that:
7		"The BBA shall be entitled to withdraw or suspend
8		the Certificate at any time by notice in writing to the
9		Applicant and without prejudice to the generality of the
10		foregoing may withdraw or suspend the Certificate by
11		notice "
12		And then there are some particulars given about
13		certain circumstances, including, for example, at $(b)$ :
14		"There is any change in the technical specification
15		of the Subject as assessed and as set out in the
16		Certificate ."
17		So that's the contractual provision that governs
18		withdrawal or suspension of the certificate .
19		Now, just in general, would you agree that a review
20		should be a thorough and comprehensive process?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	And would you agree that a meticulous and careful review
23		process is essential to the trust that the construction
24		industry has in BBA certificates?
25	Α.	Yes.

1	Q. Now, I want to focus with you at this point on the
2	review that took place between 2013 and 2015.
3	Now, as we heard from Ms Amoroso during her oral
4	evidence, this commenced in October 2013, when the
5	former project manager, Maria Barbeito, wrote to
6	Arconic. If we can look at her letter, that's at
7	{BBA00008090}. This is Ms Barbeito's letter,
8	8 October 2013, and if we go to page 2 $\{BBA00008090/2\}$ ,
9	under the heading "Submission of data" at the bottom of
10	that page, it is stated:
11	"It is necessary for the BBA to be supplied with the
12	following information in order to carry out the Review
13	of your Agrément Certificate "
14	And the number is given.
15	In 1 it says:
16	"It is our normal practice to conduct a written
17	survey of users of the product."
18	There is a typographical error in there referring to
19	Stonelite cladding panels in the second line.
20	Then we see at point 2:
21	"Written confirmation that there have been no
22	changes in the design,specification ,context of use or
23	other details that would invalidate the Certificate .
24	Alternatively, please specify any changes."
25	Then it goes on about factory production and control

1		in paragraph 3, and regarding factory production and
2		control, they are asked for full details of any changes
3		to, and then a whole list. We see raw materials, and
4		then if we go over the page $\{BBA00008090/3\}$ , the
5		manufacturing process and quality control procedure.
6		Then the list goes on $$ we don't need to go to the
7		other items in the list $$ and we can see this is signed
8		Maria Barbeito. So that was October 2013.
9		Do we take it from that that by this time, so
10		October 2013 $$ and I think by this time you're head of
11		approvals of construction products; is that right? You
12		held that position between 2013 and 2019.
13	Α.	Yes. There was a brief period where I was head of
14		approvals for the energy and ventilation team, and
15		I believe that's missed from my statement. That was for
16		a brief period before the three teams were merged into
17		two teams, at which point I became head of construction
18		projects . So I may ——
19	Q.	Right.
20	Α.	My statement wasn't entirely correct in terms of
21		chronology.
22	Q.	I see. Can you remember the date when you became head
23		of construction projects?

- 24  $\,$  A. I think it was 2013 but not precisely.
- 25 Q. Right.
- 34

1		Do we take it from this that by this time it was
2		customary to require a certificate holder at such
3		a review to provide both factory production control
4		data, that was paragraph 3, and the written
5		confirmation $$ if we can go back a page in the letter
6		$\{BBA00008090/2\}$ — that there had been no changes that
7		we see in paragraph 2? Was that customary practice
8		within the BBA?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	We saw in the evidence of Ms Amoroso that she sent
11		similar versions of this letter herself, or sent
12		a similar version of the letter herself . For the
13		transcript , the reference is at $\{BBA00008098\},$ and that
14		also contained an identical request for written
15		confirmations that there had been no changes in the
16		design.
17		Then we saw that the project managers sent a number
18		of requests for this information over a protracted
19		period, that's between October 2013 and January 2015.
20		Ms Barbeito herself sent six requests in writing, and
21		also had several telephone calls . Ms Amoroso and
22		$Mr\xspace$ Nkomo sent five written requests, so in total that's
23		11 written chasers in that period.
24		Now, was that volume of correspondence on this
25		review normal in your experience?
		35

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Didn't it indicate to the BBA that it had a recalcitrant 3 certificate holder?
- A. I would have expected more of a response after that
   number of chases, yes.
- 6 Q. Yes, not just more of a response, but a response; yes?7 Because you had no response to that.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9~ Q. Didn't it indicate that Arconic weren't interested in
- 10 sharing information with the BBA?
- A. Certificate holders very often were slow to respond for
   requests for information. This is not unique or even
   an unusual situation at that time.
- 14 Q. I see. So you have accepted that the volume of
- 15 correspondence on this review was not normal, but you're 16 saying that this was not a unique or an unusual
- 17 situation; is that right?
- 18~ A. It was common for certificate holders to be slow in
- responding. This is an exceptional extreme case,l believe.
- 21 Q. Right. You say it was common for certificate holders to 22 be slow in responding; what about no response at all to
- 23 that question posed again and again 11 times?
- 24 A. Again, it was unusual, but not unique. In these
- 25  $\,$  situations , it was to the discretion at that time of the

1		line managers whether enough information was available	1		At this time, there was discretion given to team
2		elsewhere to enable a judgement to be made as to whether	2		managers to proceed in this way. I would have expected
3		or not the certificate continued to represent the	3		the team manager to speak to his boss, the head of
4		performance as assessed.	4		approval, certainly in my team that was how it worked,
5	Q.	Right. Well, I'll come to the decision that was made	5		and so a decision would have been made at a senior level
6		about this in just a moment.	6		within the BBA that sufficient information was
7		What we know is that Ms Amoroso did succeed	7		available .
8		eventually in establishing a signed quality plan and	8		We have changed the process now, and this discretion
9		setting up some ongoing surveillance, but she did not	9		no longer applies . In these circumstances, under the
10		succeed in getting the written confirmation that there	10		current processes, the certificate would be suspended.
11		had been no changes which would invalidate the	11	Q.	Yes, well, thank you for that. But going back to what
12		certificate .	12		you said about the situation pertaining at the time, you
13		Can we go at this point to an email she sends in	13		said there that there was no contradiction in the claims
14		January 2015. This is at $\{BBA00008079\}$ . This is the	14		being made by the manufacturer compared to those made in
15		email from Ms Amoroso to Lilia Koscuk at Arconic,	15		the certificate .
16		copying in Mr Wehrle and Céline Erny, and she says:	16		The BBA's job didn't start and finish with the
17		"Hi Lilia,	17		claims being made by the manufacturer in its literature,
18		"Sorry for the late reply.	18		did it?
19		"Unfortunately in the last year we have experienced	19	Α.	No.
20		several problems in getting in touch with you and	20	Q.	The BBA's entire purpose, surely, was to scrutinise such
21		receive the required info to progress our job, this	21		claims and ascertain, by reference to objectively
22		leading to severe delays in closing this Review job.	22		verifiable evidence or information, whether those claims
23		"For this reason BBA has decided to go ahead with	23		were accurate; yes?
24		the information already in hands.	24	Α.	Yes, but the decision had already been made in the
25		"I drafted a copy of the Review Report and I am	25		original assessment based on data provided to us that
		27			20
		37			39
1			1		
		waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that	1 2		appeared to validate the claims being made.
1 2 3		waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. "			appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed
2		waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go	2		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would
2 3	A.	waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?	2 3		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed
2 3 4	A.	waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point? I don't think so. This would be in the engineering	2 3 4	Ο.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so.
2 3 4 5		waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?	2 3 4 5	Q.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA
2 3 4 5 6		<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. "</li> <li>Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Q.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came
2 3 4 5 6 7		<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. "</li> <li>Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. "</li> <li>Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. "</li> <li>Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. "</li> <li>Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	Q.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that there have been no changes undermining the certificate.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data, again, our procedures did not envisage such a situation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see. Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that there have been no changes undermining the certificate. How could information that you do have in your hands</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data, again, our procedures did not envisage such a situation could occur, that someone could behave in this manner and deliberately mislead us.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that there have been no changes undermining the certificate. How could information that you do have in your hands affect the fact that you are missing that important</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data, again, our procedures did not envisage such a situation could occur, that someone could behave in this manner and deliberately mislead us.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that there have been no changes undermining the certificate. How could information that you do have in your hands affect the fact that you are missing that important confirmation?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data, again, our procedures did not envisage such a situation could occur, that someone could behave in this manner and deliberately mislead us. But with fire test data, wasn't it envisaged that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that there have been no changes undermining the certificate.</li> <li>How could information that you do have in your hands affect the fact that you are missing that important confirmation?</li> <li>I don't know what information was available. I would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data, again, our procedures did not envisage such a situation could occur, that someone could behave in this manner and deliberately mislead us. But with fire test data, wasn't it envisaged that there could be re—testing of products periodically, as we've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>waiting for approval from my Team Manager. After that you will receive it for your personal record. " Now, did you have any role in the decision to go ahead with the documents already in hand at this point?</li> <li>I don't think so. This would be in the engineering department, so I should not have been involved.</li> <li>I see.</li> <li>Do you agree with this decision, given the history that I've just outlined to you, which we went through with Ms Amoroso in detail?</li> <li>I can't really make comment, because I don't know what information was available from other sources that led to this decision being made.</li> <li>But, hang on, you know that the manufacturer has been asked at least 11 times in writing for confirmation that there have been no changes undermining the certificate.</li> <li>How could information that you do have in your hands affect the fact that you are missing that important confirmation?</li> <li>I don't know what information was available. I would imagine that technical literature , performance claims</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A.	appeared to validate the claims being made. I don't think the BBA procedures were ever designed to cope with a situation where a manufacturer would deliberately mishold(sic) fire test data from the BBA and continue to do so. But put aside for a moment what had happened when the certificate was first issued. We know that Arconic came into possession of more fire test information in the ensuing years, information which did undermine that that was in the certificate . Why wasn't it important for the BBA to get an answer to the question whether anything had changed? Given the fact they had already misrepresented the performance of the product and were continuing to do so, despite the fact they had additional fire test data, again, our procedures did not envisage such a situation could occur, that someone could behave in this manner and deliberately mislead us. But with fire test data, wasn't it envisaged that there could be re—testing of products periodically, as we've seen in some of the underlying fire test information

- 24 made in the certificate . That would have given valid?
  - 25 A. Yes, that's true, and if that were the case, then

38

reassurance that nothing had changed.

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters

24

- 1 I would expect that a responsible manufacturer would
- immediately change the claims being made for the process
   based on the new fire data available to them. I'm
- 3 based on the new fire data available to them. I'm
- 4 assuming that they did not do so because we would have
- 5 checked that as part of the review process.
- 6 Q. Right. But here you haven't just got a void, an absence 7 of information; you have 11 requests where you've asked
- 8 for that information, you've asked whether there have
- 9 been any changes. That should have been a very simple
- 10 thing for Arconic to answer, shouldn't it?
- 11 A. Yes, it should.
- 12 Q. And you have had those 11 requests go by and they
   13 haven't said anything to you. Shouldn't that have
   14 alerted suspicion within the project managers that
- 15 something was awry?
- A. Well, again, we may well have been naive, but I don't
  think that suspicion that someone was deliberately
  misrepresenting the performance of their product in
- 19 a safety critical manner would have occurred to us.
- 20 Q. Mr Nkomo said that there was a general instruction in
- 21 place that if project managers were not getting all the
- 22 information that they had been chasing for, project
- 23 managers should then complete the review with what you
- have and close the job, that was his evidence at{Day107/48}, {Day107/54} and {Day107/55}.

### 41

- 1 Were you aware that this was the approach that 2 project managers were following at this time: to 3 complete the review with what you have and close the job 4 and move on? 5 A. I think Mr Nkomo may have accidentally slightly 6 misinterpreted the position. I would have expected him 7 to discuss that situation with his line manager as part 8 of regular monthly updates, and that they should come to 9 a decision between the two of them to close the job on 10 the basis of the information available. That was my 11 experience. 12 Q. I see. I understand that you're saying in terms of the process he should have followed, he perhaps should have 13 gone one level higher than himself, but in terms of the 14 15 basic point that he's making, he said there was 16 a general instruction in place that if project managers 17 were not getting all the information they had been 18 chasing for, they should complete the review with what 19 you have and close the job. 20 Are you suggesting that he is making that up or was 21 that indeed the general instruction at the time? 2.2 A. No, I'm not saying he's making it up, I think he's just 23 slightly not given all of the full information.
- 24 Certainly the intention was to close the job if
- 25 possible, but only if the information available to

42

- 1 you -- to him was such that he could have confidence in 2 closing that job. It's a case-by-case process, it's not 3 an overall instruction. 4 Q. And how was that communicated to project managers and 5 managers such as Mr Nkomo? A. Through training, ongoing mentoring, and the fact that 6 7 there would be a minimum of monthly meetings, initially between the project manager and the team manager, to 8 9 discuss all ongoing jobs, and then the team manager 10 would meet with the head of approvals in the same way to 11 discuss problem jobs. So in that scenario I would 12 expect that this would have been discussed with the head 13 of approvals and a decision made on an individual basis 14 that it was appropriate to close the job. 15 Q. Right. But it would appear that didn't happen in this 16 instance: ves? 17 A. I don't know. 18 Q. Did you endorse that approach, that general approach of: 19 if you can't get all the information, you just complete 20 the review with what you have and close the job? 21 A. At the time, yes, that was consistent across both teams. 22 As I said, we have perhaps recognised that we were naive 23 and changed the process as it stands at the moment. 24 Q. Right. 25 Ms Amoroso said that it was the common practice 43
- 2 there was, in her words, active denial from the 3 certificate holder to allow factory visits . That was at 4 {Day106/82:16-20}. Is she right about that? Was it common practice 5 6 that suspension would only happen where there was active 7 denial to allow factory visits? 8 A. I think she's incorrect. That is a scenario where 9 suspension would certainly happen, but there are many 10 other situations where certificates may be suspended. 11 Q. Can you explain how that came to be her understanding of 12 the circumstances, and indeed the only circumstances, in 13 which suspension would occur? 14 A. No. I can't. 15 Q. Was there any written policy or guidance to project 16 managers about when a failure to communicate with the 17 BBA should be escalated? 18 A. This would be discussed on an individual basis in the 19 meetings that I have described. 2.0 Q. When you say "This would be discussed", do you know for 21 a fact that it was discussed on a regular basis at the 2.2 time, or is that speculation on your part? 23 Α. It's speculation on my part. I can only speak from my

within the BBA that suspension would only happen where

own personal experience of the way matters were managedin my team. The intention was that it should be

1

2

- 1 consistent across both teams, our procedures are
- 2 consistent across both teams, and I would be surprised
- 3 if that were not the case. I don't have personal
- 4 experience to confirm that, though.
- 5~ Q. So when I asked you the question: was there any written
- 6 policy or guidance to project managers about when 7 a failure to communicate with the BBA should be
- escalated, is the answer to that question no?
- 9 A. I can't recall a specific policy that would cover that 10 scenario, but every job that we do is handled on
- 11 an individual basis and it is discussed with line
- 12 management, who are familiar with the processes, as are
- 13 the project managers.
- Q. Was there any written policy or guidance given to
   project managers about when to escalate a case for
   consideration for suspension?
- A. Again, on an absolute minimum of monthly basis, each job
   would be discussed with line manager and scenarios for
   handling individual situations would be developed.
- Q. Who are you saying would have been the line manager that
   this should have been discussed with? Who was that at
- 22 the time? This is 2015 -
- A. It would be the head of approvals -- I'm sorry, I spoke
   over you. It would be the head of approvals,
- 24 over you. It would be the head of approva
   25 Brian Chamberlain.

### 45

- Q. Right. But, again, I think the answer to my question is 1 no -- is this right? -- that there was no written policy 2 3 or guidance given to project managers about when to 4 escalate a case for consideration of suspension? 5 A. There are documented procedures dealing with suspension of certificates . Policies cannot possibly cover 6 7 individual circumstances because they are subtle and 8 nuanced and have to be discussed. 9 Q. When you say, "There are documented procedures dealing 10 with suspension of certificates ", are you saying that 11 those written policies don't cover at all the 12 circumstances in which suspension ought to be considered 13 or escalated within the BBA? 14 A. That's a subjective consideration that is very difficult 15 to actually put into a procedure, so no. 16 Q. Ms Amoroso has also said that she did not review the 17 original contract terms with Arconic to see what they 18 said during this time. Can you explain that, why 19 a project manager wouldn't go back to the contract terms 20 to see what the overarching obligations were in this 21 scenario? 2.2 A. I'm struggling to see why the project manager would go
- 23 back to the contract terms. The requirements for the
- $24 \qquad \mbox{review are clear}\,. \mbox{ They are } --\mbox{ there is a standard}$
- 25 review letter . The standard review letter was sent.

46

3 really see it's necessary to go back to the terms and 4 conditions of the certificate . 5 Q. In circumstances where 11 separate chasers had been sent for confirmation that there had been no changes 6 7 undermining the certificate, wouldn't you have expected 8 the project manager to have reviewed the contractual 9 obligations in their entirety in order to start 10 considering suspension? A. I think as part of the training, the contractual 11 12 obligations are understood by project managers. I don't 13 dispute that, I just wonder why anyone would need to go 14 back to read the original contract. It's the principles 15 I think that are important, and they would have been 16 understood 17 Q. Well, one possibility is so that they understand the 18 circumstances in which suspension or withdrawal of the 19 certificate can occur. 20 A. But that would not be a decision for the project 21 manager. There is an escalation process within the BBA 22 that ultimately requires the signature of a director. 23 There are about four steps in a suspension and it's not

The consequences for failing to comply with that, as

I say, would be discussed with line management. I don't

- 24 the project manager's decision.
- 25  $\,$  Q. Right. So how do you suggest this ought to have

### 47

1 happened? What, that the project manager escalated this to Mr Chamberlain for consideration of suspension; yes? 2 3 A. No, I'm saying it would depend on the individual 4 circumstances, and I'm not aware of what those 5 circumstances were and the basis for the decision that 6 was made. If it was considered that it was appropriate 7 to suspend the certificate , then there is a process to 8 be followed and that would ultimately involve the head 9 of approvals. 10 Q. Okay, but you are aware, and we have gone through it in 11 detail with the BBA witnesses, that on at least 11 12 occasions written confirmation was requested that there 13 were no changes undermining the certificate. In those 14 circumstances, would you have expected the project 15 manager to have considered suspension and referred it to 16 her line manager for further consideration? 17 A. Yes, I would expect this job to have been discussed as 18 with any other job and an appropriate decision made. 19  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Why do you say, "I would expect this job to have been discussed as with any other job"? Wasn't this a very 2.0 21 unusual situation, where those requests had been made 2.2 time and time again over a two-year period with no 23 response 24 Yes, it was an unusual scenario, although not unique. Α 25 All jobs are discussed on a regular basis with line

1		management and decisions made on the basis of the
2		available information.
3	Q.	To your knowledge, was there any pressure on the BBA
4		project managers to close out reviews? Were they
5		incentivised to close out reviews?
6	Α.	As with any business, there is pressure to complete work
7		in hand. When you say incentivised, no, there's no
8		financial or personal reward to be gained by closing
9		jobs.
10	Q.	What about pressure at around this time? Were you
11		conscious that there was pressure on project managers to
12		be completing and closing out reviews?
13	Α.	As with any business, as I say, there is always pressure
14		to complete work in hand. I'm not aware of any
15		particular emphasis at this time.
16	Q.	The reality is, isn't it, that the BBA is a commercial
17		organisation, so the longer a review takes, the less
18		profit the BBA will make on the fees that the
19		certificate holder is paying? Do you accept that?
20	Α.	It doesn't affect profit. The fee is a flat fee for
21		a review.
22		I should emphasise, yes, there is commercial
23		pressure to complete work. That is never overriding the
24		technical integrity of what we do. That is always
25		paramount.
		49
-	~	
1	Q.	Were you ever made aware that there was a leader board
2		or tally in the BBA office showing the number of
3		closed—out reviews for each team?
4		No.
5 6		You were never aware of that at any stage? No.
7		Now, we know now that by this stage Arconic had further
8	Q.	fire test data. In October 2011, Arconic had performed
9		another European test of the Reynobond PE in cassette
10		form, and this time the CSTB issued a classification
11		report saying that cassette form was a class E.
12		Then more tests were done at the end of 2013 and, on
13		31 January 2014, the CSTB issued a classification report
14		that Reynobond in either rivet or cassette form was
15		class E, so all Reynobond panels were European class E.
16		That is the time when Ms Maria Barbeito was seeking
17		information from Arconic. That classification of E for
18		both panels lasted for the better part of the year.
19		Then on 4 December 2014, at Arconic's request, the
20		CSTB issued new classification reports: the Reynobond PE
21		rivet dropped from a class B and was classified as
22		a C-s2, d0, and the Reynobond PE cassette was classified
23		as E.
24		Now, in those circumstances, it's right, isn't it,
25		that had the BBA insisted that Arconic produce written
		•

50

1	confirmation that there were no changes undermining the
2	certificate , the BBA might well have been alerted to the
3	fact that the fire performance was wrongly stated on the
4	certificate ? Do you accept that?
5 A.	If they had told us, yes. But I would have expected
6	them to provide us with those fire test reports in
7	accordance with their contractual obligations. I would
8	also have expected them to update the fire
9	classifications being claimed for their product in their
10	technical literature .
11 Q	Yes, but I think we can agree also, can we, that you
12	would have also expected the BBA to have insisted on
13	confirmation that there were no changes which
14	invalidated the certificate ?
15 A.	I think, given the history of communications with
16	Arconic, I would very much doubt they would provide us
17	with that information, but if they had done so, then
18	yes, it would have alerted us.
19 Q	Can we look at what you say about this in your second
20	witness statement, {BBA00010723/34}, paragraph 138. You
21	say there at 138:
22	"As previously described in Point 21 above, no
23	response was received from the Certificate holder to
24	these requests for the first two Reviews. As much of
25	the necessary information was available to the BBA from
	51
1	other sources, such as the Internet a decision was made
2	to continue the Certification on the basis of the
3	information that was available, on the understanding
4	that there had been no significant technical changes

 $"\mathsf{BBA}$  procedures do allow sanctions to be taken, for example where there is a  $\ldots\,$  lack of co–operation by

Certificate holders and this could lead to suspension or

withdrawal of a Certificate . However, on my review of

the documents, in this case, I can see no reason to

believe that there was any additional information

conflicting with that given in the Certificate . In

addition, the Certificate holder was continuing to

co-operate in other ways, such as maintaining the

It seems to have been considered at the time that

response to the lack of communication from the

Certificate holder during the Review process.'

surveillance operated over the manufacturing process.

withdrawing the Certificate would be a disproportionate

had been asked on multiple occasions to confirm that

there that it was considered that withdrawing the  $$52\end{tabular}$ 

there had been no changes which would undermine the

certificate and had never responded, why you are saying

Now, can you explain, in circumstances where Arconic

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

affecting the certificate ."

You go on:

1 certificate would be a disproportionate response to the lack of communication?

- 2
- 3 A. Well, that was a conclusion drawn by other people, so
- 4 I can't comment on whether or not it was appropriate.
- I can only imagine that the information available at the 5
- time gave the necessary reassurance that there was no 6
- 7 contradiction between the performance being claimed and that that was given within the certificate . 8
- 9
- Q. Well, they were not co-operating in a significant way 10 with the review, were they? We can agree that.
- 11 A. Yes
- 12 Q. And if they couldn't confirm there had been no changes. 13 vou could have no confidence that your certificate was
- 14 an accurate statement about the performance of the 15 product, could you?
- A. Well, it was consistent with the claims being made by 16 17 the manufacturer.
- 18 Q. Why did that give you confidence that the certificate
- 19 was an accurate statement about the performance of the 20 product?
- 21 A. Well, as I've explained, I don't think our procedures
- 2.2 anticipated a situation where there would be deliberate
- 23 misrepresentation of the performance of the product with
- 24 a fire safety critical aspect of performance such as
- 25

this

### 53

- 1 Q. But if all you're doing in these reviews is looking at 2 whether there is any changes as compared with the 3 manufacturer's literature, what is the point of a BBA 4 review? Couldn't an average construction professional 5 do that for themselves? A. Well, the review goes beyond looking at the 6 7 manufacturer's literature. That's only one aspect of
- 8 it. But there was no information available to us that
- 9 suggested the assessment made during the original
- 10 contract was incorrect and that nothing appeared to have 11 changed
- 12 Q. But you'd asked that very question of the manufacturer 13 and on multiple occasions they had not responded, so you did have some information available to you that 14
- 15 suggested there might be a problem: ves?
- 16 A. Yes, there could be many reasons why there was no
- 17 response, though. As I said, perhaps we were naive, but 18 I don't think we anticipated the actual reason why there
- 19 was no response.
- 20 Q. Mr Nkomo's oral evidence -- he was the team manager at 21 this time -- was that he was not even aware that there
- 2.2 was any discussion or consideration of suspension of the
- 23 certificate . That was {Day107/69} and {Day107/90}.
- 24 How can you explain why suspension doesn't even
- 25 appear to have been considered as one possible response

54

- 1 to the lack of co-operation you were getting from 2 Arconic?
- 3 A. I don't know, I was not involved in that particular 4 conversation
- MS GRANGE: Mr Chairman, if I can just finish this line of 5
- questioning, it won't take much longer. 6
- 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, all right.
- 8 MS GRANGE: If we look at another passage in your second
- 9 witness statement at page 35 {BBA00010723/35},
- 10 paragraph 142, you say this:

Grenfell Tower Inquiry

- 11 "The failure of Arconic to disclose the existence of
- 12 other fire test reports, including that demonstrating
- 13 Class E performance for the cassette fixing method
- 14 should have been declared to the BBA at the time of the
- 15 initial assessment and at each of the subsequent
- 16 Reviews. The failure to do so prevented this
- 17 Classification being included in the product 18
- Certification . We would clearly consider this to be 19
- unsatisfactory now, but could have formed no opinion on 2.0 the matter at the time of receipt of their response, as
- 21 we were unaware of the existence of the additional
- 22 data '
- 23 Now, in that last part of that paragraph, doesn't
- 24 that actually underestimate what was going on here? You
- 25 say you could have formed no opinion on the matter at

### 55

- 1 the time. Couldn't you have formed an opinion on the 2 fact that Arconic was failing to co-operate with the BBA 3 by failing to respond to its requests? 4 A. Yes, and we have now changed our procedures whereby 5 where no response is received, we will proceed to suspend the certificate . 6 7  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  The implication from your statement is that you didn't 8 consider that to be an unsatisfactory state of affairs . 9 Can you explain why not? 10 A. Well, clearly it was an unsatisfactory state of affairs . 11 As I've said, I am assuming that at the time the 12 individuals concerned considered that there was 13 sufficient information available to them to make 14 a judgement. 15 Q. Wasn't this the paradigm case of a lack of co-operation? 16 A. Clearly there was a lack of co-operation. For context, 17 it was not unique, this would sometimes happen, and 18 a judgement had to be made on a case-by-case basis. 19  $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{Can}$  you accept now that that was a wholly flawed 2.0 iudgement that was made at the time? 21 Yes, and for that reason we have now changed our Α 2.2 procedures so it cannot reoccur.
- 23 Shouldn't the BBA have suspended this certificate until Q. 2.4 Arconic provided all of the information that had been
  - requested?

25

- 1 A. That was not the policy at the time. It would be the 2 policy now. Why that was not carried out at the time, 3 I don't know, because I don't know the individual 4 circumstances MS GRANGE: I see. 5 Mr Chairman, thank you for letting me carry on. 6 7 I think that would be an appropriate moment. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Right, thank you very much. 8 9 Well, Mr Albon, we will have a break at this point. 10 We will come back at 11.40, please, and again, as I have 11 on previous occasions,  ${\sf I}$  have to ask you not to talk to 12 anyone about your evidence or anything relating to it during the break. All right? 13 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, thank you. 15 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. We will look forward to seeing you a bit later on, then. Thank you very much. 16 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 18 (11.22 am) 19 (A short break) 20 (11.40 am) SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We are 21 2.2 ready to continue hearing Mr Albon's evidence. I' II 23 just check that he is in contact with us. 24 Are you there, Mr Albon? Can you see me, can you 25 hear me? 57 1 THE WITNESS: Yes. I can. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you very much. 2 3 You're ready to carry on, I hope? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you. 5 6 Then when you're ready, Ms Grange.  $\mathsf{MS}\ \mathsf{GRANGE}:\ \mathsf{Yes,\ thank\ you\ very\ much}.$ 7 8 Mr Albon, just some short questions now about the 9 CSTB. 10 I want to know if you can help us with a matter 11 which arises from Ms Amoroso's evidence on the CSTB. 12 She said in her oral evidence that she would have expected the CSTB to notify the BBA if there had been 13 14 changes to the certified product. She said that at 14 15 {Day106/79} and also at {Day106/206} and following, and 15 16 she talked about a mutual agreement between the BBA and 16 17 the CSTB in this regard. 17 18 Can you help us, was there any mutual agreement 18 19 between the BBA and the CSTB about the sharing of 19 2.0 2.0 information relevant to, for example, the Reynobond 21 21 product? 22 A. Not in the way you have just described, no. Other than 2.2 23 the CSTB providing us with evidence -- sorry, evidence; 23
- 24 data during the original assessment, that was the end of 25
  - the relationship with regard to Reynobond.

1	Q.	Right, thank you.
2		There was or was supposed to be some sharing of
3		information relevant to the surveillance of the factory
4		processes which the CSTB was to be carrying out and
5		which the BBA relied on up until 2015; is that right?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	That's what Mr Nkomo appeared to understand this
8		agreement to relate to. He thought it was about the
9		surveillance visits which the CSTB were undertaking.
10		That was {Day107/23}.
11		So, just to be clear, is your evidence that there
12		was no agreement with the CSTB to share test evidence or
13		data more generally than that?
14	Α.	Not that I am aware of, no.
15	Q.	Yes. So you're not aware of an agreement with the CSTB
16		to share information relevant to the Reynobond products
17		if , for example, they were re—tested by the CSTB between
18		2008 and 2015?
19	Α.	No.
20	Q.	Thank you.
21		Now, moving forward in time to the 2016 review, we
22		heard from Ms Amoroso about that 2016 review which
23		commenced in October 2016.
24		Can we just go to the letter that she sent at that
25		point. This is $\{BBA00011059/4\}$ . If we go to page 4
		59
1		within this string, we can see here the email that she
2		sent on 12 October 2016 to Mr Wehrle, Mr Schmidt and
3		others at Arconic. It's about the Reynobond
4		architecture wall cladding panels and this certificate .
5		She says:
6		"I have been designated as the Project Manager
7		responsible for coordinating the review of your BBA
8		Certificate [and she gives the number] and your name has
9		been advised to me by as our main liaison contact for
10		this work.
11		"Our estimated time for the completion of this
12		project is approximately 4 months and to initiate the
13		work required for this review within that period, we

require the following information to be provided to the BBA by Alcoa Architectural Products:

"1. Written confirmation from Alcoa ... that there have been no changes to the raw materials, manufacturing process or quality control procedure, other than those already notified to the BBA.

"2. A copy of the current UK technical literature, CE Marking (if applicable) ... "3. A list of customer complaints ...

"4. Recent copies of completed quality control sheets ....

2.4

25

"In order that there are no delays in completing the

review, I would be grateful if you would reply with the 1 2 relevant information ... ' 3 Now, that is different from the letter which 4 Ms Amoroso sent in 2014, in the sense that it does not 5 request written confirmation that there have been no 6 changes in the design, specification, context or use or 7 other details that would invalidate the certificate . 8 Now, we've understood from the evidence of Mr Nkomo 9 that this email that we see on the screen would not have 10 been a standard form letter, but a letter that the 11 project manager would have taken from something they 12 were working on at the time. 13 Is it right that it was up to the project manager 14 how to phrase the requests for reviews at this time? So 15 we're now in 2016. 16 A. I was not directly involved. It was my understanding 17 there was a standard review template. I know for sure 18 there is a standard review template now. I thought 19 there would have been at this time. 20  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  So would you have expected to have seen the same 21 paragraph about written confirmation, no changes, repeated as part of this 2016 request? 2.2 23 A. I'm sorry, I'm not familiar with what the standard 24 template would have been in 2016, but I'm surprised it's 25 not there. 61

1	Q.	Yes, thank you.
2		Now, in fact, Arconic respond to Ms Amoroso in
3		terms. First, Mr Remy provides detailed information
4		about the surveillance quality plan, and Ms Amoroso then
5		asked for the UK technical literature and CE marking,
6		et cetera, and Mr Remy sends her some technical
7		datasheets, a brochure about installation and the CE
8		certificate , albeit for Reynolux. We can find no other
9		communication in which Ms Amoroso asked for any kind of
10		confirmation that there were no details that would
11		invalidate the certificate .
12		Now, can you tell us whether that was in line with
13		the BBA's formal processes and procedures at this time?
14	Α.	I'm sorry, I don't think I can, because I can't recall
15		the template that was in place at that time.
16	Q.	Right. So you can't recall what should have been
17		requested?
18	Α.	No, sorry.
19	Q.	I see.
20		Now, we heard in the oral evidence of Ms Amoroso
21		that at this time she noticed that Arconic were not
22		taking responsibility for the product when fabricated in
23		cassette form, and she required all references to that
24		to be removed at this time.
25		Doesn't it follow from that change that the BBA did

62

1	appreciate that the original certificate did cover the
2	cassette variant?
3	A. I think that is open unfortunately to interpretation.
4	It's not to my view, but clearly other people thought
5	that it did.
6	Q. That change was a very important one, wasn't it, to
7	remove references to the cassette fix , because otherwise
8	people might think the performance stated was accurate
9	for the cassette fix; yes?

- 10 A Yes
- 11  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Wasn't that something that needed to be updated as
- 12 a matter of urgency? 13 A. I think the urgency would only apply if we had been 14 aware of the reaction to fire classification of the 15 cassette product, and we weren't.
- 16  ${\sf Q}.\;\; {\sf But}\; {\sf why}\; {\sf wouldn't}\; {\sf the}\; {\sf urgency}\; {\sf apply}\; {\sf also}\; {\sf once}\; {\sf you}\; {\sf became}\;$ 17 aware that Arconic was not taking responsibility for the
- 18 product when fabricated in cassette form?
- 19 A. Well, that was something we clearly needed to address,
- 20 and I believe we did so as part of this process. But
- 21 clearly the urgency to that would be less than it would
- 2.2 be for a safety critical parameter. 23
- Q. Right. 24 Well, what we see is that the next step was for
- 25 Arconic to enter into a review contract, and that change

### 63

1		was brought about over a period of months.
2		Can you help us as to whether that was in line with
3		the BBA's standard processes at the time?
4	Α.	I think you mean re-issue. This would be the review.
5		But if it was a re-issue contract, the time to carry out
6		the re-issue would vary depending on the amount of work
7		involved and the nature of that work.
8	Q.	Does it follow that, during that time, you could have
9		a certificate remaining in circulation but which you
10		know you want to make a change to narrow the scope of
11		it?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Now, I now want to ask you some questions about the
14		BBA's decisions around this time about the relevant
15		regulatory regime governing these ACM panels.
16		If we can look at your second witness statement at
17		this point, $\{BBA00010723/24\}$ , I want to look at
18		paragraph 95.
19		Now, in this section of your statement, just for
20		context, you're dealing with the 2016 review of the
21		certificate , and you say at 95:
22		"It was also noted that the fire section required
23		updating, to include reference to the necessary height
24		and boundary restrictions. This was part of a general
25		change of BBA policy to give the BBA's opinion on the

interpretation of the requirements of the documents
supporting the national Building Regulations. This did
not represent a change in the nature or scope of the
assessment or Certificate and would not have imposed any
additional restrictions on the use of the product
defined in the national Building Regulations as
originally assessed. Please see Point 149 below for
further details ."
If we go on to paragraph 149 on page 36 of this
statement $\{BBA00010723/36\}$ , you say this, right at the
bottom of the page:
"Earlier in 2017, before the fire , the BBA had
identified what it considered to be an ambiguity in the
wording of 12.7 Insulation Materials/Products, of
Approved Document B, Volume 2. This section reads"
And then over the page $\{BBA00010723/37\}$ we get the
quote from 12.7 of Approved Document B.
At paragraph 150 you continue:
"The issue centred on what would constitute
a ' filler ' and in particular whether the polyethylene
materials in ACMs could be so classified. Since the
events at Grenfell fire there has been some debate on
this issue and an opinion has been expressed by an
Expert Witness to the Inquiry, Dr Barbara Lane, that
this is not the case. However, the BBA felt that the

1	existence of the 'etc' in this section widened the
2	definition of the materials covered by this requirement
3	and that it could be concluded that the polyethylene
4	would be required to be of limited combustibility,
5	irrespective of whether or not it constituted
6	a ' filler '."
7	Just to finish this point, you say at 151:
8	"If this was the case, as the polyethylene was not
9	of limited combustibility, the product would be
10	restricted to use on buildings up to 18m in height."
11	Just to be clear, you say in the middle of that
12	paragraph that the BBA felt that the existence of the
13	"etc" in this section widened the definition. We can
14	see that at the top of the page, where it says:
15	"In a building with a storey 18m or more above
16	ground level any insulation product, filler material
17	(not including gasket, sealants, gaskets and similar)
18	etc used in the external wall construction, should be of
19	limited combustibility."
20	Now, taking this in stages, can you explain, when
21	was this ambiguity in the wording of 12.7, as you have
22	characterised it, first identified by the BBA?

A. Not precisely. Around the beginning of 2017, I wouldthink, roughly.

25  $\,$  Q. Were you involved in the identification of this  $\,$ 

66

- 1 ambiguity?
- 2 A. Yes

4

25

- 3~  $\,$  Q. Was it you within the BBA that spotted this and came up
  - with this interpretation?
- 5 A. I think so, yes
- 6~ ~ Q. So what was it that came to change and alerted you to
- 7 the fact that there was this ambiguity in the wording?
- A. I'm afraid I don't remember. I doubt if it was an ACM
   issue, because I didn't deal with these materials.
- 10 Q. Right. So are you saying that it's possible it came to
- 11 your attention because of an issue you were dealing
- 12 with, with another, different product, not an ACM
- 13 product?
- 14~ A. Yes, I think so, and then I probably applied it in the
- wider context of other BBA certified materials.Q. Can you help us as to what other product triggered this
- 17 consideration?
- 18 A. I'm sorry, I don't recall.
- 19 Q. Was it some form of composite product with a core in the 20 middle?
- 21 A. I don't know. It may be I was reading the section for
- 22 another purpose and somehow identified this could be
- 23 a problem for composite products. I really don't
- 24 remember what the catalyst was for beginning this
  - conversation with people.

### 67

- 1  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Can you just explain to us your thinking at the time in 2 terms of why it's the reference to "etc" in that 3 paragraph that potentially widened the definition of the 4 materials to cover the core of an ACM? 5 A. I think initially the debate centred on whether or not 6 the polyethylene core would constitute a filler , and 7 there is debate about whether or not that would be the 8 case. Possibly it could be argued that it's not 9 a filler , but the fact that there was that presence of 10 "etc" within the section to me meant that we should look 11 at the purpose behind it and why it was there, and that 12 we should not restrict our interpretation to the rigid 13 definition given within the approved document.  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Right. You say, " initially the debate centred on 14 15 whether the polyethylene core would constitute 16 a filler "; can you remember when that debate was going 17 on and who was involved in that debate? 18 A. It would have been early 2017, I think, probably myself 19 and colleagues in the technical department initially 2.0  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  So are you talking about an internal debate just within 21 the BBA, or were any other organisations involved at 22 that time? 23 A. As far as I recall, it was internal. 24 Was it anything to do with doubts about the safety of Q.
- 25 some ACMs which had been involved in cladding fires

- 1 around the world?
- 2 A. No.
- 3~ Q. Did you have any awareness of such fires in early 2017?
- 4 A. Broadly, yes.
- 5 Q. Can you help us as to which fires you were aware of in 6 early 2017?
- A. Not specifically. I think there were occurrences in the
   Middle East.
- 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm sorry to interrupt you,
- 10 Ms Grange, but I'd be interested to get Mr Albon's
- evidence on a related but slightly different point, and this seems a good time to do it.
- 13 The actual regulation, it's not in ADB, is it,
- 14 Mr Albon, it's a separate instrument, and it requires
- 15 the external walls adequately to resist the propagation
- 16 of fire? That may not be the precise wording, but
- 17 that's the requirement, isn't it?
- 18 A. Yes.

- 19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Did it occur to you to consider
- 20 whether an ACM panel with a polyethylene core which was
- 21 highly combustible might not be suitable at any level?
- 22  $\,$  A. As I said previously, the BBA is not a research
- 23 organisation, it's not a fire test laboratory, we are
- 24  $\hfill required to identify and apply best practice. So if$ 
  - there was any evidence in the public domain that this

### 69

- 1 would constitute a danger, then yes,  $\, I \,$  would expect us 2 to be aware of it and to take appropriate action. But 3 I think --4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I raised -- sorry. 5 A. Sorry. I think it is for others to carry out the necessary research and place that information into the 6 public domain. 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I asked the question only because 8 9 you were obviously thinking about this sort of problem 10 at the time in relation to the 18-metre limit, and 11 I wondered whether you had thought about it without that 12 restriction in mind, but the answer may be you didn't. 13 A. I think my consideration was really specific to the 14 details given in the approved document. I'm really not 15 a fire engineer. I'm not qualified to make 16 a wider-reaching judgement on the basis of my own 17 knowledge, I'm afraid. 18 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, thank you very much. 19 Yes, Ms Grange, I'm sorry. 2.0 MS GRANGE: No. not at all. 21 Mr Albon, Mr Nkomo thought that the Dubai and UAE 2.2 cladding fires were part of the reason that the BBA 23 added this height restriction wording. That was at 24  $\{Day107/97:18-22\}$ . Is he wrong about that? That was
- 24 (Day107/91.10-22). Is newlong about that: That was
   25 his understanding, that those cladding fires , those
  - 70

- 1 international cladding fires , had led the BBA to decide 2 to refer to this height restriction at this point. Is
- 3 that right?
- 4 A. Not that I'm aware of, but Mr Nkomo is a BBA technical 5 expert specialising in cladding materials. I have
- 6 a different role within the organisation, so he may have
- been having that conversation with others but not with
- 8 me.
- 0 11
- 9 Q. But was it you taking the lead in 2017 on making these
- 10 height restriction changes to BBA certificates?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13  $\,$  A. On the basis of the contents of the approved documents,
- 14 though, not on specialist knowledge of fires that had
- 15 occurred elsewhere.
- 16 Q. Right.
- 17 Were you aware of the Lacrosse fire in Melbourne,
- 18 Australia, in November 2014?
- 19 A. I don't think so, no.
- 20 Q. Were you involved in the seeking of any external advice
- 21 or expertise in relation to this point? Did the BBA go
- 22 outside the organisation and ask for advice from
- 23 Warringtonfire, Exova, or the BRE at this point about
- 24 this interpretation?
- 25 A. I don't think we did, no.

### 71

1  $\mathsf{Q}.$  Why not? If you're not fire experts, and you say that 2 others are much more expert in these matters, why not 3 seek external assistance about the proper interpretation 4 of ADB at this time? 5 A. Well, we're not fire experts, but we are quite 6 experienced in interpreting the requirements of the 7 approved documents, and I believe we formed the view 8 that we had sufficient internal competence to make 9 a judgement on this particular point. 10 Q. Right. Was the BBA aware that there was industry guidance 11 12 dating from as early as June 2014 which suggested that 13 all elements of an external wall panel should be of limited combustibility to satisfy the main route to 14 15 compliance in ADB, that was in the Building Control 16 Alliance Technical Guidance Note 18 from June 2014? Was 17 the BBA aware of that? 18 A. I was aware of that technical guidance note. I don't 19 know if I was aware of it in 2014. But we would base 2.0 our judgements on the requirements of the approved 21 documents, which did not have that requirement. 2.2 Q. I see. So are you saying you solely looked at ADB and, 23 just on the basis of the language in ADB, that's how you 2.4 came to introduce this height restriction into your 25 certificates ?

4

- 1 A. I wouldn't say I wholly looked at ADB, but that was the
- 2 basis of that decision, yes. I would have thought if
- 3 best practice was felt to contradict the approved
- 4 documents, then the experts would have taken steps to
- 5 update those approved documents accordingly.
- 6 Q. Yes, I think what I said was solely looked at ADB, so 7 I was just implying that ADB was your only source of
- 8 information about this ambiguity; yes?
- 9 A. On that particular instance, yes.
- 10~ Q. So are you clear that it wasn't any other industry
- guidance that was instrumental in bringing about this
   change of approach within the BBA?
- A. No, I'm not. Other colleagues may have had access to
   other sources of information which may have influenced
   their views when we discussed it.
- 16 Q. I see. For example, there was some Booth Muirie
- 17 guidance from 2016 which refers to all significant
- 18  $\qquad$  elements of each and every layer of the wall needing to
- 19 be of limited combustibility if following the primary
- 20 route to compliance in ADB. Were you aware of that at 21 the time?
- 22 A. No, I would have consulted the approved document.
- 2.3 Q. Were you aware of a discussion or debate within the
- 24 wider construction industry about this ambiguity or
- anomaly in ADB at the time?

### 73

- 1 A. Not that I recall, no.
- 2 Q. Now, this is a topic to which the Inquiry will return in 3 Module 6, but can you help us at this stage as to
- 4 whether the BBA ever had any discussions with the DCLG
- 5 or MHCLG, the Government department, about this 6 ambiguity or anomaly that you refer to?
- ambiguity or anomaly that you refer to?A. I can't recall any in relation to ACMs. No, I'm not
- aware of any.
   Q. So did you ever have any discussions with
- 9 Q. So did you ever have any discussions with DCLG or MHCLG 10 about 12.7 of ADB and its interpretation, including the
- 11 filler point or the "etc" point at any stage?
- 12 A. Not that I recall .
- 13  $\,$  Q. Was this new interpretation of 12.7 of ADB a formal  $\,$
- 14 policy or stated position of the BBA?
- 15 A. Yes, internal, yes.
- 16 Q. Can you help us as to why we don't see any written17 documents which record that, which record this
- 18 consideration being given and this change in approach 19 and the rationale behind it?
- A. It would have been discussed ver
- A. It would have been discussed verbally internally witheveryone involved and training given to the staff
- 22 involved as to the reason, the interpretation and the
- consequences. We don't document every single decisionwe make within the BBA.
- 25 Q. Wasn't this a pretty important decision you were taking,

74

- 1 from now on to start putting a height restriction for
- 2 certain certificates based on wording of ADB that was
  - unchanged, it was just your interpretation of it that
  - was changing?
- 5~ A. Yes, it was a significant decision. We did brief
- б everybody ——
- 7 Q. So why --
- 8~ A. -- and explained the thinking behind the process to
- 9 everybody, and everyone involved with the drafting of
- 10 certificates would have been well aware of it.
- 11 Q. So why do we not see any documentation relating to this 12 change of approach?
- 13  $\,$  A. At the time, it was not felt necessary to document it.
- 14 As I say, we don't document every technical decision
- 15 that we make
- 16~ Q. Were there any training materials reflecting this change
- 17 in approach?
- 18 A. No, it was a verbal briefing .
- 19 Q. Was this position ever communicated to industry?
- 20 A. I'm hesitating because it was a different team.
- $21 \qquad \mbox{I}$  imagine when we were changing the certificates, we
- 22 would have communicated to the certificate holders, but
- 23 I would not have been involved in that process.
- 24 Q. Right.
- 25 Did the BBA ever take any active steps to implement

### 75

1 this change of position, for example by revisiting 2 certificates it had issued for external wall materials 3 where this change was potentially important? 4 A. I think we made the change specifically in relation to 5 ACM materials and we were going through a process of 6 updating those certificates . 7 Q. Ms Amoroso's evidence was that you decided to introduce 8 these height restrictions as and when the certificates 9 were coming up for re-issue; is that right? 10 A. Yes 11 Q. What I want to understand is if you were doing this 12 because you had concerns about the safety of these 13 products and their use over 18 metres, why wasn't this 14 a change that you were urgently implementing across all 15 **BBA** certificates? 16 A. It was our interpretation. It was an interpretation 17 that was not shared by others, such as Dr Lane. 18 Ultimately it was the approved documents that were the 19 arbiter of whether or not the product could be used 2.0 above 18 metres, the BBA certificate has no regulatory 21 significance, and so it was down to the judgement of the 2.2 individual specifying the product as to whether or not 23 it could be used above 18 metres. 2.4 Q. Yes, but let's just focus on what you, the BBA, thought. 25 Were you bringing about this change because you had

Α. 

Q.

2.2

Q.

Day 110

	concerns about the safety of ACM products with	1	Q.	Now, after the fire, you prepared a note with Mr Moore
	a polyethylene core over 18 metres?	2		that went to the BBA board. We looked at that earlier,
Α.	I think, with respect, you're applying a great deal of	3		but can we go back to it, {BBA00010485/2}.
	hindsight to the questioning. At the time we were	4		Sorry, actually, we didn't look at this before.
	making this decision, as far as I'm aware, there was no	5		This is the email where Brian Moore sends this briefing
	guidance available to us as to this failure mechanism,	6		note to the BBA board on 20 June 2017, so just a few
	the melting, ponding, reigniting of the polyethylene	7		days after the Grenfell Tower fire. We can see from the
	core. The safety criticality of that was not	8		top of the page that it was sent to you and others at
	appreciated, as far as I know. The approved documents	9		the BBA.
	certainly made no reference to it.	10		Sorry, I think we need the second email down. That
	The approved documents now do specifically refer to	11		email there, Mr Moore says in his email to the board:
	the core of ACM materials and require them to be of	12		"Dear Board Members
	limited combustibility. That change was not made until	13		"Please find appended a note regarding the fatal
	2019. So I think it's clear that this is no	14		fire at Grenfell Tower. This is our current
	criticism of the people responsible for the approved	15		understanding based on media reports.
	documents, but it simply wasn't understood at the time,	16		"In summary, we are in a reasonable position.
		10		-
	the criticality of this aspect of the product	17		"If the cladding 'system' (i.e. the combination of cladding and insulation is as described in the media,
	performance. Had we known this could happen, of course			0
~	we would have made it a matter of urgency.	19		then the system is not Certificated by the BBA.
Q.	Is it correct that you're making this change, but not on	20		"The insulation itself is not Certificated by the
	the basis that this is a necessary safety change, what,	21		BBA.
	just because you noticed that there was this ambiguity	22		"The cladding itself is . The Certificate is 2008
	and so you decided to do it anyway?	23		vintage and was in the process of being Reviewed and
Α.	It wasn't clear to us whether or not the product was	24		Reissued just before the fire . We would be in a
	restricted . We were taking a conservative view, but we	25		stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used
	77			79
		1		
	didn't understand at the time the significance of what	1		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate
0	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen.	2		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs.
Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative	2 3		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related
Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of	2 3 4		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building."
Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do	2 3 4 5		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this
	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it?	2 3 4 5 6		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it 's been sent to the
	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they	2 3 4 5 6 7		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board.
	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean
	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding-related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in
	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding-related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''?
A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding-related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''? Not really. It is his wording.
A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that,
A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board?
A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board? I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if
A. Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board? I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then
A. Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'''? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board? I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate.
A. Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board? I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate. Yes.
A. Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think information was available to us that would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	<ul> <li>above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs.</li> <li>"We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building."</li> <li>We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board.</li> <li>Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"?</li> <li>Not really. It is his wording.</li> <li>What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board?</li> <li>I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In your view, should the certificate have stated</li> </ul>
A. Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board? I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate. Yes. In your view, should the certificate have stated that, that it should not be used above 18 metres, given
A. Q. A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think information was available to us that would have indicated the significance of this. And you're quite sure, are you, that it was pre the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	<ul> <li>above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs.</li> <li>"We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building."</li> <li>We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board.</li> <li>Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"?</li> <li>Not really. It is his wording.</li> <li>What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board?</li> <li>I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In your view, should the certificate have stated</li> </ul>
A. Q. A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think information was available to us that would have indicated the significance of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs. "We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building." We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board. Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"? Not really. It is his wording. What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board? I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate. Yes. In your view, should the certificate have stated that, that it should not be used above 18 metres, given
A. Q. A.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think information was available to us that would have indicated the significance of this. And you're quite sure, are you, that it was pre the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs.</li> <li>"We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building."</li> <li>We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board.</li> <li>Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"?</li> <li>Not really. It is his wording.</li> <li>What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board?</li> <li>I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In your view, should the certificate have stated that, that it should not be used above 18 metres, given the view that you had formed of the requirements of</li> </ul>
A. Q. Q.	didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen. But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it? Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time. Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly? I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think information was available to us that would have indicated the significance of this. And you're quite sure, are you, that it was pre the Grenfell Tower fire that this change began to be made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs.</li> <li>"We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building."</li> <li>We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board.</li> <li>Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"?</li> <li>Not really. It is his wording.</li> <li>What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board?</li> <li>I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In your view, should the certificate have stated that, that it should not be used above 18 metres, given the view that you had formed of the requirements of Approved Document B and the Building Regulations?</li> </ul>
A. Q. Q. Q.	<ul> <li>didn't understand at the time the significance of what could happen.</li> <li>But surely you must have been taking that conservative view because you had some concerns about the use of polyethylene materials above 18 metres, otherwise why do it?</li> <li>Yes, we did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply with the requirements of the approved documents, and had we appreciated the criticality of that, of course we would have reacted differently, but I don't think we could have done at the time.</li> <li>Yes, and what I'm seeking to understand is: given that you did have some concerns as to whether or not they would comply, why not implement this change more quickly?</li> <li>I think I can only repeat myself, that we didn't understand the significance, and I don't think information was available to us that would have indicated the significance of this.</li> <li>And you're quite sure, are you, that it was pre the Grenfell Tower fire that this change began to be made within the BBA?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	<ul> <li>above 18m' but, as the note makes clear, the Certificate holder/user must comply with building regs.</li> <li>"We had not conducted any cladding—related inspections at building."</li> <li>We can see from the email at the top that then this is forwarded to you shortly after it's been sent to the board.</li> <li>Can you explain what you understood Mr Moore to mean by, "We would be in a stronger position if it stated in terms 'not to be used above 18m'"?</li> <li>Not really. It is his wording.</li> <li>What, so did you not understand what he meant by that, when you saw this email to the board?</li> <li>I imagine he is stating that, from a BBA perspective, if we had said it could not be used above 18 metres, then it would not have been covered by the certificate.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In your view, should the certificate have stated that, that it should not be used above 18 metres, given the view that you had formed of the requirements of Approved Document B and the Building Regulations?</li> </ul>

opinion.

A. Yes.

1 Q. I understand that, but where you say, "We were in the 2 process of updating it", are you confirming that, in 3 your view, the certificate should have stated that it 4 should not be used above 18 metres? A. I think we had come to the view that the filler, the 5 polyethylene core, would have been covered by the 6 7 definition in 12.7, so it wasn't entirely clear, but 8 yes, we were saying that. 9 Of course, had we known that it was in fact an  ${\sf E}$ 10 classification , there would have been no ambiguity and 11 it would have been very straightforward to say it should 12 not be used above 18 metres. 13 Q. Right. 14 Let's go to the note that was attached to this email 15 of 20 June. If we go to {BBA00010486}. I took you to 16 this at the very outset of your evidence and you 17 confirmed that you wrote this document; yes? 18 A. I wrote the initial draft, yes, on a technical basis. 19 It was updated slightly by Brian Moore subsequently, but 20 not on the technical basis. 21 Q. Right, yes. 22 If we go to page 3  $\{BBA00010486/3\}$ , at 23 paragraphs 16, 17 and following you're dealing with the 24 regulatory requirements in Approved Document B. 25 Paragraph 18 refers in terms and quotes from 81

1		section 12.7.
2		Then at paragraph 19 you say:
3		"Appendix A defines the meaning of 'Limited
4		combustibility' via a combination of test and material
5		requirements. It seems most unlikely, from the evidence
6		available that the LDPE filler material used in the
7		composite panels could meet these requirements. There
8		could be some debate as to whether this core constitutes
9		a ' filler ', but we believe that there is a consensus
10		within the BBA that it does. As such, the panels should
11		not, in our opinion, be used at a height exceeding 18m
12		and as such should not have been used on the
13		Grenfell Tower."
14		Where you say there that there was consensus within
15		the BBA that it did fall within the word " filler ", is
16		that right? I thought what you had told us in your
17		witness statement was that it wasn't reference to
18		" filler " that piqued your interest in 12.7, but it was
19		the reference to "etc" in paragraph 12.7 that, in the
20		BBA's view, in your view, widened the definition of
21		materials caught by the section. Can you explain for
22		us?
23	Α.	Yes, I think this was written the day after the fire .
24		At that time, $ {\sf I} $ considered that the polyethylene core
25		did constitute a filler . Subsequently to that, $I've$

82

1		
1		tried to take on board the opinions of perhaps better
2		qualified than me, such as Dr Lane, who believes that
3		it's not a filler . But I still believe the principle
4		applies that it is not restricted to fillers , the
5		presence of the "etc" widens the definition , so I think
6		my argument would stand.
7	Q.	I see. So I think what you're telling us is that your
8		interpretation of 12.7 has changed as you have heard
9		more discussion about this point; is that right?
10	Α.	Yes, partly. Also, I think we were trying to understand
11		the reason for the restriction , in terms of the
12		statutory instrument and the higher level requirements.
13	Q.	Right. Just to be clear, prior to the Grenfell Tower
14		fire , and at the time you were scratching your heads and
15		having a good think about 12.7 of ADB, are you saying
16		now that in fact it was the word "filler" that you
17		thought might cover the core of an ACM panel?
18	Α.	At the time, yes.
19	Q.	But you're telling us now in your witness statement that
20		actually it's the reference to "etc" which you think is
21		the better point; is that right?
22	Α.	At the time, I considered it would constitute a filler .
23		I have tried to take recognition of the opinions of
24		others, but I don't think that it affects the principle
25		of the statutory instruments that materials of this kind
		-
		83

1		should not be used above 18 metres.
2	Q.	Right.
3		Regardless of the filler or the other specific
4		wording in that clause, once the view was held that
5		these panels needed to be of limited combustibility, why
6		did the BBA not immediately take steps to insist that
7		its certificate holders seek the re-issue of their
8		certificates so as to impose an 18-metre limitation for
9		panels that were not materials of limited
10		combustibility?
11	Α.	At the time, this was almost an academic exercise that
12		could be debated as to whether or not we were correct.
13		As I've said, had we appreciated the significance of
14		what could happen, clearly we would have taken immediate
15		action, but I don't think the information was available
16		to us at the time.
17	Q.	I see. So you've said you were vaguely aware of
18		cladding fires in the Middle East, and you've accepted,
19		I think, that this was in part driven by safety
20		concerns, and yet despite that, are you saying that it
21		was acceptable for the $\ensuremath{BBA}$ not to immediately take steps
22		to insist on changes to these certificates to put in the
23		height restriction ?
24	Α.	I was aware of fires in the Middle East and elsewhere,

I think, but I'm not aware of any research or subsequent 84

- 1 publications that had, if you like, put the blame for
- 2 those fires on the use of ACM materials and the
- 3 mechanism of failure of those ACM materials. Had we
- 4 known that the polyethylene core could behave in the way
- that it does, clearly we would have taken a completely 5
- different view as to their significance. But, repeating 6
- 7 myself, I don't think anybody did. The approved
- 8 documents were not updated until 2019.
- 9  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Did it not occur to you, once you were aware of fires in 10 the Middle East and once you were pondering the meaning
- 11 of 12.7, that it might be advisable for the BBA to take
- 12 external advice from properly qualified fire engineers
- 13 about the risks posed by these panels?
- 14 A. I think if properly qualified fire experts had
- 15 understood the risks posed by these panels, they would have immediately put that information into the public 16
- 17 domain and contacted those responsible for the
- 18 Building Regulations.
- 19 Q. Well, that's not an answer to my question. Did it not
- 20 occur to you, once you were aware of fires in the
- 21 Middle East, and once you were pondering the meaning of
- 22 12.7, that it might be advisable for the BBA to take
- external advice from properly qualified fire experts, 23
- 24 fire engineers?
- 25 A. I thought at the time, I still think, we are capable of

- 1 making a judgement on the content of the approved
- 2 documents, which is what we were doing. Had there been
- 3 other information available to us as to the performance
- 4 of these ACM materials in fire, of course we would have
- 5 needed to take that on board, but I don't believe such 6 information existed.
- 7  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  But how did you know if you didn't ask anybody who was 8 an expert in this area?
- 9 A. Because our judgements are based on the requirements of 10 the approved documents, and we take that as being
- 11 established best practice. 12  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Let's move on now to some FAQ documents that were
- 13 issued 14
  - If we can go to {MET00053158\_P18/176}, this is
- 15 a circular that we believe was sent out from the BBA in 16
- early 2017 to all local authorities and housing 17 associations
- 18 Can you help us, did you help in the writing of this
- 19 document?
- 20 A. I would have been involved, I'm sure, yes.
- 21 Q. If we go to page 177 {MET00053158\_P18/177}, we can see
- 2.2 there are some FAQs, frequently asked questions, there,
- 23 and at the very bottom we can see this statement. It
- 24 says:
- "As a consequence of the testing carried out, the 25

86

- 1 Reynobond cladding product used at Grenfell Tower was 2 deemed to achieve a Class 0 rating.' 3 Now, Mr Moore thought that it was possible that 4 either you or Mr Denyer wrote this statement. Do you 5 remember writing that, that as a consequence of the testing carried out, the Reynobond cladding product used 6 7 at Grenfell Tower was deemed to achieve a class 0 8 rating? 9 A. I don't remember, but I'm sure I would have been 10 involved 11 Q. Can you explain why the wording is as we see here, that 12 the product was deemed to achieve a class 0 rating? Why 13 was that used? A. I think that's consistent with the wording of the 14 15 certificate at the time, isn't it? 16 Q. Well, I don't think we see that wording, "deemed to 17 achieve", anywhere in the certificate. I think we see 18 phrases like "may be regarded as" or "are judged to 19 meet", but we don't see that phrase. 20 A. Okay. Possibly not that precise phrase, but as 21 a principle I think it's consistent with the wording in
  - 22 the original certificate .
  - 23 Q. Did you know at this time that, as a fact. Revnobond PE
  - 24 had not been tested in accordance with BS 476-6 and 7?
  - 25 Α. Yes

### 87

- 1 Q. Before sending this message to the local authorities and
- 2 housing associations, can you help as to what steps the BBA took to investigate the basis on which the 2008
- 3 4 certificate claimed that Reynobond 55 may be regarded as
- 5 class 0 or were deemed to achieve a class 0 rating?
- 6 What steps did you take?
- 7 A. At this time. I don't remember.
- 8 Q. Now, we heard in the evidence of Mr Moore about another
- 9 Q&A document published by the BBA at the time. If we
- 10 can go to {CTAR00000043}. It was actually exhibited to
- Mr Todd's report at Phase 1 of the Inquiry. So these 11
- 12 appear to be some more FAQs that appeared on the BBA
- 13 website. If we look at the very bottom of page 1, these
- appear to be dated 22 September 2017. Can you see that? 14
- 15 A. Yes
- 16 Q. If we go to the bottom of page 4 {CTAR00000043/4}, we
- 17 can see reference to two updates that are given in this
- 18 particular version of these FAQs about corresponding
- 19 with Arconic and receiving correspondence from Arconic.
- 20 Can you help us, was this Q&A document actually
- 21 published on the BBA's website?
- 2.2 A. I don't know.
- 23 Q. Were you involved in the drafting of this?
- 24 I would have been, yes. Α.
- 25  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Now, we heard evidence from Mr Moore that this FAQ was

- 1 challenged by a whistleblower member of staff, and that
- 2 shortly after this, UKAS visited the BBA to assess the
  - certificate ; is that right?
- 4 A Yes

7

- Q. So did UKAS visit because there had been a complaint by 5 a whistleblower within the BBA? 6
  - A. As far as I recall , UKAS didn't tell us they had
- 8 received a complaint, I may be wrong. I wasn't aware of 9 that at the time, I don't think.
- 10 Q. Right. Have you subsequently become aware that one of 11 the UKAS visits was due to a complaint by someone inside 12 the BBA?
- 13 A. As far as I can recall, only through the evidence given
- 14 to the Inquiry.
- 15 Q. Right.
- Now. Mr Moore went on to say in his oral evidence 16
- 17 that you dealt with this member of staff and discussed
- 18 the concerns that that member of staff had with them.
- 19 Do you recall that?
- 20 A. There's a slight assumption that I know who that member 21 of staff is and that they made a complaint, but yes,
- 22 I did have a discussion with a member of staff.
- 23 Q. Who had raised concerns about one of the FAQs?
- 24 A Yes
- 25 Q. Let's just look at what Mr Moore said about that. If we

### 89

- 1 can bring up the transcript for {Day107/148:2}. The 2 question is asked: 3 "Question: And what was the nature of that 4 challenge? 5 "Answer: Again, I can't remember the specifics of it. It was dealt with by another director, the 6 7 commercial director, and the head of approvals, 8 Mr Albon, met with this member of staff to discuss his 9 concerns. 10 "The outcome that was fed back to me was there was 11 a difference of view about the BBA's approach, and, 12 yeah, you know, the more experienced -- the scientist, 13 Mr Albon, had listened carefully and given a view, the 14 non-technical salesperson had a different view, and 15 I think the outcome was that, you know, the scientist's 16 view was reasonable and matters were left there, though 17 I think matters were escalated by the colleague 18 elsewhere, possibly to the media." 19 Now, is that an accurate summary of what happened, 2.0 that there was a discussion with the member of staff and 21 the outcome was that there was a difference of view, but 2.2 the scientist 's view, ie your view, was reasonable and 23 matters were left there? 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Can you help us, what complaints were actually discussed

90

- 1 in that meeting? 2 A. I'm struggling to remember the specifics. It was 3 a slightly disjointed conversation. Our colleague 4 wasn't a scientist , had never been involved in the 5 certification process, and, as I recall, had a slightly confused understanding of the regulatory situation. His 6 7 view was that the approved documents were flawed, could not be relied upon, and that the BBA certificate in some 8 9 way overrode them. 10 Q. Right. Was that individual also concerned about the frequency of reviews that had occurred in respect of the 11 12 Revnobond certificate? 13 A. We may have discussed that, I don't recall. 14 Q. Was this a formal procedure, this complaint procedure 15 that was being followed? 16 A. No. it was an informal telephone conversation in the 17 commercial director's office . 18 Q. Was there a record made of the discussions that 19 occurred? 20 A. Not by me. 21 Q. Why not? 22 A. Possibly by the commercial director. It was an informal 23 conversation. 24 Q But why don't we see some record of the complaint that 25 was made and the response that you gave to that 91 1 complaint? 2 A. I wouldn't have described it as a complaint. It was 3 an informal conversation between colleagues. If the 4 individual was dissatisfied with the outcome, he could 5 have escalated it in writing, but as far as I know, he chose not to do so. Had he then expressed it in formal 6 7 terms, it would have been documented in a different way 8 to a casual conversation between colleagues in 9 an office. 10 Q. Right. I see. 11 I want to ask you now some questions about the UKAS 12 reviews that took place. 13 Now, it's right, isn't it, that the BBA is accredited by UKAS as a certification body; is that 14 15 right?
  - 16
  - A. Yes
  - Q. Specifically -- and you have explained this in detail in 17
  - 18 your second witness statement -- UKAS accredits the BBA
  - 19 to certify wall and cladding products and systems, and
  - 2.0 ACM materials fall within the scope of that 21 accreditation: is that right?
  - 2.2 A. Yes.

of the BBA?

25

- 23 Q. Is it right that, as part of their accreditation of the
- 2.4 BBA, UKAS would do regular surveillance and assessment

- 1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Typically, how often do those assessments occur by UKAS? 3 A. They are annual assessments for each of the 4 accreditation standards for which we are accredited. 5 There are four. Q. I see. So every year, each of those four standards are 6 7 assessed by UKAS; is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes
- 9 Q. Yes
- 10 Now, shortly after the Grenfell Tower fire, there
- 11 were two UKAS assessments. As far as we understand it,
- 12 and can you confirm, there was one visit on 12 July 2017
- 13 that was solely in relation to certificate 08/4510, the
- 14 Reynobond certificate; is that correct?
- A. Yes 15
- Q. And then there was a second visit on 15 August 2017, and 16 17 that was after the ACM certificates had been re-issued 18 with the height restriction wording on them; is that 19 correct?
- 20 A. Yes.

25

- 21 Q. And that second review, the scope of it related to the
- 2.2 re-issue of that certificate as well as other re-issued ACM certificates: is that correct? 23
- 24 A. I believe so. I don't think I was present at that
  - meeting, but I have seen the report, so yes, I think so.

### 93

1	Q.	Can we look at the UKAS report for the visit in July
2		2017. This is at {BBA00010733}.
3		This is the assessment report, and we can see in the
4		table on the right—hand side, three lines down, it
5		says $$ sorry, in the middle it says "BBA", and then
6		"Type of Assessment" on the right—hand side, it says
7		"Accreditation $-$ Extra visit". So was this visit
8		outside the usual surveillance that UKAS would conduct
9		of the BBA?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	At the time of this assessment report, did it mostly or
12		indeed entirely concentrate on a review of the BBA's
13		records for certificate 08/4510, can you help us?
14	Α.	It was a combination of examining the records and verbal
15		examination of the people involved.
16	Q.	Did UKAS look at all of the technical files for this
17		certificate at this time?
18	Α.	I don't recall. We would have provided anything that
19		they asked for.
20	Q.	Right. So you can't help us as to whether they saw the
21		whole file?
22	Α.	Not of the specifics , no, sorry .
23	Q.	If we go to page 3 {BBA00010733/3}, where we have the
24		executive summary, in the second paragraph down, in the
25		third line, we can see that you were present and

94

2 Α. Yes 3 Q. If we go to the third paragraph down, it says this: 4 "During the opening meeting it was confirmed that the UKAS Lead Assessor, Cary Randall, previously worked 5 for the BBA and had left the organisation 5 years ago. 6 7 During his time at the BBA Cary worked within a number 8 of different sections, including the section referred to 9 in this report as 'S3' under the Section Head, 10 Geoff Gurney. It was explained that the UKAS Head of 11 construction and Physics, Sam Giles, was in attendance 12 to address any conflicts of interest that may arise in 13 connection with this and therefore maintain UKAS impartiality. All present at the opening meeting agreed

representing the BBA at this assessment; yes?

- 14 15 that the assessment could go ahead on this basis and no
- 16 conflicts of interest occurred during the assessment."
- 17 So just to be clear, the UKAS lead assessor,
- 18 Cary Randall, had previously worked in the department
- 19 which had responsibility for the Reynobond certificate;
- 20 yes?
- 21 A. Yes
- 2.2 Q. Is it common for former BBA employees like Mr Randall to 2.3 end up working at UKAS?
- 24 I'm struggling with the definition of common, sorry. Α.
- 25 I think there are three or four ex-BBA members who work

### 95

- 1 for UKAS 2 Q. Right, thank you. 3 4
  - Is it right Mr Nkomo referred to Mr Randall as the cladding expert while he was at the BBA? He said in
- 5 around 2011 and 2015 that was how Mr Randall was
- 6 referred to, as the cladding expert within the BBA. Is 7 that correct?
- 8 A. He certainly had a good working knowledge,  $l^\prime m$  not sure 9 he was the expert as such, but yes, he was competent in that area.
- 10
- 11  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  The fact that he was an ex–employee of the BBA and in 12 department S3, which issued certificate 08/4510, is
- 13 a plain conflict of interest, isn't it?
- 14 A. It could be interpreted as such. It's really a question 15 for UKAS. I think, not the BBA.
- 16 Q. Wouldn't Mr Randall have had an interest in defending the processes by which he himself would have operated? 17
- 18 A. Well, he wasn't involved in this assessment, as far as
- 19 I recall. Again, I'd have to refer you to UKAS for that 2.0 question. It's their decision as to who to appoint to
- 21 this investigation.

25

- 2.2 Q. Yes, I'm sure we can ask them in due course, but I'm 23 just interested in what you can help us with about this.
- 24 Did Mr Randall take a full part in this assessment?
  - It says here that he was the lead assessor. Did he

1	in fact	take a	full	part	in	the	assessment?
---	---------	--------	------	------	----	-----	-------------

2  $\,$  A. I think he co-ordinated the assessment. I would say it

3 was led by Mr Patterson, who was the UKAS fire expert.

4 Q. Right. 5 Ca

- Can you explain, just going back to what we see on the screen, if we look at the last sentence of that
- 6 the screen, if we look at the last sentence of 7 third paragraph down, it says there:
- 7 third paragraph down, it says there:8 "All present at the opening meeting ag
- "All present at the opening meeting agreed that the
- 9 assessment could go ahead on this basis and no conflicts10 of interest occurred during the assessment."
- 11
   That reads as if it was both the BBA and UKAS that
- 12 agreed that the assessment could go ahead and no
- 13 conflicts of interest occurred; is that right?
- 14 A. I think we had no grounds to object to Mr Randall being 15 present at the assessment so yes
- present at the assessment, so yes.
   Q Lappreciate you might have no grounds
- 16 Q. I appreciate you might have no grounds to object on one 17 level, but did you think that there was a conflict of
- 17 level, but did you think that there was a conflict of 18 interest in terms of Mr Randall conducting the
- 19 investigation when he'd worked in the very department
- 20 that had issued this BBA certificate?
- 21 A. Sorry, with respect, it's really not a question for the
- 22 BBA. We are not here to appoint those who are going to
- 23 judge us. If UKAS were happy for someone who had left
- 24  $\hfill the BBA five years ago to take part in this$
- 25 investigation, I see no reason to object.

### 97

- 1 Q. I see.
- Now, just to look at some of the feedback that was 2 3 given by UKAS during this assessment, if we can go to 4 page 14 {BBA00010733/14}, what we see in this finding, what you get is a kind of finding number, and then in 5 6 the right-hand side you get a "Justification for 7 clearance or request for further evidence", and it says 8 this: 9 "Draft of the updated certificate 08/4510 provided 10 that includes more representative front page photograph, 11 improved front page summary of behaviour in relation to 12 fire information and clearer reference to product 13 application for use on buildings up to 18m." 14 Now, those changes that are listed there, changes to 15 the image, to the front page summary and the reference 16 to the 18-metre height restriction, are some of the 17 changes that we see in the certificate on re-issue on 18 4 August 2017. 19 Can you help us, were those changes made as a result 20 of the feedback from UKAS in this assessment? 21 A. I believe the changes were already being incorporated 2.2 into a re-issue of the certificate prior to this
- assessment, with the possible exception of the
- 24 photograph, I'm not sure about the photograph, but
- 25 I think the others were already being agreed.

98

- Q. I see. So it's just coincidental that those were also changes that UKAS were requesting?
   A. I don't think it's coincidental, I think they are confirming that the changes we are making
   a proportionate and appropriate.
- 6 Q. I see.

	•
7	If we can go to page 6 $\{BBA00010733/6\}$ and look at
8	the bottom of the page, there is a header in bold, we
9	can see it says "Certification documentation (7.7)", and
10	in the third paragraph down it says:
11	"The certificate content was reviewed during the
12	assessment. Particular attention was paid to the
13	section relating to fire performance. The front page
14	summary of the Certificate 08/4510 under 'Behaviour in
15	relation to fire ' does not summarise all main
16	classification data, it only included the National
17	surface spread class 0 for England and Wales and 'low
18	risk' material for Scotland. Therefore it is
19	recommended that it would be better to either include
20	all classification information or keep the headings and
21	refer to relevant section with all the information.
22	Recommended finding [and they give a number for the
23	finding] was raised in connection with this."
24	So is it right that, at the time of this assessment,
25	UKAS were critical of the front page of the certificate

### 99

1		and, in particular, what it said about behaviour in
2		relation to fire?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	And UKAS said that that summary should either provide
5		a full overview of the classifications or just
6		a reference to the section in the body of the
7		certificate where fire performance is dealt with?
8	Α.	Yes, but they were confirming judgements the BBA had
9		already made as part of the re-issue process. They were
10		looking at the original certificates , not the ongoing
11		draft or the re—issue.
12	Q.	I see. So are you saying you had already worked out
13		that that summary needed to change on the front page?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	Right.
16		If we go up to page 4 $\{BBA00010733/4\}$ at the very
17		top, there is a heading "Conclusion". It says this
18		under "Conclusion":
19		"During the assessment it was seen that the
20		information included within the certificate was
21		supported by appropriate test data and that the
22		surveillance processes in place had identified when the
23		content of the certificate needed to be revised."
24		Then underneath the bullet point list, just a little
25		bit further down, we can see it says:

1		"Overall it was seen that the BBA have followed
2		their processes in relation to the certification
3		activities undertaken. It was also noted that the
4		processes followed compare well to the requirements of
5		ISO/IEC17065 and that the current processes included
6		good demonstrations of the effectiveness of the
7		processes and systems to meet the requirements of [that
8		ISO]."
9		Now, when it says that the BBA have followed their
10		processes, is it right that what UKAS was looking at was
11		whether the BBA had complied with its own processes and
12		procedures?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	And then it had considered those processes against the
15		relevant ISO 17065 standard?
16	Α.	Well, they would do that as part of the original
17		assessment, of course, before they award the
18		accreditation, but yes.
19	Q.	Did UKAS evaluate the assessment and review process in
20		any detail?
21	Α.	I think it was a two- or three-hour meeting, I don't
22		completely recall, so in some detail, yes.
23	Q.	So it did evaluate the review process, did it, in some
24		detail?
25	Α.	I'm sorry, it should say in the report what they looked
		101

1		at. If it doesn't, I'm afraid I don't recall the
2		details of exactly which documents they examined.
3	Q.	Can you help us with this, because we can't find this
4		anywhere in the report: what, if anything, did UKAS say
5		about the BBA having closed the 2015 review without
6		having received written confirmation from the
7		certificate holder that there had been no changes which
8		would invalidate the certificate ?
9	Α.	I don't recall them commenting on that.
10	Q.	Would they have been aware of the multiple written
11		requests to give confirmation that there had been no
12		changes that invalidated the certificate that the BBA
13		had made of Arconic?
14	Α.	They had access to all of the information and documents
15		that have been provided to the Inquiry, so yes.
16	Q.	Now, clearly at this time neither the BBA nor UKAS knew
17		that Arconic had a great deal more test data about
18		Reynobond. Did the BBA and UKAS discuss the information
19		on the certificate and how it was supported by the test
20		data available?
21	Α.	Again, I don't recall details of the conversation, but
22		I'm sure they would have done, yes.
23	Q.	Can you help us as to how UKAS came to the conclusion
24		that the surveillance processes in place had identified
25		when the content of the certificate needed to be

102

revised?
----------

2	Α.	Sorry, could you rephrase that for me, please?
3	Q.	Yes. UKAS have come to the conclusion in the report $$
4		we just read it $$ that the surveillance processes in
5		place had identified when the content of the certificate
6		needed to be revised. Can you help us as to how they
7		came to that conclusion?
8	Α.	Presumably from a combination of examining the documents
9		retained on the file and verbal examination of the
10		individuals involved.
11	Q.	If they mean the surveillance done by the technical
12		assessor, that process, that surveillance process, was
13		not designed to identify new fire performance data, was
14		it?
15	Α.	No.
16	Q.	Yes.
17		Now, after this UKAS assessment, as we know, the
18		Reynobond certificate was re-issued. Do I understand it
19		correctly that you reviewed that certificate before it
20		was re—issued? Is that right?
21	Α.	Yes, I was involved in the process of updating all $ACM$
22		certificates at that time.
23	Q.	If we could just look briefly at what you say about this
24		in your second witness statement, if we can go to that
25		at page 37 {BBA00010723/37}, paragraph 154. You tell us
		103
1		this at the bottom of the page:

1		this at the bottom of the page:
2		"The Second Issue also removed the wording that 'the
3		panel may be regarded as having a Class 0 surface' as it
4		was recognised that this was open to misinterpretation,
5		amended the presentation of the fire test results (but
6		not the results themselves) and updated other wording in
7		line with the then standard BBA format."
8		Now, can you just help us, where you say you have
9		removed the wording about the class 0 surface as it was
10		recognised this was open to misinterpretation, what was
11		that misinterpretation?
12	Α.	That all versions of the product could achieve a class $\boldsymbol{0}$
13		surface when we did not have fire test data to support
14		that assertion.
15	Q.	Yes.
16		Had the UKAS assessors said something about that
17		statement, or was it the BBA's own decision to change
18		that?
19	Α.	We had decided on the revisions that were required, as
20		far as I remember, before UKAS made their visit.
21	Q.	I see.
22		In fact, what we know is there was another re—issue
23		of this certificate shortly after this, if we just go to
24		that at {BBA00000049}. Right at the bottom we can see
25		it says that the date of the second issue was

1		4 August 2017, but then two lines down, the certificate
2		was amended on 22 September 2017 to remove ST panel.
3		Can you help us, what does that mean, ST panel, there?
4	Α.	For some reason we've referred to the polyethylene
5		product as standard throughout, and so I assume the ST
6		refers to the polyethylene or standard panel.
7	Q.	Yes, I see.
8		At page 7 {BBA00000049/7}, what we see is an updated
9		table, and what we can see at the top of that page in
10		the table is that you have taken out all references to
11		the PE panels and this certificate only refers to the FR
12		panels; yes?
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	We understand that this change was made at the request
15		of Arconic following their decision not to sell PE-cored
16		Reynobond ACM at all in the UK; is that your
17		understanding?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	MS	GRANGE: Yes, thank you.
20		Mr Chairman, the next phase of my questions are all
21		about the K15 Kingspan product.
22	SIR	R MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Right.
23	MS	GRANGE: I'm very happy to begin those now and go for the
24		next eight minutes up to the lunch break, or we could
25		break now and come back slightly before 2 o'clock, if

- 1 that --
- SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: How are you getting on generally? 2 3 MS GRANGE: I'm getting on well. I think I have around 4 a half day to go with this witness. If we go well this
- 5 afternoon, we may fit it in this afternoon. If I run
- 6 into tomorrow, that won't be by very much, but I'm
- 7 certainly ahead of time, given that this was supposed to
- 8 be a two-day witness.
- 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: It sounds to me as though we could
- 10 be slightly generous to ourselves and stop now and
- 11 return at 2 o'clock, unless you tell me that would be
- 12 unwise
- MS GRANGE: No, I would be entirely content with that, and 13
- then I can take the topics without breaking. 14
- SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: There you are, Mr Albon, you get 15 16 a slightly longer lunch hour today.
- 17 We will stop now, we'll come back at 2 o'clock, and
- 18 again, as I've said to you before, please don't talk to
- 19 anyone about your evidence or anything to do with it
- 2.0 over the break, all right?
- THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you. 21
- 2.2 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. We will see
- 23 you at 2 o'clock, then, please.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.

106

- 1 (12.52 pm) 2 (The short adjournment) 3 (2.00 pm) 4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome 5 back. We're going to continue hearing evidence from Mr Albon 6 7 Mr Albon, can you see me and hear me clearly? THE WITNESS: Yes, I can. 8 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Welcome back. 10 And you're ready to continue, I hope? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: In that case, I shall invite 12 13 Ms Grange to put some more questions to you. 14 Yes, Ms Grange, when you're ready. 15 MS GRANGE: Yes, thank you. 16 Good afternoon. Mr Albon. I now want to ask you 17 about Kingspan and, in particular, about the BBA's 18 certification of the Kingspan Kooltherm K15 insulation 19 product 20 If we could go first to your third witness 21 statement, that's the statement in which you deal with 22 K15, at {BBA00010751/15}, and to paragraph 50, we can 23 see that in question 10 in the middle of that page, you 24 were asked by the Inquiry about your knowledge of the 25 BBA's relationship with Kingspan in October 2008, and 107
  - 1 you say:
- 2 "I was aware of Kingspan as a holder of a number of 3 Certificates but as far as I can recall, up to October 4 2008 I had had little, if any, direct contact with them, 5 as I was then employed in other areas of the BBA's business." 6 7 Now, can you help us, when was it after October 2008 8 that you did first have direct contact with Kingspan? 9 A. When I became technical manager in 2009. I had more 10 involvement in the insulation sector than I had 11 previously. I may at that point have had some dealings 12 with Kingspan. I became directly concerned with them 13 when I became head of energy and ventilation, 2012/2013, 14 something like that. 15 Q. Right, ves. thank you. 16 We'll come on to this in a little bit more detail, 17 but when did you first become involved in any particular 18 certificate for K15 in any capacity? 19 A. As far as I can recall, that would have been the second 2.0 issue, I think, of their initial certificate . 21 Q. Yes, was that the second issue published on 17 December 22 2013? 23 A. Yes 24 Q. Yes, thank you. 25 So when you were technical manager between 2009 and

7

- 1 2013, were you responsible for the policies and
  - procedures which applied to the K15 certificates?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. When you were head of approvals for construction
   products, that's between 2013 and 2019, did the K15
   certificates fall under your area of responsibility ?
  - certificates fall under your area of responsibility ? A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Thank you.
- 9 Now, prior to your own involvement, I think you're
- $10\,$   $\,$  aware that there had been two previous published BBA  $\,$
- 11  $\hfill \hfill \h$
- 12 amended issue 1 bearing the date of 6 April 2010, but
- which you tell us was not published until 12 July 2013;is that correct?
- A. Yes. I should perhaps say there is some uncertainty as
   to exactly when that was published. That's the best
   dates that I can give you. It's not entirely clear.
- 18 Q. I see. When you say, "That's the best date I can give
- you", how have you ascertained that publication date of12 July 2013?
- 21 A. From an examination of the retained records on the BBA's 22 files .
- 23 Q. Right. So there is something in there that tells you
- 24 that it was likely published in July 2013; yes?
- 25 A. Yes

109

- 1 Q. Thank you.
- 2 In your third witness statement, you tell us that in 3 respect of issue 1 and amended issue 1, the project 4 manager and approvals manager for both were George Lee 5 and Chris Hunt respectively; is that correct? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Let's go to issue 1, then, dated 27 October 2008 at 8 {BBA00000038}. We can see from the top that it's for 9 the Kooltherm K15 rainscreen insulation board, and we 10 can see there is a box underneath that, a pale blue box, 11 "Product scope and summary of certificate", and then in 12 the left-hand corner towards the bottom of the page we 13 can see the date, 27 October 2008, and that's been signed by Chris Hunt, head of approvals, and 14 15 Greg Cooper, the chief executive at the time. Yes? 16 A. Yes.  $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{On}\;\mathsf{page}\;\mathsf{1},\;\mathsf{we}\;\mathsf{have}\;\mathsf{it}\;\mathsf{there}\;\mathsf{on}\;\mathsf{the}\;\mathsf{page},\;\mathsf{under}\;\mathsf{the}\;\mathsf{``Key}\;$ 17 18 factors assessed" heading, we see "Behaviour in relation 19 to fire" is the third bold heading, and it tells us: 2.0 "The boards will not contribute to the development 21 stages of a fire or present a smoke or toxic hazard (see 2.2 section 7).' 23 Now, I want to ask you about this particular 24 wording, just briefly, to see whether you might be able 25 to assist us where Mr Hunt could not.

110

- 1 Can you help us, what does that phrase mean, "The
- 2 boards will not contribute to the development stages of
- 3 a fire"?
- 4 A. I don't know.
- 5~ ~ Q. So you can't help us as to whether that's derived from
- 6 guidance?
- 7 A. No.
- 8~ Q. Or from somewhere else within the Building Regulations
- 9 or Approved Document B?
- 10 A. No. Do you want me to speculate?
- 11~ Q. Not at this stage. I'm going to ask you a number of
- questions about this. I'd rather you didn't speculate.
   Well, what could the scientific or evidential basis
- 14 for such an assertion be? Let's put it like that.
- 15 A. I don't know.
- 16~ Q. Do you understand and did you understand when you came
- $17\,$  to be dealing with the K15 product that it was
- 18 a combustible phenolic insulation material?
- 19 A. Yes
- 20  $\,$  Q. As such, can you explain how it could have been accurate
- 21 to state that the boards will not contribute to the 22 development stages of a fire?
- 23 A. I don't know the basis for that statement.
- 24 Q. Because I think we can agree it's not qualified, is it?
- 25 It's a definitive statement, is it not?

111

- 1 A. Yes
- 2 Q. Does this assertion concern you at all, looking at it 3 now?
- 4  $\,$  A. Yes, it does. I would point out that it does refer the
- 5 reader to the main fire section of the certificate , and
- 6 reiterate that any certificate should be read in full ,
- $7 \qquad \ \ \, \mbox{and no decision should be based on the basis of a single}$
- 8 sentence. But, yes, it does concern me.
- $9\,$   $\,$  Q. Yes, because actually that sentence doesn't in fact
- 10 appear in section 7, does it?
- 11 A. No
- 12 Q. Can you remember when you first became aware of that 13 sentence?
- 14 A. No. I believe it was removed as part of the re-issue,
- 15 replacement of the certificate in 2014, maybe 2015. The
- 16 2014 certificate that was issued in 2015.
- 17~ Q. Do you remember reading it and being concerned about it?
- 18 A. I remember removing it in 2015, yes.
- 19 Q. And were you concerned at the time that you removed it?
- 20 A. I didn't feel it was an appropriate clause to insert in
- $21 \qquad \mbox{the certificate}$  , so yes, I was concerned.
- 22  $\,$  Q. Well, you say, "I didn't feel it was an appropriate
- $2\,3$  clause"; can we agree that it was inaccurate,
- 24 an inaccurate statement of how this combustible phenolic
- 25 insulation would behave in fire?

1	A.	As I've said, I do not know any scientific basis for
2		making that statement.
3	Q.	Yes.
4		Mr Hunt told us in his evidence that he couldn't
5		remember reading that wording at the time and asking
6		himself what it meant. He also said that, "Reading it
7		now, I think it confuses more than it helps". Can
8		I take it from your answers that you agree with that?
9	Α.	Yes.
10	Q.	And just for the transcript, that was Mr Hunt,
11		Day 108/173:1-6 and $Day 108/176:2$ .
12		Do you accept that the most natural reading of that
13		phrase, "will not contribute to the development stages
14		of a fire", is a description of something which is
15		non-combustible?
16	Α.	I am not sure whether it would be equally true of
17		something of limited combustibility, that's beyond my
18		experience, l'm afraid.
19	Q.	Either way, do you accept that the wording is
20		misleading, given that K15 is neither non-combustible
21		nor a material of limited combustibility?
22	Α.	If taken in isolation, yes. But, again, you must read
23		the full certificate .
24	Q.	Well, you keep adding that caveat, "If taken in
25		isolation, you must read the full certificate ", but
		113

- 1 nowhere is that phrase explained, is it, in section 7? It's just a bald statement that appears on the front of 2
- 3 the certificate .
- 4 A. Yes, but the true performance of the product, if you 5 wish to describe it in that way, would be given in 6 section 7 of the certificate .
- 7  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  So are you saying that a reader of this  $\;$  certificate 8 should just, what, simply ignore that sentence on the
- 9 first page? 10 A. No, they should read the certificate in full and take
- 11 the performance characteristics given in the certificate 12 against the criteria given in the approved documents.
- 13 Q. Right, but what weight should the reader of this certificate give to this statement, "The boards will not 14
- 15 contribute to the development stages of a fire"?
- 16 A. That's an opinion. The factual performance 17 characteristics are given in section 7 of the
- 18 certificate .
- 19 Q. Well --
- A. And that -- and if you take the information given in 20
- 21 section 7 and apply the criteria given in the approved
- 2.2 documents, you can form an accurate picture of where the 23 products can be used.
- 24 Q. I see. You say it's an opinion; it's a wholly
- 25 inaccurate and misleading opinion, isn't it?

114

- 1 A. I agree, we cannot substantiate it, yes.
- Q. Can you help us, did the BBA ever receive any queries, 2 3
- concerns or complaints in relation to this phrase so far 4 as you are aware?
- 5 A. We did receive some queries about the fire wording as a whole. I don't know if they related specifically to 6
- 7 that clause.
- Q. And who were those queries from? 8
- 9 A. We had a conversation with NHBC at one point, and
- 10 an enquiry from MHCLG.
- 11 Q. Yes, I'm going to come on to the enquiry from MHCLG, 12 because I think we have some emails about that.
- 13 You mention a conversation with NHBC; can you tell 14 us, when did that conversation take place?
- 15 A. It was when the certificate was being -- it was either
- 16 re-issued or the 2015 replacement specifically to the 17 wording.
- 18 Q. And who was it at the NHBC who you had this conversation
- 19 with about the wording?
- 20 A. Graham Perrior and Dave Alexander-White.
- 21 Q. Right, and were they concerned about the scientific and 22 evidential basis for that statement?
- 23 A. As I recall, it was more about the classifications given
- 24
- in the certificates rather than that front page 25 statement.

## 115

1 Q. I see.

2

- Why, when you first saw this, did you not
- 3 investigate how it had come to be included in the
- 4 certificate in the first place?
- 5 A. It wasn't a process I would normally follow. If
- 6 I thought a wording in a certificate was inappropriate,
- 7 clearly I would seek to correct that. If the staff 8
- involved were still working in the operational 9 certification side of the business. I would have
- 10 a conversation with them to establish where it had come
- 11 from. In this case, both staff members had moved on
- 12 within the business, were no longer working in this
- 13 area
- 14  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Can you help us, why wasn't that a process that you
- 15 would usually follow? Even if the relevant staff have
- 16 moved on, wouldn't you want to understand whether the
- 17 training was adequate for staff at the time, whether the
- 18 processes that were being applied for fire performance
- 19 assessments were robust? Why wouldn't you want to
- 2.0 understand any of those things?
- 21 A. Well, the training had greatly increased since the time 2.2 that certificate was written. We had different project 23 managers, we had different managerial staff in post and
- 2.4 ultimately I was signing off the certificates rather
- 25 than a colleague. So there was almost no overlap

7

- 1 between the processes in place in 2008 and those in
- 2 place when I came to head the department.
- 3  $\mathsf{Q}.~\mathsf{I}$  see. So you decided, did you, that there wouldn't be
- 4 anything to be learned from investigating how this error 5 had come to occur on the certificate?
- A. I was confident that error would not be repeated and 6
- that the processes we had in place at that point were
- far more robust than they were at the time that 8
- 9 certificate was drafted.
- 10 Q. I see. But we know that, for example, Chris Hunt did
- 11 carry on working in the BBA, albeit in a different 12 department. Why wasn't it important to ascertain how
- 13 Mr Hunt could have signed off on this certificate when
- 14 there was no evidential basis for that statement?
- 15 A. Because he had moved to a non-technical role within the 16 organisation. He was heading up product development
- 17 activities and no longer in a position to make technical 18 judgements over insulation products.
- 19 Q. Did you ever speak to Mr Hunt about this, about how this 20 came to occur?
- 21 A. Not that I recall, no.
- 2.2 Q. Can we look now at page 5 of this same certificate
- {BBA00000038/5}, and section 7 on page 5. We can see at 23
- 24 the bottom the heading "Behaviour in relation to fire",
- 25 and at section 7.1 we can see details are given of

### 117

1		a BS 8414 $-1$ test, which is a large-scale fire test; yes?
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	And then also some details are given below that of
4		a BS EN 1364 $-1$ fire resistance test for non–loadbearing
5		elements; yes?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	You tell us in your witness statement $$ we don't need
8		to turn it up, it's paragraph 86 of your third witness
9		statement on page 24 $\{BBA00010751/24\}$ $$ that the BBA
10		was provided with a full copy of the 8414 test report
11		prior to the issue of the first certificate .
12		Now, the description of the $8414-1$ test includes
13		6-millimetre cement particle boards, that's in the
14		second line of that bullet point. This is the same test
15		to $8414 - 1$ which is referred to in all issues of the
16		certificate for K15. Do you agree?
17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	We can see at the end of the third line down, so in that
19		first bullet point, at the end of the third line, it
20		says this:
21		"The cement particle boards provided the
22		overcladding for the rainscreen system."
23		Now, did you consider at any stage, or are you aware
24		of any other BBA employee considering, that cement
25		particle beards might not be able to be used as the

- 2 25
- particle boards might not be able to be used as the

118

1 outer layer in a rainscreen cladding system on 2 a high-rise building? 3 A. I wasn't involved in the drafting of this certificate , 4 but I think that would have been an unusual scenario, to 5 have an unfinished cement particle board as a cladding. Q. Yes. Did that occur to you when you came to be involved 6 7 in these certificates after 2008, that that was 8 an unusual scenario, to have an unfinished cement 9 particle board as a cladding? 10 A. I was aware of it, yes. 11 Q. Yes. 12 Were you aware that that build-up described was not 13 one that could be replicated on an actual high-rise 14 building? 15 A. In what way could it not be replicated, sorry? Q. Well. for the same reason, because it's a cement 16 17 particle board which you wouldn't expect to be used as 18 the outer cladding for a high-rise building. 19 A. Yes 20 Q. Now, my next question relates to a matter which we may 21 need to deal with at a later stage in this Inquiry, but 22 for now I want to ask you this: do you recall being 23 involved in early 2014 in any discussions or meetings 24 with the BRE on the subject of any BBA certificate for 25 K15?

## 119

- 1 A. Sorry, what was the date again?
- 2 Q. Early 2014. Do you remember being involved in any
- 3 discussions or meetings with the BRE on the subject of 4 any BBA certificate for K15?
- 5 A. I don't recall one, no.
- 6 Q. We believe that those discussions may have involved 7
- Stephen Howard and Sarah Colwell, does that help?
- 8 A. I have met both of those individuals. I'm sorry, 9 I really don't recall a meeting about K15. It's not to 10 say there wasn't one.
- 11 Q. Right. So you can't remember a meeting with the BRE at 12 which you came to discuss the certificate for K15 and 13 its wording?
- 14 A. Do you know the specifics of what was discussed that
- 15 might help jog my memory?
- 16 Q. No, we're just going on what other BRE witnesses have 17 told us, so that's why we're asking you. We're not
- 18 aware there's any notes of that meeting.
- 19 A. It is possible, but I don't recall it.
- $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Did anyone at the BRE ever express to you at any stage 2.0
- 21 a view that the 8414-1 test build-up on which Kingspan
- 2.2 were relying was a non-standard or non-typical system?
- 23 Did the BRE ever say that to you?
- 2.4 They didn't, but I was aware of that. I didn't think Α
- 25 that was the purpose of the test. It's not a role that

- 1 I fulfil , but, as I understand it, it's very unlikely
- 2 that an actual site installation will exactly reproduce
- 3 the construction in the test. I was of the
- 4 understanding that they would be used as the basis of
- 5 desktop assessments by suitably qualified individuals to
- 6 extrapolate those results to particular real—world 7 constructions.
- 8 Q. Right. So just so as I'm clear on your evidence, are
- $9 \qquad \ \ \, you \ \ \, saying \ \ that \ \ the \ \ purpose \ \ of \ \ referring \ \ to \ \ this \ \ test \ \ in$
- 10 the BBA certificates was because the BBA understood that
- 11 that would be used for the basis of desktop assessments 12 in the future?
- A. I understood that they -- well, I believed that they
   could be used for that purpose, yes.
- 15 Q. I see, but that's not the premise on which they're 16 included in the certificate , is it?
- A. Well, they're included as representative test data for
  that particular construction. It is for the specifier
  and the reader to decide whether or not it's appropriate
- 20 for a particular installation .21 Q. Well, we'll come and look at that wording again in
- a moment, but nowhere in the certificate does it say,
- 23 "We've included these details of the 8414 test build-up
- so that desktop assessments can be done on the basis of
- 25 it". It doesn't say that, does it?

### 121

1	Α.	No, it doesn't. We provide the test data to be used by
2		others on the basis of the requirements of a given
3		installation and requirements of the approved documents.
4		That certificate does not say it is suitable for use on
5		any particular installation . That is a judgement to be
6		made by others.
7	Q.	Right.
8		Did you understand that that 8414 test data applied
9		only to the exact materials tested in the exact same
10		configuration? Did you understand that?
11	Α.	Yes.
12	Q.	If we go back to page 1 of the certificate
13		$\{BBA00000038/1\},$ to the "Product scope" section, we can
14		see that at the top we've got the main Kooltherm K15
15		rainscreen heading, then the lighter box, "Product scope
16		and summary of certificate", we can see that it says
17		there:
18		"This Certificate relates to Kooltherm K15
19		Rainscreen Insulation Board, a rigid phenolic board with
20		foil composite facings, for use as external thermal
21		insulation on new and existing steel frame or masonry
22		walls."
23		Do you see that?
~ 4		

- 24 A. Yes.
- 25  $\,$  Q. Now, that reference to the use of K15 on steel-frame

122

	walls was not correct in 2008 in relation to buildings
	with a storey over 18 metres, was it?
	(Pause)
Α.	I'm hesitating because I don't understand what you're
	asking me.
Q.	Well, let me ask it a different way: given that the BBA
	only had evidence of one test to BS 8414 $-1$ with
	a masonry substrate, and had no evidence of any testing
	to BS 8414-2 for steel-frame structures, it was not
	correct that K15 could be used on existing steel-frame
	walls in buildings over 18 metres, was it?
Α.	Well, with respect, it doesn't say that. It doesn't say
	that you can use it above 18 metres on a steel-frame
	construction. You could use it below 18 metres on
	a steel-frame construction.
Q.	Well, where does it draw that distinction that you're
	drawing now? Where does it clearly state that you can
	only use it on a steel-frame construction if it's below
	18 metres?
Α.	That restriction isn't given in the BBA certificate,
	it 's given in the approved document, and as I've said,
	it's for the reader to take the data within the
	certificate and apply that to the criteria given in the
	approved document.
Q.	Why is that not made clear in this certificate ? Why is
	123
	Q. A. Q.

1		it not made clear that you can only use it on
2		a steel-frame building if it 's under 18 metres?
3	Α.	It 's a fundamental principle of certification . We don't
4		say what it's not suitable for in that way. It may well
5		be that post-publication of this document,
6		a representative BS 8414 $-2$ test had been carried out, in
7		which case it would be suitable for that construction to
8		be used above 18 metres.
9	Q.	Yes, but with respect, Mr Albon, when you issue this
10		certificate , you're not concerned with what might happen
11		post-publication, surely the BBA is concerned with what
12		information it has at the time it issues the
13		certificate ; yes?
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	And it only had an $8414-1$ test; yes?
16	Α.	Yes.
17	Q.	So shouldn't it have made clear that for steel $-$ frame
18		walls, it could only be used if under 18 metres? Wasn't
19		that an important qualification to include as part of
20		this product's fitness for purpose?
21	Α.	No, not at all. It's for the specifier for
22		an individual building to read the information in this
23		certificate . As you say, there is no BS $8414-2$ test.
24		In its absence, its use as covered by this certificate

would be below 18 metres. But it's the approved

1 documents that make that distinction, not the

- 2 BBA certificate.
- 3  $\,$  Q. Mr Albon, in your first witness statement you have told
- 4 us -- this is, for the reference, {BBA00000158/16},
- 5 paragraph 64 -- that the intention is that the
- 6 certificate is a standalone document that gives the
- 7 reader all of the information required without recourse
- $8 \hspace{1.5cm}$  to other documents. If it's a standalone document that
- $9 \qquad \ \ \, gives the reader all of the information required, why$
- $10 \qquad \mbox{ isn't it clear from the very first page of this }$
- 11  $\hfill \hfill \h$
- 12 construction over 18 metres?
- 13 A. When I wrote of no other documents being required,
- $14 \qquad \ \ {\rm clearly} \ {\rm I}$  was not referring to the statutory instrument
- $15\,$  or the approved documents that support it. They are the
- 16 governing documents that decide whether or not a product
- 17 can be used in a particular situation. The certificate18 gives the specifier the information they need on which
- 19 to make an informed judgement. If there is no data
- 20 within the certificate that allows the use above
- 21 18 metres, then clearly it is restricted by the approved
- documents to below 18 metres.
- 23- Q. I see. So, so far on this page, have I got this right,
- $24\,$   $\,$  the reader is to ignore the sentence under "Behaviour in
  - relation to fire ", and understand that the statement

### 125

about use in steel – frame buildings is qualified to only 1 buildings below 18 metres; is that right? 2 3 A. I wouldn't expect any informed specifier to make 4 a judgement on the basis of the first page of the 5 certificate ,  $\ I \$  would expect them to read the whole 6 document. If they do that, all of the necessary 7 information on restrictions in relation to location 8 based on fire is given in section 7 of the certificate . 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Ms Grange, can I just suggest this: 10 regardless of what may come later in the certificate, 11 the opening paragraph is simply a description of the 12 product, isn't it, which is designed for use as thermal 13 insulation in different types of construction? It 14 doesn't say any more than that, does it? MS GRANGE: Sorry, Mr Chairman, are you asking me or are you 15 16 asking the witness? 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I'm putting it to you that 18 it's simply a generic statement which doesn't seek to 19 address problems of over or under 18 metres and maybe 2.0 shouldn't be regarded as defective because it doesn't do 21 SO 2.2 MS GRANGE: Yes. I think what I'm seeking to explore is why 23 we don't see from the very first page of this 24 certificate that K15 can only be used in one specific 25 construction over 18 metres, and that --

2	least in relation to the first paragraph, namely that
3	the first paragraph is simply generic in its intent and
4	tells you that the product is intended for use with
5	masonry and steel-framed walls. It's not addressing
6	questions of height or limitations.
7	MS GRANGE: Yes, I understand. I'm really seeking to get to
8	the bottom of why a qualification to that effect only
9	appears in the next issue of this certificate .
10	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, you can ask the witness that,

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I'm suggesting an explanation, at

11 of course.

Grenfell Tower Inquiry

1

- 12 MS GRANGE: Yes, we'll come to that.
- 13 Were you aware, Mr Albon, in 2008 that K15 was being
- 14 regularly specified for use in the over-18-metre market?
- 15 A. I would have no way of knowing that.
- 16 Q. Did you ever become aware of that, that K15 was being
- 17 regularly specified for use in the over-18-metre market?
- 18 A. Not pre the Grenfell Tower fire, no.
- 19 Q. Let's look at what it says in this certificate about the
- 20 classification to BR 135 of the 8414 test data. If we
- 21 can go back to section 7.1 on page 5 {BBA00000038/5}, we
- see at the bottom of that page that same bullet point,
- $2\,3\,$  and you can see, if we look three lines up from the
- 24 bottom of that paragraph, it says this:
- 25 "Within the stated test time the temperature at the

### 127

1	level 2 thermocouples did not exceed 600°C, therefore
2	displaying limited fire spread away from the fire source
3	and that the product meets the criteria stated within
4	BRE 135."
5	Now, you were asked about that particular wording by
6	the Inquiry, if we can look at your third witness
7	statement, page 25 $\{BBA00010751/25\}$ , and if we look at
8	Inquiry question $27(i)$ , which is the second question
9	down there. You're asked the question:
10	"On what basis did the BBA deem it acceptable and/or
11	accurate to conclude and to state, in the absence of any
12	Classification Report to BR 135, that the criteria
13	therein had been met?"
14	In your answer, you give a detailed explanation of
15	the different aspects of a BR 135 assessment. Then if
16	we can look at what you say at paragraph 94 at the
17	bottom of page 26 of your statement $\{BBA00010751/26\}$ ,
18	you say this:
19	"The BBA considers itself competent to make
20	a judgement as to the results of a BS 8414 test, based
21	on the above BR 135 based criteria, when provided with
22	a full report on a performed test. There is clearly
23	some subjectivity to the judgement of the mechanical
24	performance, and this is one of the reasons that it is
25	now standard practice to give report reference details

128

- 1 in Certificates, to enable a specifier to make their own
- 2 assessment of the results, should they choose to do so.'
- 3 Now, just picking up on the end of that paragraph,
- 4 was there not also some subjectivity in the judgement of
- 5 mechanical performance back in October 2008?
- A. Yes 6

- Q. If that's right, why weren't the report reference
- 8 details not always given in the certificate ? Can you 9 help us?
- 10 A. I don't know. It obviously would have been better had 11 they done so.
- 12 Q. Can you help us, when was this practice of giving report
- 13 reference details introduced by the BBA?
- 14 A. I don't recall the exact date. Possibly around
- 15 2014/2015. I'm guessing, to be honest. Around that 16 time
- 17 Q. Okay, thank you.
- 18 So just to be clear, in the absence of a BR 135
- 19 classification report, is this right, the BBA carried
- 2.0 out its own assessment of the test data in the report
- 21 against the criteria in BR 135?
- 2.2 A. Yes, the approved documents do not require
- 23 a classification report, it requires the system to meet 24 the criteria of BR 135.
- 25 Q. Can you help us, who are you talking about when you say

### 129

- that the BBA considers itself competent to make 1 a judgement about the results of an 8414 test? Are vou 2
- 3 talking about all project managers? Who is it within
- 4 the BBA that would have been competent to carry out
- 5 those assessments?
- A. Technical experts within the area of insulation. 6
- 7 Q. I see

8

- What about in December 2013 for issue 2 of the
- 9 certificate . which you were involved with: did you carry
- 10 out that exercise at that time?
- 11 A. I would have reviewed the conclusions of the project 12 manager who would have made the initial assessment.
- 13 I would have reviewed that conclusion.
- 14 Q. I see. So you would have reviewed the conclusion about 15 BR 135 criteria, would you?
- 16 A. Yes
- Q. Was the assessment of 8414 test data against the 17
- 18 criteria in BR 135 a normal or regular occurrence for 19 the BBA in October 2008?
- 20 A. I wasn't involved in that time. I believe this was the
- 21 first certificate of its type, so it would not have been 2.2 normal at that time.
- 23 Q. Right.
- 24
- Who would they be? You say that there were 25 technical experts in the area of insulation who were
  - 130

- 1 capable of making these assessments. Can you give us 2 some names? Who would they be?
- 3 A. Jon Denyer, Gayetree Ramkorun ...
- Q. Right --4
- 5 A. Possibly other experienced project managers at that
- time. Obviously, as with any company, we have some 6
- 7 turnover of staff, so putting the relevant staff in the
- 8 right timescale is quite difficult .
- 9 Q. Yes. What about George Lee, who was the project manager 10 for this certificate?
- 11 A. He was an experienced project manager who had worked in 12 this area for some time, so possibly.
- 13 So you would expect him to be making assessments against BR 135 based on 8414 test data; yes? 14
- 15 A. If it was his first experience of that test, and
- 16 I suggest it would be, then I would expect him to 17 discuss it with management.
- 18 Q. That would have been Mr Hunt, wouldn't it?
- 19 A. Or a technical expert working in a different department.
- 20 Q. In your third witness statement -- I don't think we need
- 21 to turn it up now -- you set out in a table for us all
- those individuals at the BBA who were involved in 22
- 23 drafting the various K15 certificates, and you tell us
- 24 that Brian Haynes as the technical manager, you say that
- 25 for amended issue 1 and issue 1, he provided opinion on

### 131

1 the performance in fire of the properties of the 2 product. That's what you tell us there 3 Can you help us, on what specifically did 4 Mr Brian Haynes provide an opinion about the fire 5 properties of the product? 6 A. From memory, I'm sorry, I can't tell you specifically . 7  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  So where you tell us in your statement that  $\mathsf{Mr}$  Haynes provided an opinion on the performance in fire 8 9 properties of the product, where did you get that from? 10 Α. There would have been documentary evidence on the file 11 in forms of notes or emails. That's the only way 12 I could have inferred that. I wasn't involved at the 13 time 14 Q. Would any such opinion or advice be recorded in writing? 15 A. It should be, ves. 16 Q. If we go to the witness statement of Mr Denyer, Jon Denyer, at {BBA00010780/24}, I want to look at 17 18 paragraph 99. Mr Denyer says in that top paragraph: 19 "In addition, I do have an email on my email archive 2.0 dated 9 June 2008 from the then Project Manager 21 (George Lee) to our then Technical Manager 2.2 (Brian Haynes) requesting an opinion on the BS 8414 test 23 but I have no record of a reply to this request.' 24 If we could go to that email, we think this is 25 {BBA00000255}, we can see that there is an email there

1		at the top of the page from George Lee to Brian Haynes,
2		cc'ing Chris Hunt, saying:
3		"Hi Brian,
4		"Please find attached product description and [8414]
5		fire report, for which I require a Fire Opinion."
6		You can see this relates in the subject to
7		Kooltherm K15.
8		Now, Mr Albon, we cannot find a response to that
9		email. Do you know whether a fire opinion was in fact
10		provided?
11	Α.	I have found no documentary evidence of such an opinion.
12		It may be that Brian Haynes discussed with George Lee,
13		but I don't know.
14	Q.	According to the BBA's policies and procedures, should
15		there have been a written response to that providing
16		a fire opinion if one was provided?
17	Α.	There should be a documentation of any technical
18		judgements made on a project, yes.
19	Q.	Yes. And you can't help us as to why we don't find that
20		in this case? We don't find any fire opinion helping us
21		as to how someone looked at the 8414 test data and
22		concluded that the BR 135 criteria were satisfied .
23	Α.	I haven't found any documented evidence of that decision
24		being made.
25	Q.	No.
		100

1		Just looking back at issue $1$ of the $$ certificate , and
2		the phrase that we were looking at, this is at
3		$\{BBA00000038/5\}$ and looking at paragraph 7.1, it's
4		summarising the BS 8414 report and at the very last line
5		it 's saying:
6		" and that the product meets the criteria stated
7		within BRE 135."
8		And you see there it says, "the product meets the
9		criteria stated"; do you see that?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Now, going back to your third witness statement,
12		$\{BBA00010751/27\},$ we can see that you have been asked
13		about this particular sentence at Inquiry
14		question 27(k), and you're asked the question:
15		"On what basis did the BBA deem it acceptable and/or
16		accurate to conclude and to state that 'the product' had
17		met the criteria within BR 135?"
18		Your response is below. You say:
19		"As explained above, the test relates to the
20		specific construction tested and it would have been
21		preferable not to refer to 'the product' in this
22		section. This was corrected in the Second Issue of the
23		Certificate, issued on 17 December 2013."
24		Now, I'm not sure that's an answer to the question
25		you were asked, and so I'm going to ask it again.

134

- Now, take it in stages: why do you say it would have been preferable not to refer to the product in this
- 3 section?

1

2

- 4 A. Because, as stated, the test relates to a specific 5 construction and so it is a system test and not 6 a product test.
- 7 Q. Yes. So does it follow, do you consider the assertion
- 8 that K15 as a product had met the criteria in BR 135 to9 have been an accurate assertion?
- 10 A. No, it is a system test, not a product test.
- 11 Q. Do you agree that a reader would inevitably conclude
- 12 that K15 as a product had met the criteria in BR 135?
- 13 A. I would hope that anybody making a judgement on the
- 14basis of a complex test such as BS 8414 would understand15that that is a system test. If not, that is potentially
- 16 misleading, yes.
- 17~ Q. Yes, can we agree that that section of the certificate
- 18 is wholly inaccurate and misleading?
- 19 A. I think the use of the word "product" is inaccurate and
- 20 misleading. I wouldn't say the whole sentence is
- 21 inaccurate and misleading.
- Q. That's the bit I'm asking you to focus on, the statementthat the product had met the criteria within BR 135.
- 24 Can we agree that that is wholly inaccurate and
- 25 misleading?

### 135

- 1~ A. Yes, you cannot extrapolate that result to other
  - constructions including that product.
- 3 Q. Quite.

2

- 4 Can you explain, why was that not corrected until 5 2013?
- A. I think it was an unfortunate human error that wasoverlooked during the certificate checking process.
- 8 I can't explain it .
- 9 Q. Did you ever speak to Mr Hunt about this inaccurate
- 10 statement on page 5 of the certificate? I've asked you
- 11 about whether you spoke to him about the statement on
- 12 page 1 about the product not contributing to the
- $13 \qquad \mbox{development stages of a fire, but did you ever speak to}$
- him about this inaccurate statement, that the productmet BR 135?
- 15 met BR 135
- 18~ Q. Mr Hunt could not account for this kind of error making
- 19 its way into the final version of issue 1 and also
- 20  $\qquad$  amended issue 1 of the certificate . Can you help as to
- 21 how that error has found its way into that certificate ?
- 22 A. No.
- 23  $\,$   $\,$  Q. Can we look at the witness statement of George Lee at
- $24 \qquad \mbox{this point, who you tell us undertook the drafting of}$

1		I want to look at what he says at paragraph 23.
2		Now, the questions the Inquiry asked are not
3		
		included in this statement, just the answers. He is
4		asked by the Inquiry what his understanding was of the
5		classification national class 0. At 23 his response was
6		this:
7		"A 'Class 0' rating indicates limited
8		combustibility ."
9		Do you see that?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Now, is that your understanding too, that a class 0
12		rating indicates limited combustibility?
13	Α.	No, that's incorrect.
14	Q.	Back in 2008, was that your understanding, that
15		a class 0 rating indicates limited combustibility?
16	Α.	No.
17	Q.	Can we agree that Mr Lee does not appear from that
18		answer to have a clear or accurate understanding of the
19		meaning of limited combustibility and its relationship
20		to a classification of national class 0?
21	Α.	I would agree that at the time he was writing this
22		statement, he clearly did not have an understanding. He
23		left the BBA, I don't know, ten years ago. I don't
24		believe he has worked in this area since he left . It
25		may be his memory is inaccurate and that he did
		137

<ul> <li>Q. I see. Well, given that he has said this in 2019 to us, do you have any reason to think that he would have</li> <li>thought something different back in 2008, when this certificate was being put together?</li> <li>A. I think it's inevitable he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he was working with these</li> <li>products than he would have relying on memory ten years</li> <li>later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> <li>which you have admitted was inaccurate and not supported</li> </ul>	1		understand the difference at the time.
<ul> <li>thought something different back in 2008, when this</li> <li>certificate was being put together?</li> <li>A. I think it's inevitable he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he was working with these</li> <li>products than he would have relying on memory ten years</li> <li>later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have that, a statement</li> </ul>	2	Q.	I see. Well, given that he has said this in 2019 to us,
<ul> <li>certificate was being put together?</li> <li>A. I think it's inevitable he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he was working with these</li> <li>products than he would have relying on memory ten years</li> <li>later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have that, a statement</li> </ul>	3		do you have any reason to think that he would have
<ul> <li>A. I think it's inevitable he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he was working with these</li> <li>products than he would have relying on memory ten years</li> <li>later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have that, a statement</li> </ul>	4		thought something different back in 2008, when this
<ul> <li>understanding at the time he was working with these</li> <li>products than he would have relying on memory ten years</li> <li>later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have that, a statement</li> </ul>	5		certificate was being put together?
<ul> <li>products than he would have relying on memory ten years</li> <li>later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have that, a statement</li> </ul>	6	Α.	I think it's inevitable he would have had a better
<ul> <li>9 later. I can't tell you that he did understand</li> <li>10 the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>11 Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>12 a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>13 insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>14 not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>15 a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>16 A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>17 the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>18 been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>19 working in different product areas.</li> <li>20 Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>21 this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>22 contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>23 can you conclude that he would have that, a statement</li> </ul>	7		understanding at the time he was working with these
<ul> <li>the difference at the time. I would hope that he did.</li> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	8		products than he would have relying on memory ten years
<ul> <li>Q. Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that</li> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	9		later. I can't tell you that he did understand
<ul> <li>a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal</li> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	10		the difference at the time. $\ \mbox{I}$ would hope that he did.
<ul> <li>insulation materials including Kingspan's products does</li> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	11	Q.	Right. Well, can you explain to us how it could be that
<ul> <li>not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have</li> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	12		a BBA project manager drafting certificates for thermal
<ul> <li>a clear understanding of fire classifications ?</li> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	13		insulation materials including Kingspan's products does
<ul> <li>A. As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at</li> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	14		not appear in his statement to this Inquiry to have
<ul> <li>the time he was working with these products would have</li> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	15		a clear understanding of fire classifications ?
<ul> <li>been better than it is ten years later, when he has been</li> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	16	Α.	As I've tried to explain, I think his understanding at
<ul> <li>working in different product areas.</li> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	17		the time he was working with these products would have
<ul> <li>Q. How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of</li> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	18		been better than it is ten years later, when he has been
<ul> <li>this certificate, it says, "This product will not</li> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	19		working in different product areas.
<ul> <li>contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How</li> <li>can you conclude that he would have had a better</li> <li>understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li> </ul>	20	Q.	How can you deduce that, given that on the front page of
<ul><li>23 can you conclude that he would have had a better</li><li>24 understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement</li></ul>	21		this certificate , it says, "This product will not
24 understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement	22		contribute to the development stages of a fire"? How
	23		can you conclude that he would have had a better
25 which you have admitted was inaccurate and not supported	24		understanding at the time he wrote that, a statement
	25		which you have admitted was inaccurate and not supported

1		by any evidence?
2	Α.	Well, I think the two things are different . I'm not
3		deducing anything, I'm merely suggesting that if he is
4		relying on his memory from ten years ago, he may not
5		have the understanding now that he had at the time that
6		he was writing certificates . I really don't know.
7	Q.	If we look at paragraph 25 of your third witness
8		statement, that's at page 7 {BBA00010751/7}, you tell us
9		something about the systems that are meant to be
10		followed. You say:
11		"The individual level of knowledge possessed by each
12		member of staff is closely monitored by line management,
13		both informally via daily interaction and more formally
14		via annual appraisals against set objectives. As part
15		of this [process], needs for further training are
16		discussed and documented for achievement over the year
17		to follow."
18		Then you go on at 26:
19		"Further, Project Managers and their management are
20		assigned particular product areas in which to specialise
21		as they build their experience $-$ for example, there is
22		a team that works only in the field of thermal
23		insulation . In this way, knowledge can be built on more
24		quickly, liaising with more experience colleagues
25		working in the same team, as opposed to working across

# 139

1		the full range of product covered by the BBA."
2		Now, can you help us, was George Lee a specialist in
3		thermal insulation?
4	Α.	He worked largely in the field of thermal insulation, he
5		was not an expert in thermal insulation in the way that
6		some of his colleagues would have been.
7	Q.	I see.
8		What about Mr Hunt? Was he an expert in the field
9		of thermal insulation?
10	Α.	No.
11	Q.	Do you consider that it's possible that $\ensuremath{Mr}$ Lee may have
12		included the phrase "will not contribute to the
13		development stages of a fire" on page 1 of the
14		certificate , which we've looked at, on the basis that
15		he believed K15 to be a material of limited
16		combustibility?
17	Α.	If he believed that the material was of limited
18		combustibility, I believe he would have included
19		a statement to that effect in section 7 of the
20		certificate . So I think it's unlikely it was on that
21		basis.
22	Q.	I see.
23		Have you at any stage been aware of confusion in the
24		wider industry about the meanings of class 0 and limited $% \left( {{\left( {{{\left( {{{\left( {{{\left( {{{c}}} \right)}} \right.} \right.} \right)}_{0,0}}}} \right)} \right)$
25		combustibility?

2

3

4

Day 110

1	Α.	I'm not aware of any confusion between those two terms,
2		they're both clearly defined within the approved
3		documents.
4	Q.	Can we just look briefly back at another passage in
5		Mr Lee's witness statement, so $\{BBA00010794/6\}$ . If we
6		go to paragraph 44(a), this is about whether or not the
7		BBA was accredited by UKAS to interpret fire test data,
8		and Mr Lee has answered:
9		"Not to my knowledge. At the time of my employment,
10		this would be the reason to obtain a fire opinion, as
11		the BBA were not accredited to interpret fire [test]
12		data."
13		Now, is he right about that?
14	Α.	No, I think he has a limited understanding of the
15		accreditation process.
16	Q.	Yes. So, in fact, the BBA was accredited to interpret
17		fire test data; yes?
18	Α.	That's not really the way accreditation works. We are
19		accredited to assess and certify products. The scope of
20		that accreditation is limited by UKAS to certain product
21		areas. Within those product areas, there are a wide
22		variety of product parameters we are required to assess
23		and understand. Fire is one of those, and so it is
24		included under the accreditation, but it is not a direct
25		part of the accreditation.

## 141

1	Q.	Can you explain why $Mr$ Lee thought that the $BBA$ were not
2		accredited to interpret fire data?
3	Α.	I think from what I've seen of his statement, he is
4		consistently relying on memory and not giving answers
5		that are credible.
6	Q.	I see.
7		Let's move on now to section 7.2 of this issue $1$ of
8		the certificate on page 5, if we can go back to that
9		$\{BBA00000038/5\}$ , right at the bottom we can see
10		section 7.2, it tells us there:
11		"The product is classified as Class 0 or 'low risk'
12		as defined in the documents supporting the national
13		Building Regulations. The product, therefore, may be
14		used in accordance with the provisions of $\dots$ "
15		Then over the page $\{BBA0000038/6\}$ it tells us:
16		"England and Wales — Approved Document B,
17		paragraph 8.4, Volume 1 and paragraphs 12.5 and 12.6,
18		Volume 2 (see also Diagram 40)."
19		So that's what we see about class 0 in this first
20		issue of the K15 certificate.
21		I want to ask you about what fire test data was
22		provided by Kingspan at any stage to evidence the
23		assertion that K15 had achieved class 0.
24		If we can go first to one of the witness statements
25		provided by Mr Brian Moore to the Inquiry at

142

5	particular the assertion that K15 had achieved
6	a classification of class 0. He states there, if we
7	look at 15 and then 16:
8	"15. Certificate 08/4582 and the First issue of
9	Certificate $14/5134$ stated that the product was a
10	Class 0/'Low Risk' material. In order to demonstrate
11	this, test reports are required to BS 476–6 and BS 476–7
12	and no such reports are contained on any of the K15 file
13	folders .
14	"16. Instead, the classification for K15 was
15	extrapolated from a series of fire reports on similar
16	Kingspan phenolic products, including those of similar
17	density and facing type."
18	Then he says that copies of the reports are
19	exhibited to his statement.
20	Mr Moore was asked about this during his oral
21	evidence, and I want to take you to what he said then.
22	If we can go to the transcript at $\{Day107/167:7\}$ , he is
23	being asked about this exercise of extrapolation, and
24	this is the answer he gives, picking it up in line 7.
25	He says:
	143

 $\{\mathsf{BBA00011097}/4\},$  this witness statement is dated

18 November 2020. If we go to page 4 and look at

paragraph 3(m), we can see that Mr Moore has been asked

about the technical assessment by the BBA of K15, and in

1		"Well, if there are no Kingspan $$ if there are no
2		fire reports to justify the class 0 statement, on what
3		basis was the BBA including this in a $\mbox{ certificate }$ , was
4		the question that I asked, and Mr Albon's view, a very
5		experienced and senior person at the BBA, his view was
6		that it was more likely than not that it was
7		extrapolated from a series of fire reports on similar
8		Kingspan phenolic products, including those of similar
9		density, ie the material referenced at exhibit BM4.
10		"You will recall that at the start of my statement
11		I did clarify that wording as deduction, belief, rather
12		than an absolute. There is a formula here that someone
13		has extrapolated from a series of fire [test] reports."
14		Now, can you help us, when did you first conclude
15		that an extrapolation was likely to have taken place?
16	Α.	When I was asked as part of the Inquiry's questions.
17	Q.	So was it the case that you looked back at the $K15$
18		files , found no evidence of BS 476–6 and 7 testing, and
19		therefore concluded that there must have been some form
20		of extrapolation; is that right?
21	Α.	It's a little more than that. There is no evidence of
22		the necessary BS 476 test reports, but the project
23		manager had placed within that specific technical folder
24		a number of associated Kingspan fire test reports to
25		those standards. They would only be on that folder if

- 1 they had formed some part of the assessment of K15.
- 2 There is nothing directly linking them to the
- 3 conclusions drawn, but I inferred from the fact that
- 4 they were placed on the file that an extrapolation had
- $5\,$  been made on the basis of those reports. That is
- 6 an inference; I can't confirm that.
- 7 Q. I see.

25

- 8 Did you ever consider as an alternative possibility
- 9 that those responsible for drafting the certificate
- $10 \qquad \ \ \, \mbox{simply accepted Kingspan's claim in their own marketing}$
- 11 \$ literature that K15 was class 0 and included that claim \$
- $12 \qquad \mbox{ in the BBA certificate, without carrying out any }$
- 13 extrapolation exercise?
- 14~ A. If that were the case, I don't know why the project
- 15 manager would have placed these reports, which were 16 collated from other assessments we had carried out, on 17 this specific assessment folder.
- 18 Q. Would it have been in accordance with the BBA's
- 19 procedures at the time to have taken Kingspan's
- 20 marketing literature and to replicate what was in that 21 because that said class 0?
- A. Absolutely not. There should be a defined anddocumented technical assessment to back up any
- 24 statements made in the certificate.
  - Q. Did you actually check with either Mr Lee or Mr Hunt

### 145

1		what had led to the inclusion of the class 0 statement	
2		in the certificate ?	
3	Α.	No.	
4	Q.	Just to be clear, you're not suggesting that you	
5		yourself ever carried out any such extrapolation in	
6		relation to K15 and class 0, are you?	
7	Α.	No, I'm not.	
8	Q.	Now, going back again to your third witness statement,	
9		$\{BBA00010751/21\}$ , and looking at the top of page 21 and	
10		Inquiry question 23(d), you were asked the following:	1
11		"On what basis did you or any other employee or	1
12		agent of the BBA consider it appropriate for the BBA to	1
13		'extrapolate' in the manner described 'instead' of	1
14		requiring the relevant test reports?"	1
15		Your answer at 70 was:	1
16		"I was not involved in this process and so am unable	1
17		to comment on the details of the technical assessment	1
18		made."	1
19		Now, I'm not sure that was actually an answer to the	1
20		question. Is this right: that you do not know for	2
21		a fact that such technical assessment was actually made?	2
22	Α.	There is no documentation on file to confirm that, so	2
23		I can't be sure, no.	2
24	Q.	Can I ask you this: whether or not an extrapolation was	2

actually carried out on this occasion, on what basis do

146

- 1 you consider that it would ever be appropriate to 2 extrapolate from test reports for various products to 3 pronounce a classification to national class 0 for 4 a different product? 5 Α. That would depend on the circumstances and the individual carrying out the assessment. It's not 6 7 unknown for an insulation manufacturer to produce 8 identical products for exactly the -- excuse me, for 9 different purposes. So it may be there is an absolutely 10 identical product used for roofing and for cladding. 11 Now, if we had a fire test report on that product and we 12 knew for certainty that it was an identical formulation 13 and specification, it might be appropriate to transfer 14 that classification across. Equally, if we had a letter 15 of opinion from a suitably qualified individual at 16 a UKAS accredited fire laboratory that they had carried 17 out an extrapolation, we might be prepared to accept 18 that. But we would not carry out that type of technical 19 judgement within the BBA.
- Q. Right. So taking this in stages, can we agree that
   there wasn't an absolutely identical product to K15 that
   you could simply take information for in this instance?
- 23 A. I don't know.
- 24 Q. When you say you don't know, did you check the
- 25 products -- I'll come to it in a moment -- that you say

### 147

1		were referred to on the file and check whether they were
2		an absolutely identical product to K15?
3	Α.	Well, I wasn't involved in the assessment process at the
4		time, so, no, I wouldn't have done that.
5	Q.	No, and the file doesn't reveal any opinion being
6		provided by a UKAS accredited fire laboratory, does
7		it
8	Α.	No.
9	Q.	—— suggesting an extrapolation?
10	Α.	No.
11	Q.	If we look again at the evidence of Mr Moore, if we can
12		go to the transcript at ${Day107/170:17}$ , he says this:
13		"Answer: I understood that it was not $$ it wasn't
14		common, but it was not unusual, if there were products
15		of a similar $$ of a very similar kind to each other,
16		and if the performance was adjudged to be so similar to
17		one that we'd already assessed, it was not unusual for
18		the BBA to extrapolate its opinion from one product to
19		a similar one. That was the core of the conversation.
20		"Question: Is what you've just told us something
21		that John Albon told you, or is it something you're
22		telling us from your own knowledge and experience?
23		"Answer: It is something that I'm saying arose in
24		my conversation with Mr Albon based on his knowledge and
25		experience across many, many years, more than me, at the

- 1 BBA. To me that sounded -- and I think this material
- 2 was actually in the place where the fire test reports
- 3 would be, in the particular folder, so it was -- it was
- 4 far from a -- it wasn't a leap of faith; it was
- 5 a reasonable deduction to be drawn, and that was the
- 6 basis for the belief ."
- 7 Now, is Mr Moore correct? He's saying that it
- 8 wasn't unusual, if there were products of a very similar
- 9 kind to one another and if the performance was adjudged
- $10\,$  to be so similar to one already assessed, for the BBA to
- 11 extrapolate opinion from one product to a similar one.
- 12 Do you agree with that?
- 13  $\,$  A. I don't think that's inconsistent with the explanation
- 14 I just gave. It would depend on the circumstances15 individual to the case.
- 16 Q. Mr Albon, I think it is inconsistent, because you said17 that if there was an identical product you would
- 18 extrapolate, and Mr Moore here is referring to products
- 19 of a similar or of a very similar kind. So which is it?
- 20 Is it only where there is an identical product that you
- 21 extrapolate, or is it where there is a similar or very
- 22 similar product that you would extrapolate test data of 23 this nature?
- 24 A. If it was identical, the BBA could make that judgement.
  - If it was not identical and it was the similar scenario,

- 1 I would expect us to obtain an expert opinion from 2 outside of the BBA.
- 3 Q. Okay. So it sounds from what you're saying like
- 4 Mr Moore was wrong that it was not unusual for the BBA 5 to extrapolate from one product to a similar one; he is
- 6 wrong about that, yes?
  7 A. I think it depends what you mean by -- what he means by
- 8 "the BBA would extrapolate". We would potentially take
- 9 a classification and use it, but it may be based on
- 10 a judgement made by somebody from outside of the BBA.
- 11 Q. I see

25

- 12 Can you help us, in what other circumstances and for
- 13 what other products or manufacturers have such
- 14extrapolations ever been carried out? Can you give us15some context to this?
- A. It's not uncommon that we have a fire test report that
   has a limited scope of applicability, for example. We
   might then ask our certificate holder to seek a letter
   of opinion from the organisation that carried out the
- 19 of opinion from the organisation that carried out the 20 fire test to expand that scope of applicability.
- 21 for example for thickness of insulation. It may have
- 22 a limited thickness within the scope of the fire test
- 23 report, but the fire laboratory might be prepared to
- 24 expand that thickness to match that which the
- 25 certificate holder wants covered in the certificate .

150

- 1 Q. Yes. Now, that scenario is not quite the same as what 2 I'm trying to get at. I understand that if you have 3 actually got an extrapolation carried out by 4 a third-party assessor, that's a different thing. But going back to what the BBA itself does, can you help us, 5 have the BBA ever carried out other extrapolations for 6 7 other products or manufacturers like the one that we see referred to for K15 and class 0? 8 9 A. I'm not aware of our having done what you are 10 suggesting, unless it was the scenario I explained 11 previously where it was the same product being used for 12 two different applications. 13 Q. So are you saying this is the only time you have ever 14 come across this, the K15 situation and class 0, the 15 only time you've come across an extrapolation from 16 similar products? 17 A. Well, I don't know what the extrapolation was, that's 18 the problem that I have. I don't know what work was 19 done, because it's not documented on the file, so I find 20 that difficult to answer. 21 Q. Do you consider that extrapolation is a process 22 permitted by the BS 476-6 and 7 test standards? 23 Mr Moore was not able to help us on that guestion and 24 said he didn't know the answer. Can you help us? 25 A. It would certainly be beyond the competence of the BBA 151
- 1 to carry out that. We would expect an expert fire 2 opinion if we were to do something outside of what was 3 defined within the fire test standards. 4 Q. I see 5 Do you know, did the BBA follow any particular 6 guidance when carrying out these extrapolations? 7 A. Again, unless I know what extrapolation was carried out, no, we did not have a procedure for extrapolating 8 9 fire test reports because I would not expect us to be 10 doing that.  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Are you aware as to whether the BBA has ever had 11 12 a discussion with a fire engineer external to the BBA 13 about the concept of extrapolating test data from 14 different products? 15 A. Not that I can recall. 16 Q. If we go back to your third witness statement at page 21  $\{\mathsf{BBA00010751}/21\},$  in the middle of page 21 you were 17 18 asked at (e): 19 "On what basis did you consider that the BBA was 20 entitled to describe as class 0 a product which had not. 21 to the BBA's knowledge, achieved that classification?' 2.2 You tell us at 71: 23 "A technical assessment would have been made. There 2.4 are reports on file relating to the insulation foam 25 component used and various facers and I assume that

these were used to make a fire engineering assessment of
the likely performance of the K15 product."
Now, you can take it from me that the reports to
BS 476–6 and 7 which Mr Moore told us that he found in
the test data area of the K15 file and are exhibited to
his second witness statement $$ what I'm going to do is
just summarise those for you.
What we see is an unfaced CFC free phenolic foam
laminate test to BS 476–7 from August 1991; a K7 sarking
board test to BS 476–7 from February 1993; K9 with
a glass tissue not a foil facer tested to BS 476 $-6$ from
October 1993; K9 with a glass tissue not foil facer test
to BS 476–7 from October 1993; K8 cavity boards with
a glass tissue not foil facer tested to BS 476 $-6$ and 7
in a letter from July 1994; Kooltherm DL2000 with one
aluminium face and one glass tissue face tested to
BS 476-6 from October 2003; Kooltherm DL3300 with one
aluminium face and one glass tissue face tested to
BS 476–7 from October 2003; and finally, an assessment
report to BS 476 $-6$ and 7 on Kooltherm DL3300 with one
aluminium face and one glass tissue face from
December 2003.
Now, I've summarised those test reports to you. Can
you explain and help us, in the light of those, what led
you to the assumption that those reports were used to

#### 153

1		make a fire engineering assessment as you describe it of
2		the likely performance of the K15 product?
3	Α.	The only basis on which I formed that impression was the
4		fact that they had been placed on the file for K15.
5		There would be no reason for them to be on the file
6		unless they had been used. I would not be competent to
7		make that technical judgement. I don't know on what
8		basis that judgement was made.
9	Q.	Have you actually read those reports for the other
10		Kingspan products yourself?
11	Α.	I may have glanced at them when I put the file together
12		for the Inquiry, but no, I didn't study them in detail.
13	Q.	Had some form of extrapolation been conducted, what
14		consideration do you think ought to have been given to
15		the fact that these reports were, some of them, very
16		old? One of them was already 15 years old by 2008.
17		Should that have been a consideration in any such
18		assessment?
19	Α.	The age of reports should always be a consideration.
20		It's not to say because it's 15 years old it can't be
21		used, but you would need a good case in order to be able
22		to use a report that was that old.
23	Q.	What consideration should have been given to the fact
24		that your of these word, at any on the hour had the same

that none of those products appear to have had the same 24 25 facer arrangement as K15, ie foil facers on both sides

154

1	-	of the phenolic core? What consideration should have
2	2	been given to that?
3	Α.	I think that would be for a suitably qualified fire
4		expert to decide. It's outside my competence to judge.
5	5	It may be that a judgement could be made on the known
6	5	performance of those facers, but I don't know.
7	Q.	Mr Albon, you're the BBA's chief scientific officer . If
8	3	it was outside your competence to judge, wouldn't it
9	)	have been outside the competence of the project manager
10	)	and the head of approvals who were considering this
11	-	certificate at its time?
12	A.	I don't think they would have been more qualified to
13	5	make a judgement than myself or other colleagues we have
14		in the business. I don't know who made the decision and
15	5	on what basis.
16	Q.	Does it follow from your answers that you can't tell us
17	,	how that extrapolation exercise could have been done,
18	3	that you can't take us through the steps as to how you
19	)	would conclude that it can be classified to class 0?
20	) A.	No, I can't.
21	. Q.	Did you take steps to find out from Mr Hunt who was
22	2	responsible for the technical sign-off of that first K15
23	5	certificate and whether your deductions on the matter
24		were correct?
25	б А.	No.
		155
		155
1	Q.	Can we go to {BBA00011093}. This is a letter dated
2		2 December 2004 to Ivor Meredith and it's signed, we can
3	5	see at the top of page 2, by Simon Lloyd of the BBA.
4		If we go back to the main part of the letter, we can
5	5	see in the opening paragraphs that the letter is chasing
6		a response to an earlier letter from 7 September 2004.
7		It says:

- It says: 8 "On consulting our records  $\ldots\,$  we have not received 9
- a reply from you to our letter [of that date] ... " 10 And at the second paragraph, he states:
- 11 "We would like to point out that we are unable to
- 12 proceed with the work, until we have received the 13 information requested."
- 14 Underneath that,  ${\sf Mr}$  Lloyd has listed various outstanding pieces of information, including, just over 15 16 halfway down the list, "Reaction to fire data" and
- 17 "Surface spread of flame". Do you see that?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19  $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;$  It is apparent from your witness statement and that of
- 20 others at the BBA that there was no fire test data to
- 21 BS 476-6 and 7 provided to the BBA on K15 prior to
- issue 1 of the certificate . Do you agree with that? 22
- 23 A. Yes.
- $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  As far as you were aware, when did the BBA first receive 24
- 25 test data showing tests to BS 476–6 and 7 for K15 which

5

1

- 1 would confirm a class 0 classification ?
- 2 A. I don't think we ever did.
- 3 Q. No, that seems to be the position, but we just wanted to
- 4 confirm it with you: that you never actually received
  - test data to those parts of 476-6 and 7?
- A. I think I've seen Euro classification data, but I don't 6 7 recall seeing a BS 476 set of reports.
- 8 Q. Did you ever consider that there might be a reason that 9 that data was not forthcoming from Kingspan when
- 10 requested? 11 A. I was not involved at this stage of the assessment.
- 12 I think my initial involvement was when we had the C
- 13 category to the Euro classification system.
- 14 Q. Whose responsibility would it have been to ensure that 15 this fire test data had been received for K15 in
- 16 October 2008 when the certificate was first issued?
- 17 A. Initially the project manager and then, when the final 18 certificate was reviewed prior to issue, by the
- 19 individual making the certification decision. Q. Yes, and what about on 17 December 2013 for issue 2 of 20 21 the certificate ? That certificate carries your
- 2.2 signature as head of approvals, doesn't it?
- 23 A. Yes.

25

24 Q. Was it your responsibility or somebody beneath you to

# ensure that that fire test data had actually been

### 157

- 1 received for K15?
- 2 A. The content of the certificate was entirely my
- 3 responsibility. However, it's not part of normal BBA
- 4 procedure to go back and repeat the initial assessment
- 5 as part of a re-issue. During a re-issue, we focus on
- the changes that we are making to the certificate. We 6
- 7 don't go back to the original first principles
- 8 assessment that was carried out for the first issue of 9 that certificate .
- 10 Q. I see. So that error was made and it just wasn't picked
- 11 up in later issues of the certificate ; is that correct? A. Yes 12
- Q But should it have been? Should someone have checked at 13 the time of issue 2 in December 2013 that there was 14
- 15 in fact that test data available?
- 16 A. That would not form part of our normal procedures. We 17 would expect that the statements made on a certificate 18 can be justified .
- 19 Q. Can you help us as to why it's not made clear in any of 2.0 the K15 certificates that that class 0 classification
- 21 has been reached by way of an extrapolation from similar 2.2 products?
- A. I don't believe that would be significant. If the 23
- 24 product can achieve a class 0 rating, it can achieve
- 25 a class 0 rating. It's a black and white can or cannot.
  - 158

- It does appear in this case that we cannot justify the 2 fact we made that statement. 3 Q. Are you aware now that during the lifetime of this 4 certificate Kingspan had obtained test results which in fact showed that K15 was not able to achieve class 0? 5 A. I have seen that reported as part of this Inquiry, yes. 6 7 Q. Are you able to accept, as Mr Hunt did, in relation to 8 issue 1 and amended issue 1, that this was a very basic 9 failure of due diligence on the part of the BBA? 10 A Yes 11 Q. You told us that when you signed off on issue 2 of the 12 certificate , you had already become concerned about the 13 assertion on page 1 of the certificate about not 14 contributing to the development stages of a fire. In 15 those circumstances, why did you also not check the 16 other assertions in the certificate before it was 17 re-issued? 18 A. I think there is a difference between an inappropriate 19 and misleading wording and a statement based on fact, 20 given the criteria contained within the approved 21 documents. I had no reason at that point to believe we 22 did not have the necessary supporting information on 23 file . 24 Q I see. So you're saving at the time you would draw
- 25 a distinction between inappropriate and misleading

#### 159

- 1 wording as compared with a statement based on fact; yes?
- A. I think the wording is subjective, the statement on 2
- 3 class 0 was objective, and I had no reason to believe we 4 would not have that data on file.
- 5 Q. So it didn't occur to you, once you had found one major 6 error with the certificate , to check that there weren't 7 others?
- A. I would have read, I hope, the rest of the certificate . 8
- 9 I regret the fact I did not pick up that misleading
- 10 wording on the front page.
- 11 Q. But what about the class 0 statement?
- 12 A. As I've said, there was no reason to suppose we wouldn't 13 have had that information on file.
- 14 Q. Right. So you don't regret signing off on that?
- 15 A. Yes, I regret not doing it, but I don't think I would
- 16 have been expected to go back and check it. I think it 17 was a reasonable assumption to make that those reports
- 18 would be there to enable us to make that statement.
- 19 MS GRANGE: I see.
- 2.0 Mr Chairman. I think that would be a good moment for
- 21 our afternoon break, if that suits you.
- 2.2 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. How are we doing? A question
- 23 I keep asking you, I know, but still, I'll ask it again.
- 2.4 MS GRANGE: Yes, we're doing well. If we do go into
- 25 tomorrow, it won't be by very much, and I'll do my best

1	to see if I can conclude the remaining questions today.
2	But these topics are important and I don't want to feel
3	like I'm rushing them, so
4	SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: No, no, I'm not seeking to rush you,
5 6	I'm just enquiring. All right, thank you very much. Mr Albon, we will have our short break at this
0 7	
8	point. Today will be a bit tighter, we will come back at 3.35, please. All right?
9	Please don't talk to anyone about your evidence on
10	the break. Okay?
11	Thanks very much, see you later.
12	(3.22 pm)
13	(A short break)
14	(3.35 pm)
15	SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We're ready
16	to continue with Mr Albon's evidence, if he is there.
17	So the first question is : are you there, Mr Albon,
18	can you see me and hear me clearly?
19	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm here.
20	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much. And
21	you're ready to go on, I hope?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.
23	SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Thank you.
24	Now, Ms Grange, when you're ready.
25	MS GRANGE: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman.
	161
	101
1	Yes, Mr Albon. Now, thinking back to that first K15
2	certificate in October 2008, it's right, isn't it, that
3	no initial assessment or audit as to the manufacture of
4	K15 had been carried out prior to that certificate being
5	produced; yes?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. If we look at your third witness statement,
8	$\{BBA00010751/22\}$ , and I want to look at what you say at
9	paragraph 74, just focusing on the first four lines of
10	that paragraph, you say:
11	"For an assessment of a new product for a new
12	client, it is normal practice to carry out an initial
13	factory inspection. However, in this case, Kingspan
14	held other Certificates for very similar products, that
15	were manufactured in an identical way, using the same
16	foam insulation and very similar facers."
17	Now, just pausing there, how would anyone at the BBA
18	know that the K15 was manufactured in an identical way
19 20	to other similar products if there had been no
20 21	assessment of the manufacture or production process for K15?
21 22	ITT2:
	A The accessment of production is based on an internal RRA
	A. The assessment of production is based on an internal BBA document known as a guality plan. We would have had
23	document known as a quality plan. We would have had

1		of the assessment of K15, we would have updated the
2		quality plan to also include the K15 product. From
3		a desktop examination, it would have been clear that the
4		same raw materials, the same manufacturing line, the
5		same quality control procedures, the same equipment and
6		the same staff would have been involved in the
7		production of K15 as had previously been certified for
8		these other Kingspan certified materials.
9	Q.	Right. You say from a desktop examination it would have
10		been clear that the same raw materials, the same
11		manufacturing line, the same quality control procedures,
12		the same equipment and staff would have been involved;
13		how would the BBA know that from a desktop examination
14		if they hadn't actually gone and seen the manufacture
15		and production process themselves?
16	Α.	Well, we would have seen the manufacturing process for
17		these other products, because we inspect and audit the
18		factories on a six-monthly basis. So we would have had
19		a very high level of familiarity with the factory
20		environment. Post-certification, the surveillance would
21		commence for K15 and the assessment process was
22		validated by the fact that when the auditor was in the
23		factory, it was confirmed that the process was as
24		described in the quality plan document.
25	Q.	I see. Are you effectively saying that an assumption
		163

1		would have been made prior to the first issue of this
2		certificate that the manufacturing process was identical
3		for K15 as it was for other Kingspan products? Is that
4		what you're saying?
5	Α.	No, it would have been documented on the basis of
6		information provided by the manufacturer and assessed by
7		the project manager as part of the update of the quality
8		plan document.
9	Q.	So you would take it on trust that what Kingspan was
10		telling you about its manufacturing process was correct;
11		yes?
12	Α.	It would have been informed by existing knowledge and
13		experience of the process, and it would have been
14		validated as part of normal surveillance process
15		immediately post-certification.
16	Q.	Yes, but that's after the issue of the certificate . $\ensuremath{ I\xspace 'm}$
17		focused on what happens before the certificate is
18		actually issued. What I'm asking is whether you take on
19		trust Kingspan's assertions that the manufacturing
20		process is identical?
21	Α.	There is no physical validation until the first
22		surveillance visit , but there would be a very high
23		degree of confidence based on a previous knowledge of
24		these type of materials.
25	Q.	Yes, I see.

.

- 1 Can you help us, in what other circumstances has 2 this occurred? Have other manufacturers had such
- 3 assumptions being made about their products without
- 4 there actually having been a surveillance visit?
- A. I wouldn't use the term "assumption", I think it's 5
- a considered technical judgement. But, yes, that 6 7 principle has been applied in other processes.
- Q. When you say the principle has been applied in other 8
- 9 processes, can you give us some examples of products or
- 10 manufacturers where similar assumptions have been made
- 11 about the manufacturing process being similar to other 12 products?
- 13 A. It may be applied in situations where it is a very
- 14 large scale piece of equipment, it is very difficult to
- 15 vary the process parameters, such as damp proof 16 membranes
- 17 Q. L see
- 18
- Now, in relation to that desktop assessment or
- 19 desktop exercise which you say took place on this
- 2.0 occasion relating to the BBA quality plan, by whom was
- 21 that exercise carried out? Who did that desktop
- 22 assessment?
- 23 A. It would have been initially the project manager.
- 24 Quality plans are signed by a line manager. The title 25
  - of those managers has changed over the years, but it

- 1 would have been assessed and checked by a line manager.
- $\mathsf{Q}.~\mathsf{I}$  see. So would it have been carried out by George Lee 2
- 3 and then checked by Christopher Hunt?
- 4 A. I would expect so, yes.
- 5 Q. Can you help us as to why we don't see any documentation
- to that effect on the file? 6
- 7 A. No. I can't.
- 8 Q. I want to ask you now about the amendments that were
- 9 made to issue 1 of the certificate . If we can go to
- 10  $\{BBA00000037/1\}$ , we can see in the bottom left-hand
- 11 corner of the certificate that it still carries a date
- 12 of first issue of 27 October 2008, but underneath that 13 date we see in very small print it says:
- " Certificate amended on 6 April 2010 ..." 14
- 15 Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. So, just to be clear, this is still the first issue of 17
- 18 the certificate but an amended version of it was
- 19 produced; is that correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. If we go back to your third witness statement.
- 2.2 {BBA00010751/30}, and look at paragraph 111, you say: 23 "Although the date of the Amendment is given on the
- 24 Certificate as 6 April 2010, in fact it was not
- 25 published until 12 July 2013 and was superseded by the

166

- 1 Second Issue dated 17 December 2013."
- 2 Now, just to be clear, did you read the amended
- 3 issue 1 of the certificate before it was published in
- 4 July 2013?
- A. No. I don't think so. 5
- Q. I think you have told us that from documents on the 6
- 7 file , the best guess you have is amended issue 1 was
- 8 published on 12 July 2013; is that correct?
- 9 A. If that's the date I gave, yes.
- 10 Q. Can you help us, what was the reason for the delay of
- 11 over three years between the amendment date,
- 12 6 April 2010, and the publication date? Can you help us
- 13 with that?
- 14 A. I'm sorry, I don't know
- 15 Q. Isn't that an extremely long time for the certificate to
- 16 be awaiting publication? 17 A. Yes
- 18 Q. Is this unusual in the experience of the BBA?
- 19 A. Yes, amendments are only intended to allow very minor
- 20 changes to a certificate . It should be
- 21 a straightforward process.
- 22  ${\sf Q}.\;$  Can you help us as to what was happening with the
- 23 certificate between April 2010 and July 2013 as far as
- 24 you are aware? Was it simply sitting waiting to be
- 25 published or was something else going on?

# 167

- 1 A. As far as I can recall, I wasn't involved, so I don't 2 know. 3 Q. Can you help us as to what it was, what happened in 4 July 2013, which actually resulted in the certificate
- 5 finally being published?
- 6 A. Again, I'm sorry, I don't know.
- 7  $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{I}$  want to go back a little in time and ask you about
- 8 an exchange with Kingspan that occurred shortly after
- 9 the publication of the first version of the certificate.
- 10 issue 1. without amendments.
- 11 The BBA wrote to Kingspan on 24 December 2008, so 12 only two months after the certificate was first
  - published, proposing some amendments to the wording.
  - If we can look at some emails on that, if we go to {KIN00002093/2}, there is an email there from George Lee
  - to Gareth Mills on 24 December 2008 at 9.50, copying in
  - Mr Hunt, about Kingspan Kooltherm K15 rainscreen
- 17 18 insulation board. Mr Lee begins by saying:
- 19 "Hi Gareth.

13

14

15

16

2.0

21

2.4

25

- 'We have recently received a number of comments on the K15 certificate in relation to the clarity of
- 2.2 wording used as part of this certificates fire section. 23
  - "In response to this we have a suggested amendment to the text which we wish to make. This amendment we
  - will make at no cost to yourselves and as an improvement

1		to the certificate , which I hope you will agree will	1		with Kingspan as a matter of urgency?
2		improve how this certificate will read in the future."	2	Α.	I agree this is an improvement, and I agree it should
3		Now, have you seen that correspondence previously,	3		not have been allowed to delay for three years without
4		prior to looking at it for the purposes of the Inquiry?	4		knowing the details, but I have to reiterate that no one
5		Not that I recall, no.	5		should be making a judgement on the fitness for purpose
6	Q.	Can you help us as to what comments had been received by	6		of the material on the basis of one statement on the
7		the BBA about the clarity of wording used as part of the	7		front page.
8		fire section?	8	Q.	I see.
9		No.	9		Let's go to amended issue 1 again, so that's
10		Have you ever asked anyone else in the BBA about that?	10		$\{BBA00000037/5\}$ , and look down to section 7, "Behaviour
11		No.	11		in relation to fire".
12	Q.	If we look at the third paragraph of this email where we	12		Now, this section has changed in this amended
13		then have some bullet points, George Lee sets out the	13		issue 1. It still states that the product is classified
14		changes that he proposes to the certificate , and in the	14		as class 0 or low risk, that's the same, in 7.1, as
15		third line down we can see that in relation to the "Key	15		defined in the documents supporting the national
16		factors assessed" point, "Behaviour in relation to	16		Building Regulations, but then this bit has changed, it
17		fire", he wishes the certificate to be amended to state:	17		says:
18		"The boards are classified as Class '0'. The boards	18		"The product, therefore, made be used in accordance
19		will not contribute to the development stages of	19		with the provisions of "
20		a fire ."	20		Then for England and Wales it's got Approved
21		Then this is the new part:	21		Document B, and you can see that for volume 2 of
22		"The product has been tested to BS $8414-1$ for	22		Approved Document B it now says not only that
23		a specific construction on masonry walls."	23		paragraphs 12.5 and 12.6 are there, but also 12.7. So
24		So that sentence in the certificate is what's new.	24		it's now saying the product therefore may be used in
25		That's making clear it's been tested to BS 8414 $-1$ for	25		accordance with the provisions of 12.7 of volume 2 of
		169			171
1		a specific construction on masonry walls.	1		ADB.
2		Now, can we agree that that amendment to specify	2		Now, going back to your third witness statement and
3		that K15 could be used over 18 metres with one specific	3		page 31 of that $\{BBA00010751/31\}$ , question (a) there at
4		build—up only on masonry walls was a fundamentally	4		the top of the page, there is a short question:
5		important amendment, wasn't it?	5		"Why was reference to paragraph 12.7 added to this
6	Α.	It certainly improves the clarity, yes.	6		section?"
7	Q.	Yes, and to set this out on the front page of the	7		You say this at paragraph 113:
8		certificate would have made absolutely clear to the	8		"As above, I was the not involved in the preparation
9		reader the limitation on the use of K15 over 18 metres	9		of this Certificate, but I believe that this reference
10		to one specific configuration; do you agree?	10		to 12.7 relates only to the product's use in masonry
11	Α.	Yes.	11		construction. Section 12.7 states that any insulation
12	Q.	Were you aware, when you came to be involved in this	12		product used above 18m must be a material of limited
13		certificate , that the BBA had proposed its amendments to	13		combustibility, but also that this restriction does not
14		clarify the use of K15 over 18 metres as early as	1 /		apply to a masonry cavity wall construction which
1 -			14		
15		December 2008?	14 15		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved
15 16	A.				
		December 2008?	15		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved
16		December 2008? No.	15 16		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of
16 17		December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan	15 16 17		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the
16 17 18	Q.	December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan might have played in delay in issuing the amended	15 16 17 18		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the product could be used in a suitable masonry construction
16 17 18 19 20	Q.	December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan might have played in delay in issuing the amended version of issue 1? No, when I came to this certificate it was in the final	15 16 17 18 19 20		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the product could be used in a suitable masonry construction without height restriction, provided the requirements of Diagram 34 were met."
16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan might have played in delay in issuing the amended version of issue 1? No, when I came to this certificate it was in the final stages of the second issue. I was not aware of the	15 16 17 18 19		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the product could be used in a suitable masonry construction without height restriction, provided the requirements of Diagram 34 were met." Now, I'm going to come to ask you about the
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan might have played in delay in issuing the amended version of issue 1? No, when I came to this certificate it was in the final stages of the second issue. I was not aware of the correspondence prior to that.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the product could be used in a suitable masonry construction without height restriction, provided the requirements of Diagram 34 were met." Now, I'm going to come to ask you about the substance of that answer in moment, but can I just ask
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan might have played in delay in issuing the amended version of issue 1? No, when I came to this certificate it was in the final stages of the second issue. I was not aware of the correspondence prior to that. Do you agree that Mr Lee, if he didn't get a speedy	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the product could be used in a suitable masonry construction without height restriction, provided the requirements of Diagram 34 were met." Now, I'm going to come to ask you about the
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	December 2008? No. Were you at any stage aware of any role that Kingspan might have played in delay in issuing the amended version of issue 1? No, when I came to this certificate it was in the final stages of the second issue. I was not aware of the correspondence prior to that.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9 of the Approved Documents. Since the Certificate covered the use of both masonry cavity wall and rainscreen systems, the product could be used in a suitable masonry construction without height restriction, provided the requirements of Diagram 34 were met." Now, I'm going to come to ask you about the substance of that answer in moment, but can I just ask you this: first, when did you come to form the belief

170

- 1 A. When I was asked to prepare this witness statement.
- 2 Q. And what led you to form that belief? Where did you get 3 that from?
- 4 A. From my knowledge of the product and the approved 5 documents. I believe my suggestion is the only way in 6
- which that statement could be correct.
- 7 Q. I see
- 8 If we look within this third witness statement at 9 page 49 {BBA00010751/49}, paragraph 191, you make the 10 point very confidently there, if we look at that. In the first five lines you say: 11
- 12 "As described in point 35 above, the statement 13
- relating to the use of the product in accordance with the provisions of clause 12.7 of Approved Document B 14
- 15 Volume 2, related exclusively to its use in masonry
- construction. It did not cover the product's use as 16
- 17 part of a rainscreen cladding system, for which above
- 18 18m, a material of limited combustibility rating was
- 19 required by the documents supporting the national 2.0 Building Regulations."
- 21 So just to be clear, this is in fact your view
- 22 formed at a later stage -- is this right? -- of what the
- 23 author or person approving amended issue 1 might have
- 24 intended: ves?
- 25 A. Yes, I was not involved in drafting that statement.

# 173

- 1 Q. Have you spoken at any stage to either George Lee or Chris Hunt about what their reasoning was at the time 2 3 for including this reference to 12.7 in amended issue 1? 4 A. No, neither individual worked for the BBA and I was 5 aware that both were being asked to provide their own 6 witness statements, so I did not think that would be 7 appropriate. 8 Q. George Lee in his witness statement did not appear to be 9 able to offer any reason as to why this reference to 10 12.7 of Approved Document B was added to amended 11 issue 1, and that would tend to suggest, would it not, 12 that he might not have had in mind the reasoning that 13 you now suggest? 14 A. It's difficult for me to know what Mr Lee had in mind 15 when he drafted that certificate. but I'm not suggesting 16 that was his intention, that's the only way in which 17 I can see that that clause would be correct. 18 Q. Yes. Can we just look at Mr Hunt's oral evidence on 19 this, transcript at  $\{Day109/56:13\}$ , he is asked: 2.0 'Question: What do you mean, it may have been 21 related to masonry cavity walls? Can you explain? 2.2 "Answer: Well, having thought about it more 23 recently again, obviously, with the -- you know, looking 24 at the certificates and the available files and ...
- 25 I think that that reference was probably related to

174

- 1 masonry cavity construction, because that reference 2 appears in Approved Document B, there is that reference 3 to masonry cavity walls and masonry external walls are 4 mentioned in this certificate . "Question: Yes. That is something that you have 5 considered fairly recently may have been the reason for 6 7 the inclusion of that wording; is that right? 8 "Answer: Yes, but it seems to me now that that was 9 also likely -- the likely situation at the time." 10 Now, Mr Hunt does not appear to know for certain 11 what the reason was for including that wording. Can you 12 help us with this: does the BBA keep records of 13 significant amendments made to certificates and the 14 reasons why such amendments are made? 15 A. We do now. In this case, the records are sparse. Q. Based on BBA procedures at the time, should there have 16 17 been a record as to why this amendment was being made in 18 amended issue 1? 19 A. Yes. This goes beyond what I would normally expect to 20 see carried out under an amendment. I would expect to 21 see more documentary evidence than is in fact on file. 2.2  $\mathsf{Q}.\;$  Yes, so just to be clear, you would expect to see some written document setting out the rationale for adding in 23 24 clause 12.7 of Approved Document B into this amended 25 issue of the certificate ; yes? 175 1 A. No, not at that level of detail. I would expect to see 2 key technical decisions documented. We do not explain 3 the rationale behind every single clause in 4 a certificate . Q. But this was a significant amendment, wasn't it? 5 A. I don't think it's particularly significant, is it? 6 7 It's an addition to one clause that's available in the
  - 8 approved document. 9 Well, let's look at it. Were you aware in April 2010 of Q.
  - 10 the wording of paragraph 12.7 of Approved Document B? 11 A. Yes
  - 12 Q. Let's bring that up. This is the 2006 edition at
  - $\{CLG10000007/96\}.$  There we have clause 12.7 and it's 13 headed "Insulation Materials/Products": 14
  - 15 "In a building with a storey 18m or more above
  - 16 ground level any insulation product, filler material
  - 17 (not including gaskets, sealants and similar) etc. used
  - 18 in the external wall construction should be of limited
  - 19 combustibility (see Appendix A). This restriction does 2.0 not apply to masonry cavity wall construction which
- 21 complies with Diagram 34 in Section 9.'
- 2.2
- Now, do you agree that, other than masonry cavity 23 wall construction, the whole thrust of that paragraph is
- 24 that all insulation products being used in the external
- 25 wall construction of buildings with a storey over

- 1 18 metres should be materials of limited combustibility?
- 2 A. Yes. This product is not of limited combustibility, and 3 the certificate does not state that it is of limited
- 4 combustibility
- Q. Well, how, then, if it's not a product of limited 5 combustibility, could K15 be used in accordance with 6 7 paragraph 12.7 of Approved Document B, which is what 8 this certificate said?
- 9 A. I think it's capable of misinterpretation. The only way 10 in which it could satisfy would be for the masonry
- 11 cavity wall construction. But if this product was of
- 12 limited combustibility, the BBA certificate would very
- 13 clearly state that in the fire section. I think it's
- 14 an enormous leap to go from compliance with 12.7 to 15 inferring that a material is of limited combustibility.
- 16 Q. How is that an enormous leap, when that is the entire 17 thrust of paragraph 12.7. Mr Albon?
- 18 A. Well, it's not the entire thrust, because it goes on to 19 state, "This restriction does not apply to masonry".
- 20 I agree it's potentially misleading, but once again, you
- 21 have to read the whole certificate , and if you had gone
- 22 on to read or the specifier had gone on to read the fire
- section in its entirety, it does not state, "This 23
- 24 material is of limited combustibility", and if it was,
- 25 the BBA would explicitly state that it was.

- Q. But it also doesn't state, "This material is not of 1 limited combustibility", does it? 2
- 3 A. It's completely impractical to state every single thing 4 that a product isn't. Our process is to state what
- 5 a product is, and it's not sensible to infer that it is 6 something that the BBA does not state it is.
- 7  $\mathsf{Q}.$  Yes, but you're saying that had the certificate been 8 read in its entirety, the reader would have realised
- 9 that this reference in 12.7 was only to an exception in 10 12.7: ves?
- 11 A. Yes, I accept if taken in isolation that clause is 12 potentially misleading, but it should not be taken in
- 13 isolation Q. Yes, but what I'm interested in is what was it elsewhere 14 15 in the certificate that would have informed the reader 16 that the product was not of limited combustibility when
- 17 there's no such statement anywhere else in the
- 18 certificate ?
- 19 A. As I said, I think it is completely impractical to state what a product isn't, we can only state what a product 20 21 is. It's not non-combustible either, and we don't state
- 2.2 that. We do say, without sufficient evidence at the
- time, that it's class 0. We go on in a later edition to 23
- 24 say that it's category C. But at no point do we say
- 25 it's of limited combustibility.

178

- 1 Q. I see. So are you saying that a reader of this 2 certificate would not be led to conclude by reference to 3 that 12.7 reference that this product was of limited 4 combustibility? 5 A. I think that clause is potentially confusing and I would expect a reader then to look for further confirmation 6 7 that it is of limited combustibility. Not finding that, they would conclude that it is not of limited 8 9 combustibility. 10 Q. I see. 11 Do you agree that to have added paragraph 12.7 onto 12 that BBA certificate for K15 was misleading, and 13 potentially dangerously so, given that K15 was 14 a combustible phenolic foam? 15 A. I agree it's misleading. I don't agree it's dangerous, 16 because, again, you should read the whole certificate 17 and it does not state that that product is of limited 18 combustibility. 19 Q. I see 20 Let's go to your third witness statement at this 21 point, {BBA00010751/33}, paragraph 125. Here you are 22 being asked at 44 why the reference to 12.7 of Approved 23 Document B was subsequently removed in the next issue of
- 24 the BBA certificate for K15 dated 17 December, ie 25
  - issue 2. You say this at 125:

# 179

1		"The Certificate wording was changed as part of
2		a general BBA policy of not repeating information given
3		within Building Regulations within the main text of the
4		document. For this reason, all references to Approved
5		Documents and Mandatory Standards were removed from this
6		section as part of the Second Issue – the revision did
7		not relate to 12.7 alone."
8		Then going on to paragraph 126, you say:
9		"The opportunity was taken to revise the wording in
10		line with other BBA insulation Certificates, as the
11		style and format had evolved since the issue of the
12		Certificate in 2008. It is BBA policy to maintain
13		consistency of approach for a given product type and
14		this often means rewording of sections during
15		Certificate [Reviews]."
16		In other words, is it right that your evidence is
17		that the removal of the reference to 12.7 of ADB was not
18		specific to that particular section, but simply part of
19		a wider process of stylistic change which happened to be
20		going on at the time? Is that right?
21	Α.	Yes. At the time I was not aware of the perceived
22		significance of that reference to 12.7. I did become
23		aware of that at a later point with correspondence with
24		MHCLG, but at that point this certificate had,
25		I believe, already been re-issued.

1	Q. I see.	1		maso
2	Well, let's look at that exchange of correspondence	2	Α.	Well,
3	now between you and Mr Brian Martin from the DCLG in	3		of his
4	respect of amended issue 1 of the certificate .	4		const
5	If we can go, please, to $\{BBA00000178/3\}$ , this is	5	Q.	No, ł
6	the beginning of the chain. It's an email from	6		to pa
7	Mr Brian Martin, you can see, from	7		consi
8	communities.gsi.gov.uk to you, copying in Guy Bampton	8	Α.	He's
9	and Nick Price, and the subject is, "Safety concerns	9		text
10	regarding BBA certificate 08452". He says:	10	Q.	Well,
11	"Dear John	11		isn ' t
12	"I'm not sure we have met. I am currently the	12		"
13	official at DCLG responsible for Part B of the Building	13		shoul
14	Regulations.	14		appea
15	"[It] has come to my attention that BBA cert 08452	15		a ma
16	2008 included advice that the product in question	16		S
17	satisfied paragraph 12.7 of volume 2 of Approved	17		parag
18	Document B. Para 12.7 provides that insulation	18	Α.	Yes.
19	materials used in external walls should be materials of	19	Q.	Did y
20	limited combustibility. It would appear however, that	20		that
21	the product in question is not a material of limited	21	Α.	With
22	combustibility .	22		draw
23	"I am also aware that cert 08452 has recently been	23		seriou
24	revised and that this reference has been removed.	24	Q.	Well,
25	"I am concerned that the original certificate may	25		his c
	181			
1	have been issued in error. As this is a serious safety	1		a ser
2	matter, I would appreciate it if you could investigate	2	Α.	I dor

1		have been issued in error. As this is a serious safety
2		matter, I would appreciate it if you could investigate
3		and advise me of the outcome of your investigation as
4		soon as possible. Could you please also acknowledge
5		receipt of this email.
6		"Best Regards
7		"Brian Martin."
8		Now, can you help us, what was your reaction when
9		you received this email?
10	Α.	I think I was on leave when this email was sent, and it
11		was redirected to my colleague Jon Denyer, who handled
12		the immediate investigation in my absence. When
13		I returned from leave, Jon and I discussed and
14		I responded from that point. So I wasn't aware of
15		this $$ the receipt of this initial email at the time.
16	Q.	Okay. So when you did become aware of this email, when
17		you returned from leave, what was your reaction to it?
18	Α.	I was concerned. Clearly, this was an issue I was
19		previously unaware of. I was aware of Brian Martin as
20		an experienced professional responsible for Approved
21		Document B, and of course I was concerned that he had
22		these issues.
23	Q.	Yes. Do you accept that Mr Martin doesn't appear to
24		have considered the possibility that the reference to

24	have considered the possibility that the reference i
25	12.7 was in fact a reference to the exception for

182

1		masonry in 12.7?
2	Α.	Well, at this point I wasn't really aware of the nature
3		of his concern, but no, it doesn't mention masonry
4		construction.
5	Q.	No, he's read it and he has assumed that the reference
6		to paragraph 12.7 is stating that this product can be
7		considered a material of limited combustibility; yes?
8	Α.	He's not stating that, he's asking us to explain the
9		text of the certificate .
10	Q.	Well, he's saying very clearly in the second paragraph,
11		isn't he:
12		"Para 12.7 provides that insulation materials
13		should be materials of limited combustibility. It would
14		appear however, that the product in question is not
15		a material of limited combustibility."
16		So he is concerned about the thrust of
17		paragraph 12.7; yes?
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	Did you agree when you read this with Mr Martin's view
20		that this was a serious safety matter?
21	Α.	Without knowing the basis of his concerns, I couldn't
22		draw a conclusion, but he had stated it is a potentially
23		serious safety matter, so yes, I was very concerned.
24	Q.	Well, can I ask it this way: once you knew the basis of
25		his concerns, did you agree with him that this was
		183
1		a serious safety matter?

A. I don't think I ever found out the basis of his

3		concerns.
4	Q.	Sorry, I don't understand that answer. Aren't the bases
5		for his concerns very clearly set out in this email?
6	Α.	I never had a conversation with Brian Martin on this
7		subject. We twice offered to meet with $MHCLG$ and they
8		declined our invitation .
9	Q.	Are you saying that you didn't understand the basis of
10		his concerns based on this email and a reading of
11		amended issue 1 of the certificate?
12	Α.	I understood the question he was asking me, yes, and we
13		responded with an explanation. I did not understand the
14		background that had caused him to raise this concern.
15	Q.	I see.
16		Let's look at your response to Mr Martin. It comes

Let's look at your response to Mr Martin. It comes 17 five days later on 16 July. We can see it in the email 18 above on page 2 {BBA00000178/2}, timed at 12.14, if we

19  ${\rm could} \,\, {\rm go} \,\, {\rm to} \,\, {\rm that}.$ 

- 20 Now, I' II read it to you in a moment, but can you
- 21 remember, had you discussed Mr Martin's email with any
- 22 colleagues before you sent this response --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- five days later on 16 July 2014? 24

25 A. Yes. As I've explained, my colleague Jon Denyer carried

1		out an investigation, aided I think by	1		"The amendments made on 6th April 2010 to
2		Gayetree Ramkorun, and I believe the three of us	2		Certificate 08/4582 included a new reference to
3		discussed it . Certainly Jon and I discussed it .	3		paragraph 12.7 of Approved Document B. This was not
4	Q.	So you discussed it with Jon Denyer and you think with	4		intended to imply that the product was of limited
5		Ms Ramkorun? It's Ms, isn't it?	5		combustibility and, as you have observed, was removed in
6	Α.	Yes.	6		the subsequent reissue dated 17 December 2013.
7	Q.	So you think the three of you discussed it before you	7		"The reference to paragraph 12.7 seems to have been
8		sent this email; is that correct?	8		an unfortunate, and rare, oversight that would not
9	Α.	I'm sure I discussed it with Jon Denyer. I can't be	9		escape the internal checks and measures that BBA
10		sure about Gayetree.	10		currently operate. A review of other Certificates has
11	Q.	Can you help us, what was the nature of those	11		confirmed that this has not been reproduced elsewhere."
12		discussions? What did the three of you discuss?	12		Now, I just want to pause there.
13	Α.	The wording of the certificate, the basis for it,	13		We've just been through your witness statement, and
14		justification for it or otherwise, and consequences.	14		we've just heard your evidence on the point, where
15	Q.	What consequences did you discuss based on the wording	15		you've told us that the reference to 12.7 of ADB was
16		of the certificate ?	16		inserted into the certificate due to the potential use
17	Α.	Was that certificate still valid? Was the wording still	17		of the product in masonry cavity wall construction, and
18		in place? Were there other certificates of the same	18		you've told us that the reference to 12.7 was only
19		type that had the same wording that were valid? How did	19		removed as a result of coincidental and wider changes in
20		the event come about? Who came up with the wording?	20		the formatting applying to all references to the
21		And what was the likelihood of that wording occurring in	21		Building Regulations and the guidance. So that's what
22		future certificates ?	22		you've told us in your statement and in your evidence,
23	Q.	I see.	23		but here in the email we've been looking at, you tell
24		As you have explained and as you also tell us in	24		Mr Martin that the inclusion of 12.7 was an unfortunate
25		your witness statement, you said that your colleague	25		and rare oversight which was subsequently removed.
		185			107
		185			187
1		Jon Denver conducted an initial investigation . Can you	1		Can you help us, why do you tell him that in this
1 2		Jon Denyer conducted an initial investigation . Can you help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?	1 2		Can you help us, why do you tell him that in this email?
1 2 3		Jon Denyer conducted an initial investigation . Can you help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do?		A.	email?
2	А.	help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do?	2	A.	email? Firstly , if I said in my witness statement that this was
2 3 4	A.	help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would	2 3 4	A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry
2 3 4 5	A.	help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the	2 3	A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention.
2 3 4	A.	help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues	2 3 4 5	A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would
2 3 4 5 6	A.	help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the	2 3 4 5 6		email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate , looked at the basis for the statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the full details.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see.
2 3 4 5 6 7		help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the full details. Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate , looked at the basis for the statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the full details.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate , looked at the basis for the statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the full details. Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of? What did he do? It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would have read the certificate , looked at the basis for the statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the full details. Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there, unfortunate and I think a rare oversight.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> <li>Mr Martin {BBA00000178/2}, let's look at your response,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> <li>Mr Martin {BBA0000178/2}, let's look at your response,</li> <li>so you say:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there, unfortunate and I think a rare oversight. I see. So I think you're telling us —— is this right? —— that the inclusion of it was an unfortunate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> <li>Mr Martin {BBA0000178/2}, let's look at your response,</li> <li>so you say:</li> <li>"Brian</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there, unfortunate and I think a rare oversight. I see. So I think you're telling us is this right? that the inclusion of it was an unfortunate and rare oversight, and all you're doing in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> <li>Mr Martin {BBA0000178/2}, let's look at your response,</li> <li>so you say:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there, unfortunate and I think a rare oversight. I see. So I think you're telling us —— is this right? —— that the inclusion of it was an unfortunate and rare oversight, and all you're doing in your statement is speculating about how that reference might
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> <li>Mr Martin {BBA0000178/2}, let's look at your response,</li> <li>so you say:</li> <li>"Brian</li> <li>"Re: [that certificate, and you quote the number and</li> <li>the title ].</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there, unfortunate and I think a rare oversight. I see. So I think you're telling us —— is this right? —— that the inclusion of it was an unfortunate and rare oversight, and all you're doing in your statement is speculating about how that reference might potentially have been at least partly correct; is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	<ul> <li>help us, what did Mr Denyer's investigation consist of?</li> <li>What did he do?</li> <li>It 's difficult for me to recall. He certainly would</li> <li>have read the certificate, looked at the basis for the</li> <li>statement made, presumably discussed it with colleagues</li> <li>who had drafted it. I'm afraid I don't remember the</li> <li>full details.</li> <li>Can you help us as to what his findings were? Because</li> <li>you tell us at paragraph 184, page 47 of your third</li> <li>witness statement {BBA00010751/47}, that your response</li> <li>to Brian Martin was guided by information generated by</li> <li>the investigation. Can you help us, what were his</li> <li>findings that that investigation had generated?</li> <li>That that statement was open to interpretation and</li> <li>potentially misleading.</li> <li>Right.</li> <li>If we go back to that email that you write to</li> <li>Mr Martin {BBA0000178/2}, let's look at your response,</li> <li>so you say:</li> <li>"Brian</li> <li>"Re: [that certificate, and you quote the number and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	email? Firstly, if I said in my witness statement that this was inserted because it was intended to cover a masonry construction, I apologise, that wasn't the intention. That is the only way I can see that that statement would be correct. I think there is a difference. Yes, I see. In terms of the specific reference, it was removed as part of a policy. If that policy had not been in place, it would have been reviewed and I think it would have been removed on the basis that it was potentially confusing. That judgement was not made because of the policy that overrode it. In terms of my statements to Brian Martin, I think it was included in error because it is potentially misleading, and that was, as I described there, unfortunate and I think a rare oversight. I see. So I think you're telling us —— is this right? —— that the inclusion of it was an unfortunate and rare oversight, and all you're doing in your statement is speculating about how that reference might

186

188

1	Q.	Why do you say in your email that it would not escape
2		the internal checks and measures that the BBA were
3		operating in July 2014? Can you help us with that?
4	Α.	Yes. At that point, we would not be making changes of
5		this type by amendment. Amendments should only be for
6		very straightforward and simple non-technical
7		corrections to a certificate . For that reason, there
8		was a lower level of checking and oversight applied to
9		an amendment than would have been the case for
10		a re-issue of the certificate .
11		In addition, since this amendment was instigated in
12		2010, we had put in place additional levels of checking
13		and additional levels of management within the
14		organisation which meant it was significantly less
15		likely that this type of oversight could recur.
16	Q.	I see.
17		What was the review of other certificates that you
18		refer to in your email? You can see in the third
19		paragraph down you say:
20		"A review of other Certificates has confirmed that
21		this has not been reproduced elsewhere."
22	Α.	We checked to see there were no other rainscreen
23		insulation certificates that would parallel K15 and in
24		which we could have made the same mistake, and there
25		wasn't.

# 189

1	0	What do you mean by "no other rainscreen insulation
2	Q.	
		certificates that would parallel K15"? What do you mean
3		by that?
4	Α.	Well, as I've tried to explain in this email, we have
5		a system of leader certificates , whereby any certificate
6		of a given product type should have, as far as is
7		technically possible, the same technical wording so they
8		are consistent and comparable. So we looked to check
9		there were no other rainscreen insulation certificates
10		where we might expect to see this same wording.
11	Q.	I see. Who carried out that review?
12	Α.	Either Jon Denyer or me, I can't remember.
13	Q.	I see. We will come back to that in a moment.
14		Could I just ask you: can you tell us, why did you
15		not mention the diagram 34 masonry exception to
16		Brian Martin in this email? Can you explain that?
17	Α.	I think we had accepted that this wording was open to
18		misinterpretation and was an error. I don't think there
19		would have been any value in trying to qualify that.
20		At the time I wrote this email, the certificate had
21		been re—issued with new wording. It was no longer
22		current. We didn't understand the background and the
23		nature of his concerns, other than the email, which is
24		why the BBA's chief executive and I offered to meet with
25		Brian to discuss this, to better understand his

190

1		concerns. He chose not to take up that invitation and
2		we offered a second time, and again he chose not to meet
3		with us.
4	Q.	Yes, I understand. But can you explain, what is the
5		value, as you've tried to do today and in your witness
6		statement, of qualifying that statement now if that
7		wasn't a position that you took with Mr Martin back
8		then?
9	Α.	Well, I think in my response to the questions of the
10		Inquiry, 1've been dealing with the situation from $2008$
11		up until mid-2017. This was in relation to a specific
12		certificate that had only been in place for a matter of
13		months and had since been re—issued so that the wording
14		was no longer current.
15	Q.	I see.
16		Going back to this review of other certificates ,
17		when had that taken place? Was that between your return
18		to the office and your response to Mr Martin on
19		16 July 2014? Can you help us with that?
20	Α.	Yes, it would have been.
21	Q.	How could you be certain that the error had not been
22		reproduced elsewhere without a wider form of
23		investigation?
24	Α.	There are a very limited number of certificates of this
25		type. The BBA has records of all of those certificates .
		191

2		there was only one other at the time.
3	Q.	I see.
4		Can we go now to $\{BBA00004224/3\}$ , this is a series
5		of internal BBA emails on this subject. If we start at
6		the bottom of page 3, and Mr Denyer's email to you and
7		Ms Ramkorun on 15 July at 9.40, we can see he writes:
8		"Paragraph 12.7 of Approved Document B requires
9		insulation above 18 m to be of limited combustibility,
10		unless it is contained within a masonry cavity wall
11		complying with diagram 34."
12		Then over the page to page 4 {BBA00004224/4}:
13		"While the Certificate contains a lot of sub
14		sections that are clearly taken from cavity wall
15		insulation Certificates, it may not have been the
16		intention to imply that use of the product within
17		masonry cavity walls is within the scope of the
18		Certificate . I can't find anything on Jobcon FS relating
19		to the amendments made on 6th April 2010 and signed off
20		by Chris Hunt. This may also be the first and only
21		rainscreen insulation board."
22		Then he proposes a draft reply, and he sets out that
23		draft reply to Mr Martin, which essentially you adopt
24		when you reply to Mr Martin; do you agree?
25	Α.	Yes.

We identified them and we checked all of them. I think

1	Q.	Mr Denyer was at the time a senior scientist within the	1		some
2		BBA; that's right, isn't it?	2		and s
3	Α.	Yes.	3		witho
4	Q.	If we move up the chain to the next email on page $3$	4		١
5		$\{BBA00004224/3\}$ , we can see you send an email to	5		mean
6		Ms Ramkorun at 9.21 on 16 July 2014. So note the time,	6		third
7		16 July 2014, 9.21. You say:	7		email
8		"Gayetree	8		"
9		"I need to know urgently (ie today) whether this	9		whic
10		error has slipped into any other Certificates of this	10		next
11		type. Could you get someone to check this please.	11	Α.	l wo
12		"Thank you and sorry for the lack of notice."	12		issue
13		Now, did the review of other certificates that you	13	Q.	So w
14		referred to in your email to Mr Martin take place on	14		may
15		16 July between this email, 9.21, and when you sent your	15	Α.	Yes.
16		email to Mr Martin, which was at 12.14 on the same day?	16	Q.	Wha
17	Α.	Clearly it must have done. There was, I thought, only	17		see t
18		one other certificate of this type. From Jon Denyer's	18		,,
19		email, it appears that this was the only certificate of	19		reissi
20		this type. So the check would not have taken very long.	20		was i
21	Q.	I see. But you say that was nevertheless a thorough	21		C
22		review, do you, taking place in around three hours?	22	Α.	Cavit
23	Α.	If it was identified there was no other certificate of	23	Q.	I see
24		this type, it would not have taken very long to	24		the f
25		establish that.	25		when
		193			
		173			

1	Q. Now, staying with this email chain, on page 2
2	$\{BBA00004224/2\}$ we see that Ms Ramkorun responds to your
3	urgent message at 9.55, so about 35 minutes later on the
4	same day, and she says:
5	"Hi John
6	"As discussed this was a first of its kind. That is
7	a certificate for the insulation only in a cladding
8	system without actually covering the cladding system and
9	hence perhaps required fire test for fitness for
10	purpose. We have offered Kingspan another contract for
11	similar purpose. But in any case it will follow the
12	current version which has the proper fire wording as
13	explained in the next paragraph.
14	"Having said that, if you recall when we did the
15	reissue last year we did agree that the fire statement
16	was indicating cwi when actually it was not. So the
17	wording got changed and any argument from client was
18	sent to Exxovva[sic] for their expertise opinion. As
19	attached.
20	"My thoughts: Bearing in mind that the original
21	certificate was a first of its kind and hence would have
22	been commented by technical. I do know the pm who
23	worked on it originally , used to be careless and it is

24 easy to blame him. However other people have actually

25 commented on the draft. Also the revision was done by

194

1		somebody who was normally very dependent on technical
2		and seems unlikely would have included reference to 12.7
3		without checking first."
4		Now, can you help us, what did you understand her to
5		mean when she refers to the "proper fire wording" in the
6		third and fourth lines of the first paragraph of that
7		email? So she says:
8		"But in any case it will follow the current version
9		which has the proper fire wording as explained in the
10		next paragraph."
11	Α.	I would assume that means the wording in the second
12		issue .
13	Q.	So wording that does not include the statement that it
14		may be used in accordance with 12.7; yes?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	What was meant by CWI in the second paragraph? Can you
17		see the second paragraph, second line, she says:
18		"Having said that, if you recall when we did the
19		reissue last year we did agree that the fire statement
20		was indicating cwi when actually it was not."
21		Can you help us as to what that might mean?
22	Α.	Cavity wall insulation .
23	Q.	I see. So she is saying, "last year we did agree that
24		the fire statement was indicating cavity wall insulation
25		when actually it was not"; yes?
		195

А.	Yes.		
-			

-		
2	Q.	Is she right to say that the K15 certificate was a first
3		of its kind in the first line of the first paragraph?
4	Α.	I believe it was, yes.
5	Q.	Can we take it as well that the reference to PM $$ under
6		"My thoughts", in the second italicised line, she says:
7		"I do know the pm who worked on it originally, used
8		to be careless "
9		Do we take it that that's project manager?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Which project manager is Ms Ramkorun referring to there?
12	Α.	Well, it 's not clear. Do you want me to speculate?
13	Q.	Well, what did you understand when you received this
14		email? Who was she referring to when she said, "I do
15		know the [project manager] who worked on it originally,
16		used to be careless"? What did you understand that to
17		mean?
18	Α.	Probably George Lee.
19	Q.	Yes.
20		How would Ms Ramkorun know $$ this is at the third
21		line of that $$ that other people have commented on the
22		draft? She says, "[I do know that] other people have
~ ~		

- actually commented on the draft". 23
- 24 A. I don't know. I don't know which draft she's referring
- 25

to.

1	Q. Yes, we don't have those or any version of this	1	INDEX	
2	certificate with comments from others, nor do we know	2		PAGE
3	who might have commented on the draft. So you don't	3	MR JOHN ALBON (continued)	1
4	know either, no?	4		-
5	A. Sorry, no, I don't.	5	Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUI	RY2
6	Q. Did you carry out any further investigation into who	6	(continued)	
7	might have commented on or checked the draft?	7		
8	A. No.	8		
9	Q. Why not?	9		
10	A. As far as I was aware, it was George Lee and Chris Hunt	10		
11	who had worked on the amendment. Neither of those	11		
12	individuals were still employed in a technical capacity	12		
13	by the BBA.	13		
14	Q. So that was the reason why you didn't carry out any	14		
15	further investigation into those individuals; yes?	15		
16	A. Yes.	16		
17	MS GRANGE: Yes, Mr Chairman, I think that is an appropriate	17		
18	moment. Sorry that I have gone on a couple of minutes	18		
19 20	past 4.30. I'm doing well, and I anticipate tomorrow	19		
20 21	I would be around no more than 45 minutes, an hour, with this witness.	20 21		
21 22		21		
22	SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Right, thank you very much. MS GRANGE: We'll have to go into tomorrow.	22		
24	SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Yes.	24		
24	Well, there we are, Mr Albon. I'm sorry we've got	24		
25	Weil, there we are, wit Albent. This sorry we ve got	25		
	197		199	
1	to ask you to come back tomorrow, I think not for too			
2	long, if that's any consolation, and I think you can		200	
3	expect to be away by lunchtime anyway.			
4	So we will stop there. We will continue, please, at			
5	10 o'clock tomorrow, and once again, I must ask you not			
6	to discuss your evidence or anything relating to it with			
7	anyone else over the adjournment. All right?			
8	THE WITNESS: Okay, understood.			
9	SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Okay, thank you very much. Then we			
10	will see you at 10 o'clock tomorrow, please.			
11	THE WITNESS: Okay.			
12	SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: That's the end of today's business.			
13	Thank you very much.			
14	(4.31 pm)			
15	(The hearing adjourned until 10 am			
16	on Tuesday, 23 March 2021)			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
	198			

113-1 115-22 117-14

able (10) 11:6,9,15 110:24 118:25 151:23 154:21 159:5.7 174:9 above (27) 3:18 10:12 51:22 66:15 76:20,23 78:5 80:1.10.15.19 81:4.12 84:1 123-13 124-8 125-20 128:21 134:19 172:8,12 173:12,17 176:15 184:18 186:24 192:9 absence (6) 16:18 41:6 124:24 128:11 129:18 182:12 absolute (2) 45:17 144:12 absolutely (5) 145:22 147:9.21 148:2 170:8 academic (1) 84:11 accept (13) 8:2,4 10:6 11:19 49:19 51:4 56:19 113:12,19 147:17 159:7 178:11 182:23 acceptable (5) 5:11 6:15 84:21 128:10 134:15 accepted (4) 36:14 84:18 145:10 190:17 accepting (1) 12:5 accepts (3) 4:21 5:6,23 access (2) 73:13 102:14 accidentally (1) 42:5 accommodate (1) 2:13 accordance (10) 19:7 51:7 87:24 142:14 145:18 171:18.25 173:13 177:6 195:14 according (1) 133:14 accordingly (1) 73:5 account (1) 136:18 accreditation (10) 92:21,23 93:4 94:7 101:18 141:15.18.20.24.25 accredited (10) 26:12 92:14 93:4 141:7,11,16,19 142:2 147:16 148:6 accredits (1) 92:18 accurate (11) 39:23 53:14,19 63:8 90:19 111:20 114:22 128:11 134:16 135:9 137:18 achieve (12) 8:1 19:20 24:11 87:2,7,12,17 88:5 104:12 158:24,24 159:5 achieved (12) 4:3 5:3 15:18 19:3,13,17 24:5,6 26:8 142:23 143:5 152:21 achievement (1) 139:16 achieving (1) 5:8 acknowledge (1) 182:4 acknowledged (1) 27:15 acm (18) 19:23 64:15 67:8,12 68:4 69:20 76:5 77:1.12 83:17 85:2.3 86:4 92:20 93:17,23 103:21 105:16 acms (3) 65:21 68:25 74:7 across (12) 8:24 27:22 29:8 43:21 45:1,2 76:14 139:25 147:14 148:25 151:14,15 action (2) 70:2 84:15 active (3) 44:2,6 75:25 activities (2) 101:3 117:17 actual (5) 10:4 54:18 69:13 119:13 121:2 actually (28) 14:12 46:15 55:24 79:4 83:20 88:10,20 90:25 112:9 145:25 146:19,21,25 149:2 151:3 154:9 157:4,25 163:14 164:18 165:4 168:4 194:8.16.24 195:20.25 196:23 adb (17) 69:13 72:4,15,22,23 73:1,6,7,20,25 74:10,13 75:2 83:15 172:1 180:17 187:15

added (5) 70:23 136:17 172:5 174:10 179:11 adding (2) 113:24 175:23 addition (5) 16:11 52:14 132:19 176:7 189:11 additional (12) 2:11 16:19,21 30:14,19 31:21 40:15 52:12 55:21 65:5 189:12,13 address (3) 63:19 95:12 126:19 addressing (1) 127:5 adequate (1) 116:17 adequately (1) 69:15 adjourned (1) 198:15 adjournment (2) 107:2 198:7 adjudged (2) 148:16 149:9 admitted (1) 138:25 adopt (1) 192:23 advice (9) 25:17.18 28:17 71:20,22 85:12,23 132:14 181:16 advisable (2) 85:11,22 advise (1) 182:3 advised (2) 26:5 60:9 advising (1) 29:5 affairs (2) 56:8,10 affect (2) 38:18 49:20 affected (1) 23:21 affecting (1) 52:5 affects (1) 83:24 afraid (5) 67:8 70:17 102:1 113:18 186:7 after (16) 36:4 38:1 79:1,7 80:6 82:23 89:2 93:10.17 103:17 104:23 108:7 119:7 164:16 168:8,12 afternoon (6) 2:11 106:5,5 107:4.16 160:21 again (38) 4:11 8:9,10 9:19 10:13 15:2 18:18 19:10 23:22 30:6 36:23,23,24 40:16 41:16 45:17 46:1 48:22 57:10 90:5 96:19 102:21 106:18 113:22 120:1 121:21 134:25 146:8 148:11 152:7 160:23 168:6 171:9 174:23 177:20 179:16 191:2 198:5 against (6) 101:14 114:12 129:21 130:17 131:13 139:14 age (1) 154:19 agent (1) 146:12 ago (4) 95:6 97:24 137:23 139:4 agree (40) 7:3 11:5,9,14 27:18 32:19,22 38:8 51:11 53:10 111:24 112:23 113:8 115:1 118:16 135:11.17.24 137:17.21 147:20 149:12 156:22 169:1 170:2.10.23 171:2,2 176:22 177:20 179:11,15,15 183:19,25 192:24 194:15 195:19,23 agreed (4) 95:14 97:8,12 98:25 agreement (5) 58:16,18 59:8.12.15 agrment (2) 1:6 33:13 ahead (6) 37:23 38:4 95:15 97:9,12 106:7 aid (1) 12:24 aided (1) 185:1 akbor (2) 1:8,10 albeit (3) 27:7 62:8 117:11 albon (31) 1:3.6.12.13 2:22 15:7 57:9.24 58:8 69:14 70:21 90:8,13 106:15 107:6,7,16 124:9 125:3 127:13 133:8 148:21,24 149:16 155:7 161:6,17 162:1 177:17 197:25 199:3 albons (4) 57:22 69:10 144:4 161:16 alcoa (3) 24:25 60:15,16

alerted (4) 41:14 51:2,18 67:6 alexanderwhite (1) 115:20 ali (1) 1:8 alliance (1) 72:16 allow (4) 44:3,7 52:7 167:19 allowed (1) 171:3 allows (1) 125:20 almost (3) 22:16 84:11 116.25 alone (2) 1:21 180:7 already (14) 37:24 38:4 39:24 40:13 60:19 98:21,25 100:9,12 148:17 149:10 154:16 159:12 180:25 also (37) 3:13 5:6 13:2 21:16,18 31:21 32:3 35:14.21 46:16 51:8.11.12 58:15 63:16 64:22 83:10 91:10 99:1 101:3 104:2 113:6 118:3 129:4 136:19 142:18 159:15 163:2 171:23 172:13 175:9 178:1 181:23 182:4 185:24 192:20 194:25 alternative (2) 5:4 145:8 alternatively (1) 33:24 although (2) 48:24 166:23 aluminium (3) 153:16,18,21 always (7) 12:18 15:1 17:16 49:13.24 129:8 154:19 ambiguity (9) 65:13 66:21 67:1,7 73:8,24 74:6 77:22 81.10 amended (25) 3:21 9:7 104:5 105:2 109:12 110:3 131:25 136:20 159:8 166:14.18 167:2.7 169:17 170:18 171:9,12 172:24 173:23 174:3,10 175:18,24 181:4 184:11 endment (13) 166:23 167:11 168:23.24 170:2.5 175:17.20 176:5 189:5,9,11 197:11 mendments (11) 166:8 167:19 168:10,13 170:13,24 175:13,14 187:1 189:5 192:19 noroso (15) 29:19 33:3 35:10.21 37:7.15 38:10 43:25 46:16 59:22 61:4 62:2,4,9,20 amorosos (2) 58:11 76:7 amount (1) 64:6 analysis (1) 10:1 andor (2) 128:10 134:15 annual (2) 93:3 139:14 anomaly (2) 73:25 74:6 another (16) 2:4 8:25 9:5 11:17 19:18 24:13 50:9 55:8 67:12,22 88:8 90:6 104:22 141:4 149:9 194:10 swer (24) 4:8 13:7 14:17 40:11 41:10 45:8 46:1 70:12 85:19 90:5 128:14 134:24 137:18 143:24 146:15.19 148:13.23 151:20.24 172:22 174:22 175:8 184:4 answered (1) 141:8 answering (1) 15:2 nswers (5) 12:2 113:8 137:3 142:4 155:16 anticipate (1) 197:19 anticipated (2) 53:22 54:18 anybody (3) 85:7 86:7 135:13 anyone (8) 47:13 57:12 106:19 120:20 161:9 162:17 169:10 198:7 nything (12) 2:14 40:11 41:13 57:12 68:24 94:18 102:4 106:19 117:4 139:3

192:18 198:6

anyway (2) 77:23 198:3 anywhere (3) 87:17 102:4 178:17 apologise (1) 188:5 apparent (1) 156:19 appear (16) 9:2 14:3 43:15 54:25 88:12,14 112:10 137:17 138:14 154:24 159:1 174:8 175:10 181:20 182.23 183.14 appeared (4) 40:1 54:10 59:7 88:12 appears (4) 114:2 127:9 175:2 193:19 appended (1) 79:13 appendix (3) 19:8 82:3 176:19 applicability (2) 150:17,20 applicable (4) 20:8 27:7 30:17 60:21 applicant (1) 32:9 application (1) 98:13 applications (1) 151:12 applied (11) 30:11,15 31:3 67:14 109:2 116:18 122:8 165:7,8,13 189:8 applies (3) 22:16 39:9 83:4 apply (11) 20:10,23 25:8 63:13,16 69:24 114:21 123:23 172:14 176:20 177:19 applying (2) 77:3 187:20 appoint (2) 96:20 97:22 appraisals (1) 139:14 ppreciate (3) 63:1 97:16 182:2 appreciated (4) 10:10 77:9 78:9 84:13 approach (11) 27:11,19 42:1 43:18,18 73:12 74:18 75:12,17 90:11 180:13 appropriate (17) 24:24 43:14 48:6.18 53:4 57:7 70:2 99:5 100:21 112:20.22 121:19 146:12 147:1.13 174:7 197:17 approval (2) 38:1 39:4 approvals (13) 34:11,14 43:10,13 45:23,24 48:9 90:7 109:4 110:4,14 155:10 157:22 pproved (63) 3:20 4:18.25 5:7.15 6:13 11:22.25 16:14 19:7 26:22 65:15,17 68:13 70:14 71:13 72:7,20 73:3,5,22 76:18 77:9,11,15 78:8 80:21,23 81:24 85:7 86:1,10 91:7 111:9 114:12,21 122:3 123:21,24 124:25 125:15.21 129:22 141:2 142:16 159:20 171:20.22 172:15 173:4.14 174:10 175:2,24 176:8,10 177:7 179:22 180:4 181:17 182:20 187:3 192:8 approving (1) 173:23 approximately (1) 60:12 april (10) 29:23,25 109:12 166:14.24 167:12.23 176:9 187:1 192:19 arbiter (1) 76:19 architectural (2) 26:5 60:15 architecture (2) 4:2 60:4 archive (1) 132:19 arconic (32) 15:25 23:13 30:2,3,7 31:10 33:6 36:9 37:15 40:7 41:10 46:17 50:7.8.17.25 51:16 52:21 55:2,11 56:2,24 60:3 62:2,21 63:17,25 88:19,19 102:13,17 105:15 arconics (1) 50:19 area (10) 9:1 86:8 96:10 109:6 116:13 130:6,25 131:12 137:24 153:5 areas (8) 5:21 16:13 17:15

108:5 138:19 139:20 141:21.21 arent (1) 184:4 argued (1) 68:8 argument (2) 83:6 194:17 arise (1) 95:12 arises (1) 58:11 arose (1) 148:23 around (10) 49:10 64:14 66:23 69:1 96:5 106:3 129:14.15 193:22 197:20 arrangement (1) 154:25 ascertain (2) 39:21 117:12 ascertained (1) 109:19 aside (1) 40:6 ask (28) 3:2 18:18 29:15 57:11 64:13 71:22 86:7 92:11 96:22 107:16 110:23 111-11 119-22 123-6 127:10 134:25 142:21 146:24 150:18 160:23 166:8 168:7 172:21,22 183:24 190:14 198:1.5 asked (35) 4:1 34:2 38:15 41:7,8 45:5 52:22 54:12 62:5,9 70:8 86:22 90:2 94.19 107.24 128.5 9 134.12 14 25 136.10 137:2,4 143:3,20,23 144:4,16 146:10 152:18 169:10 173:1 174:5,19 179:22 asking (10) 113:5 120:17 123:5 126:15,16 135:22 160.23 164.18 183.8 184:12 aspect (3) 53:24 54:7 77:17 aspects (2) 23:18 128:15 assertion (8) 104:14 111:14 112:2 135:7,9 142:23 143:5 159:13 assertions (2) 159:16 164:19 assess (3) 89:2 141:19,22 assessed (12) 3:7 4:6 32:15 37:4 65:7 93:7 110:18 148:17 149:10 164:6 166:1 169:16 assessment (63) 19:7 20:13 26:19 27:5 31:5 39:25 54:9 55:15 58:24 65:4 92:24 94:3.6.11 95:1.15.16 96:18.24 97:1.2.9.10.12.15 98:3.20.23 99:12.24 100:19 101:17,19 103:17 128:15 129:2,20 130:12,17 143:4 145:1,17,23 146:17,21 147:6 148:3 152:23 153:1,19 154:1,18 157:11 158:4,8 162:3,11,20,22 163:1,21 165:18.22 assessments (11) 93:2.3.11 116:19 121:5,11,24 130:5 131:1,13 145:16 assessor (5) 95:5,17 96:25 103.12 151.4 assessors (1) 104:16 assigned (1) 139:20 assist (1) 110:25 assistance (1) 72:3 associated (2) 10:9 144:24 associations (2) 86:17 88:2 assume (3) 105:5 152:25 195:11 assumed (1) 183:5 assuming (2) 41:4 56:11 assumption (5) 89:20 153:25 160:17 163:25 165:5 assumptions (2) 165:3,10 attached (3) 81:14 133:4 194:19 attempting (2) 10:17,20 attendance (1) 95:11 attention (3) 67:11 99:12 181:15 audit (2) 162:3 163:17

auditor (1) 163:22 august (4) 93:16 98:18 105:1 153:9 australia (1) 71:18 author (1) 173:23 authorities (2) 86:16 88:1 available (27) 12:19 16:22 23:9,24 37:1 38:12,20 39:7 41:3 42:10,25 49:2 51:25 52:3 53:5 54:8.14 56:13 77:6 78:18 82:6 84:15 86:3 102:20 158:15 174:24 176:7 average (2) 7:15 54:4 awaiting (1) 167:16 award (1) 101:17 aware (69) 16:7,21,24 18:1 20:12 26:13 42:1 48:4,10 49.14 50.1 5 54.21 59:14.15 63:14.17 69:5 70:2 71:4,17 72:11,17,18,19 73:20,23 74:8 75:10 77:5 84:17,24,25 85:9,20 89:8,10 102:10 108:2 109:10 112:12 115:4 118.23 119.10 12 120.18 24 127.13 16 140:23 141:1 151:9 152:11 156:24 159:3 167:24 170:12,17,21 174:5 176:9 180:21.23 181:23 182:14,16,19 183:2 197:10 awareness (1) 69:3 away (2) 128:2 198:3 awry (1) 41:15 b (37) 3:20 4:18 5:16 6:14 14:8 16:9 11 14 15 17:18.24 18:4.7.19 19:8 32:13 50:21 65:15.17 80:21 81:24 111:9 142:16 171:21,22 173:14 174:10 175:2,24 176:10 177:7 179:23 181:13,18 182:21 187:3 192:8 **b41 (1)** 9:9 back (52) 3:5 8:8,9 18:25 20:19 27:1 28:14 31:1 35:5 39:11 46:19.23 47:3.14 57:10.21 79:3 90:10 97:5 105:25 106:17 107:5,9 122:12 127:21 129:5 134:1.11 137:14 138:4 141:4 142:8 144:17 145:23 146:8 151:5 152:16 156:4 158:4.7 160:16 161:7.15 162:1 166:21 168:7 172:2 186:18 190:13 191:7,16 198:1 background (3) 30:10 184:14 190:22 bald (1) 114:2 bampton (1) 181:8 barbara (1) 65:24 barbeito (4) 33:5 34:8 35:20 50:16 barbeitos (1) 33:7 base (1) 72:19 based (20) 11:20 39:25 41:3 75:2 79:15 86:9 112:7 126:8 128:20.21 131:14 148:24 150:9 159:19 160:1 162:22 164:23 175:16 184:10 185:15 bases (1) 184:4 basic (2) 42:15 159:8 basically (1) 4:10 basing (1) 10:19 basis (58) 11:24 31:2 42:10 43:13 44:18 21 45:11 17 48:5,25 49:1 52:2 56:18 70:16 71:13 72:23 73:2 77:21 81:18,20 88:3 95:15

97:9 111:13.23 112:7

121:4.11.24 122:2 126:4 128:10 134:15 135:14 140:14.21 144:3 145:5 146:11.25 149:6 152:19 154:3,8 155:15 163:18 164:5 171:6 183:21.24 184:2,9 185:13 186:5 188:12 bba (230) 4:14 6:18 8:14,22 9:16 11:6 16:1.7.21.23.24 17:7 18:7 19:25 20:4.12.16.17 25:11.19 26:12,20 27:2,23 28:2,24 29:5 30:1,3,6,16 31:13,19,20 32:7,24 33:11 35:8 36:2,10 37:23 39:6 40:2.4.11 44:1.17 45:7 46.13 47.21 48.11 49:3.16.18 50:2.25 51:2,12,25 52:7 54:3 55:14 56:2,23 58:13,16,19 59:5 60:7.15.19 62:25 64:25 65:12,25 66:12,22 67:3,15 68:21 69:22 70:22 71:1,4,10,21 72:11,17 73.12 74.4 14 24 75.25 76.15 20 24 78.22 79:2,6,9,19,21 80:14,24 82:10,15 84:6,21 85:11,22 86:15 88:3,9,12 89:2,6,12 91:8 92:13.18.24.25 94:5.9 95:1,6,7,22 96:4,6,11,15 97:11,20,22,24 100:8 101-1 9 11 102-5 12 16 18 104:7 109:10 115:2 117:11 118:9,24 119:24 120:4 121:10,10 123:6,20 124:11 125:2 128:10.19 129:13.19 130:1,4,19 131:22 134:15 137:23 138:12 140:1 141:7,11,16 142:1 143:4 144:3,5 145:12 146:12,12 147:19 148:18 149:1.10.24 150:2.4.8.10 151:5.6.25 152:5,11,12,19 156:3,20,21,24 158:3 159:9 162:17,22 163:13 165:20 167:18 168:11 169:7,10 170:13 174:4 175:12.16 177:12.25 178:6 179:12.24 180:2.10.12 181:10.15 187:9 189:2 191:25 192:5 193:2 197:13 bba000000371 (1) 166:10 bba000000375 (1) 171:10 bba00000038 (1) 110:8 bba000000381 (1) 122:13 bba000000385 (4) 117:23 127:21 134:3 142:9 bba000000386 (1) 142:15 bba00000047 (1) 3:6 bba000000472 (1) 9:6 bba000000473 (1) 23:4 bba000000475 (4) 3:14 8:9 18:25 20:20 bba00000049 (1) 104:24 bba000000497 (1) 105:8 bba0000015816 (1) 125:4 bba000001782 (2) 184:18 186:19 bba000001783 (1) 181:5 bba00000255 (1) 132:25 bba000042242 (1) 194:2 bba000042243 (2) 192:4 193:5 bba000042244 (1) 192:12 bba000080422 (1) 31:5 bba000080423 (1) 31:9 bba000080424 (1) 32:4 bba00008079 (1) 37:14 bba00008090 (1) 33:7 bba000080902 (2) 33:8 35:6 bba000080903 (1) 34:4 bba00008098 (1) 35:13 bba000104852 (1) 79:3

bba00010486 (1) 81:15	34:15 36:20 52:12 63:20	bs (35) 4:23 6:5 18:12,15	cavity (15) 153:13 172:14,17	103:22 108:3 109:2,6,11	92:19 96:4,6 119:1,5,9,18	closely (1) 139:12
bba000104863 (1) 81:15	72:7 80:22 82:9 83:3	26:23 87:24 118:1,4	174:21 175:1,3 176:20,22	115:24 116:24 119:7	147:10 173:17 194:7,8	closing (4) 37:22 43:2
bba00010693 (2) 24:16	86:5,15 93:24 98:21	123:7,9 124:6,23 128:20	177:11 187:17	121:10 129:1 131:23	claddingrelated (1) 80:3	49:8,12
28:15 bba0001072317 (1) 3:24	112:14 120:6 130:20 137:24 140:18 158:23	132:22 134:4 135:14 143:11,11 144:18,22	192:10,14,17 195:22,24 ccing (1) 133:2	138:12 139:6 158:20 162:14 168:22 174:24	claimed (3) 51:9 53:7 88:4 claims (10) 31:24 38:21,23	coating (13) 19:15 21:1,3,4,12,13,14,16,19,23
bba0001072317 (1) 3:24 bba0001072318 (1) 4:9	159:21 160:3 172:9 173:5	145:11,11 144:10,22	ce (3) 60:21 62:5,7	175:13 180:10 185:18,22	39:13,17,21,22 40:1 41:2	23:9,16,24
bba0001072324 (1) 64:17	180:25 185:2 196:4	153:4,9,10,11,13,14,17,19,20	cement (6) 118:13,21,24	187:10 189:17,20,23	53:16	coatings (3) 22:17 24:3 26:3
bba0001072327 (2) 19:10	believed (3) 121:13	156:21,25 157:7 169:22,25	119:5,8,16	190:2,5,9 191:16,24,25	clarification (1) 30:16	coil (1) 26:3
24:10 bba0001072328 (1) 12:12	140:15,17 believes (1) 83:2	bs2 (1) 5:8 bs3 (2) 5:6 6:15	centred (3) 65:19 68:5,14 cert (2) 181:15,23	192:15 193:10,13 certification (11) 20:16 52:2	clarify (4) 21:15 22:11 144:11 170:14	coincidental (3) 99:1,3 187:19
bba0001072330 (1) 16:4	below (8) 65:7 118:3	bs476 (1) 4:22	certain (6) 8:2 32:13 75:2	55:18 91:5 92:14 99:9	clarity (5) 12:24 168:21	collated (1) 145:16
bba0001072334 (1) 51:20	123:14,18 124:25 125:22	build (1) 139:21	141:20 175:10 191:21	101:2 107:18 116:9 124:3	169:7 170:6,25	colleague (6) 90:17 91:3
bba0001072335 (1) 55:9 bba0001072336 (1) 65:10	126:2 134:18 beneath (1) 157:24	building (28) 3:10,21 5:18 9:7,21 16:17 22:23 65:2,6	certainty (1) 147:12 certificate (360) 3:1,3,5,5	157:19 certified (7) 20:4,17 58:14	class (113) 3:12,19 4:4,15 5:5,8,10,14,20,23	116:25 182:11 184:25 185:25
bba0001072337 (2) 65:16	best (9) 2:13 69:24 73:3	66:15 72:15 80:2,4,21	4:2,5,7,11,17 5:17 6:18,22	67:15 162:25 163:7,8	6:1,6,14,19 7:4,17	colleagues (9) 68:19 73:13
103:25	86:11 109:16,18 160:25	85:18 111:8 119:2,14,18	7:2,8,9,11,13,20,24	certify (2) 92:19 141:19	8:1,12,15,16,17	92:3,8 139:24 140:6
bba00010733 (1) 94:2 bba0001073314 (1) 98:4	167:7 182:6 better (11) 5:7 15:19 50:18	124:2,22 142:13 171:16 173:20 176:15 180:3	8:3,6,8,25 9:5 10:8,13 11:3,4,10,17,20,21,23	certifying (1) 21:2 cetera (1) 62:6	9:12,17,18,20,25 10:7,8,16,22 11:14	155:13 184:22 186:6 colour (25) 13:1,8,18
bba000107333 (1) 94:23	83:1,21 99:19 129:10	181:13 187:21	12:3,14,24 13:2,9,10,14	cfc (1) 153:8	12:7,15,17	19:5,11,14,25 20:10 21:9
bba000107334 (1) 100:16	138:6,18,23 190:25	buildings (8) 6:15 66:10	14:3,4,13,22 15:5,11 16:11	chain (6) 24:16,17 28:14	13:5,6,12,14,16,19,21,23	22:19,22 23:16
bba000107336 (1) 99:7	between (26) 6:5 17:14 24:17 25:13 33:2 34:12	98:13 123:1,11 126:1,2 176:25	17:2,6,8,12 18:24 19:1,25 20:6,7,11,19 21:9,13,17,25	181:6 193:4 194:1	14:1,5,7,9,12,23 15:11,14 16:11,13,15,16,25	25:6,7,8,20,25 26:4,6 27:3,12,20,21 28:7,12
bba0001075115 (1) 107:22 bba0001075121 (2) 146:9	35:19 42:9 43:8 53:7	buildup (4) 119:12 120:21	22:4,8,12,15,20	chairman (8) 2:21 55:5 57:6 105:20 126:15 160:20	17:8,9,11,19,20,25	colours (26) 12:16
152:17	58:16,19 59:17 92:3,8	121:23 170:4	23:3,15,17,19,22 27:2,5,12	161:25 197:17	18:4,4,7,9,19,20 25:9	13:9,13,15 14:5,18
bba0001075122 (1) 162:8	108:25 109:5 117:1 141:1	built (1) 139:23	28:6,24,25 29:6,12,16,20	challenge (1) 90:4	50:11,15,15,21 55:13	15:3,10,17,19 18:24
bba0001075124 (1) 118:9 bba0001075125 (1) 128:7	159:18,25 167:11,23 181:3 191:17 193:15	bullet (5) 100:24 118:14,19 127:22 169:13	30:9,22 31:6,8 32:6,8,10,16,18 33:13,23	challenged (1) 89:1 chamberlain (2) 45:25 48:2	87:2,7,12 88:5,5 99:17 104:3,9,12	19:4,20 20:3,8,13 21:15 22:17 23:10,25 24:5,6,11
bba0001075125 (1) 128:7 bba0001075126 (1) 128:17	beyond (4) 54:6 113:17	business (8) 29:8 49:6,13	35:2 36:3,11,18,21 37:3,12	change (31) 25:23 26:1	137:5,7,11,15,20 140:24	25:12 26:21 28:1
bba0001075127 (1) 134:12	151:25 175:19	108:6 116:9,12 155:14	38:16,24 39:10,15 40:7,10	28:19 31:19 32:14 41:2	142:11,19,23 143:6,10	column (2) 31:11,17
bba0001075130 (1) 166:22	bit (6) 57:16 100:25 108:16	198:12	44:3 47:4,7,19 48:7,13	62:25 63:6,25 64:10,25	144:2 145:11,21 146:1,6	colwell (2) 26:16 120:7
bba0001075131 (1) 172:3 bba0001075133 (1) 179:21	135:22 161:7 171:16 black (1) 158:25	СС	49:19 51:2,4,14,23 52:5,9,10,13,14,18,20,24	65:3 67:6 73:12 74:18 75:12,16 76:1,3,4,14,25	147:3 151:8,14 152:20 155:19 157:1 158:20,24,25	combination (4) 79:17 82:4 94:14 103:8
bba0001075147 (1) 186:11	blame (2) 85:1 194:24	c (2) 157:12 178:24	53:1,8,13,18 54:23 56:6,23	77:13,20,21 78:14,21	159:5 160:3,11 169:18	combinations (2) 20:5,18
bba0001075149 (1) 173:9	blue (1) 110:10	call (1) 30:1	60:4,8 61:7 62:8,11 63:1	100:13 104:17 105:14	171:14 178:23	combustibility (42) 66:4,9,19
bba000107517 (1) 139:8	bm4 (1) 144:9	calls (1) 35:21	64:9,21 65:4 75:22 76:20	180:19	classes (1) 6:5	72:14 73:19 77:13 82:4
bba0001078024 (1) 132:17 bba000107944 (1) 136:25	board (19) 1:6 50:1 79:2,6,11,12 80:7,13 83:1	came (18) 8:20 27:25 40:7	79:22 80:1,16,18,24 81:3 84:7 87:15,17,22 88:4 89:3	changed (13) 38:25 39:8 40:12 43:23 54:11 56:4,21	classification (47) 4:23 5:6 10:10,14,24 14:17 16:10	84:5,10 113:17,21 137:8,12,15,19
bba000107946 (1) 141:5	86:5 110:9 119:5,9,17	44:11 67:3,6,10 72:24 102:23 103:7 111:16	91:8,12 93:13,14,22	83:8 165:25 171:12,16	17:9,15 18:13 19:18,19,24	140:16,18,25 172:13
bba000110594 (1) 59:25	122:19,19 153:10 168:18	117:2,20 119:6 120:12	94:13,17 95:19 96:12	180:1 194:17	20:2 21:5,6 22:18,24 23:21	173:18 176:19
bba00011093 (1) 156:1 bba000110974 (1) 143:1	192:21 boards (10) 110:20 111:2,21	170:12,20 185:20	97:20 98:9,17,22 99:11,14,25 100:7,20,23	changes (36) 33:22,24 34:2 35:6,15 37:11 38:16 41:9	24:13 26:8 28:11 50:10,13,17,20 55:17	177:1,2,4,6,12,15,24 178:2,16,25 179:4,7,9,18
bbas (21) 30:18 39:16,20	114:14 118:13,21,25	cannot (9) 5:3 7:20 46:6 56:22 115:1 133:8 136:1	102:7,8,12,19,25	47:6 48:13 51:1,13 52:4,23	63:14 81:10 99:16,20	181:20,22 183:7,13,15
62:13 64:3,14,25 82:20	153:13 169:18,18	158:25 159:1	103:5,18,19 104:23	53:12 54:2 58:14 60:17	127:20 128:12 129:19,23	187:5 192:9
88:21 90:11 94:12 104:17	body (2) 92:14 100:6	cant (30) 6:24 25:9 26:16	105:1,11 108:18,20 110:11	61:6,21 71:10 84:22	137:5,20 143:6,14	combustible (4) 69:21
107:17,25 108:5 109:21 133:14 145:18 152:21	bold (3) 4:1 99:8 110:19 booth (1) 73:16	38:11 43:19 44:14 45:9	112:5,6,15,16,21 113:23,25	98:14,14,17,19,21 99:2,4 102:7,12 158:6 167:20	147:3,14 150:9 152:21 157:1,6,13 158:20	111:18 112:24 179:14 come (29) 3:1 8:24 13:1,2
155:7 190:24	boss (1) 39:3	53:4 62:14,16 74:7 90:5 94:20 102:3 111:5 120:11	114:3,6,7,10,11,14,18	169:14 187:19 189:4	classifications (18)	37:5 42:8 57:10 81:5 103:3
bearing (2) 109:12 194:20	both (19) 5:13,22 16:15	132:6 133:19 136:8 138:9	115:15 116:4,6,22	changing (2) 75:4,21	4:15,20,22 5:1 13:8 14:19	105:25 106:17 108:16
became (8) 10:8 34:17,22	18:4,6 35:3 43:21 45:1,2	145:6 146:23 154:20	117:5,9,13,22 118:11,16	characterised (1) 66:22	18:2 19:21 20:7,9 22:5	115:11 116:3,10 117:5
63:16 108:9,12,13 112:12 become (6) 89:10 108:17	50:18 97:11 110:4 116:11 120:8 139:13 141:2 154:25	155:16,18,20 166:7 185:9 190:12 192:18	119:3,24 120:4,12 121:16,22 122:4,12,16,18	characteristics (2) 114:11,17 chased (1) 170:25	24:12 25:13 27:9 51:9 100:5 115:23 138:15	121:21 126:10 127:12 147:25 151:14,15 161:7
127:16 159:12 180:22	172:17 174:5	capable (3) 85:25 131:1	123:20,23,25	chasers (2) 35:23 47:5	classified (9) 9:20 16:8	172:21,23 181:15 185:20
182:16	bottom (20) 3:6,25 16:5	177:9	124:10,13,23,24	chases (1) 36:5	50:21,22 65:21 142:11	190:13 198:1
before (19) 1:19 2:15 15:7 29:12 34:16 65:12 79:4,24	33:9 65:11 86:23 88:13,16 99:8 104:1,24 110:12	capacity (2) 108:18 197:12	125:2,6,11,17,20 126:5,8,10,24 127:9,19	chasing (3) 41:22 42:18 156:5	155:19 169:18 171:13 clause (16) 19:8 31:10,16	comes (1) 184:16 coming (1) 76:9
88:1 101:17 103:19 104:20	117:24 127:8,22,24 128:17	careful (1) 32:22 carefully (1) 90:13	129:8 130:9,21 131:10	chat (1) 28:19	32:5 84:4 112:20,23 115:7	commence (1) 163:21
105:25 106:18 159:16	142:9 166:10 192:6	careless (3) 194:23 196:8,16	134:1,23 135:17	check (12) 1:12 40:23 57:23	173:14 174:17 175:24	commenced (2) 33:4 59:23
164:17 167:3 184:22 185:7	boundary (2) 16:16 64:24	carried (26) 3:3 20:13 26:20	136:7,10,20,21,25	145:25 147:24 148:1	176:3,7,13 178:11 179:5	comment (3) 38:11 53:4
began (1) 78:21 begin (1) 105:23	box (3) 110:10,10 122:15 br (17) 16:21 127:20	29:16 40:22 57:2 86:25	138:5,21 140:14,20 142:8,20 143:8,9 144:3	159:15 160:6,16 190:8 193:11,20	clear (41) 4:16 7:25 9:23 13:10 17:1 24:4,7,25 25:20	146:17 commented (6) 194:22,25
beginning (4) 12:2 66:23	128:12,15,21 129:18,21,24	87:6 124:6 129:19 145:16 146:5,25 147:16 150:14,19	145:9,12,24 146:2	checked (7) 41:5 158:13	27:12 32:6 46:24 59:11	196:21,23 197:3,7
67:24 181:6	130:15,18 131:14 133:22	151:3,6 152:7 158:8 162:4	150:18,25,25 155:11,23	166:1,3 189:22 192:1	66:11 73:10 77:14,24 80:1	commenting (2) 28:23 102:9
begins (2) 8:10 168:18 behave (3) 40:17 85:4	134:17 135:8,12,23 136:15 bre (11) 26:9,14 71:23	165:21 166:2 175:20	156:22 157:16,18,21,21 158:2,6,9,11,17	197:7 checking (4) 136:7 189:8,12	81:7 83:13 95:17 109:17 121:8 123:25 124:1,17	comments (3) 168:20 169:6 197:2
112:25	119:24 120:3,11,16,20,23	184:25 190:11 carries (2) 157:21 166:11	159:4,12,13,16 160:6,8	195:3	125:10 129:18 137:18	commercial (5) 49:16,22
behaviour (10) 3:7,15 98:11	128:4 134:7	carry (14) 2:15 33:12 57:6	162:2,4 164:2,16,17	checks (2) 187:9 189:2	138:15 146:4 158:19	90:7 91:17,22
99:14 100:1 110:18 117:24	break (12) 2:10,12	58:3 64:5 70:5 117:11	166:9,11,14,18,24	chief (3) 110:15 155:7	163:3,10 166:17 167:2	common (8) 8:22 36:18,21
125:24 169:16 171:10 behind (4) 68:11 74:19 75:8	57:9,13,19 105:24,25 106:20 160:21 161:6,10,13	130:4,9 147:18 152:1	167:3,15,20,23 168:4,9,12,21	190:24 choose (1) 129:2	169:25 170:8 173:21 175:22 196:12	43:25 44:5 95:22,24 148:14
176:3	breaking (1) 106:14	162:12 197:6,14 carrying (5) 20:1 59:4	169:1,2,14,17,24	chose (3) 92:6 191:1,2	clearance (1) 98:7	communicate (2) 44:16 45:7
being (44) 14:12 20:21 21:13	brian (20) 45:25 79:5 81:19	145:12 147:6 152:6	170:8,13,20 172:9,16	chosen (2) 19:15 20:13	clearer (2) 7:10 98:12	communicated (3) 43:4
28:25 30:3,8 38:13,23	131:24 132:4,22	cary (3) 95:5,7,18	174:15 175:4,25 176:4	chris (7) 110:5,14 117:10	clearly (25) 1:14 55:18	75:19,22
39:14,17 40:1 41:2 51:9 53:7,16 55:17 74:18 79:23	133:1,3,12 142:25 181:3,7 182:7,19 184:6 186:12,21	casebycase (2) 43:2 56:18	177:3,8,12,21 178:7,15,18 179:2,12,16,24	133:2 174:2 192:20 197:10 christopher (1) 166:3	56:10,16 63:4,19,21 84:14 85:5 102:16 107:7 116:7	communication (3) 52:19 53:2 62:9
86:10 91:15 97:14	188:15 190:16,25	cassette (18) 16:2,7,24 17:22 18:3,5 27:14	180:1,12,15,24	chronology (2) 29:21 34:21	123:17 125:14,21 128:22	communications (1) 51:15
98:21,25 112:17 115:15	brief (3) 34:13,16 75:5	50:9,11,14,22 55:13 62:23	181:4,10,25 183:9 184:11	circular (1) 86:15	137:22 141:2 161:18	communitiesgsigovuk (1)
116:18 119:22 120:2	briefing (2) 75:18 79:5	63:2,7,9,15,18	185:13,16,17 186:5,22,25	circulation (1) 64:9	177:13 182:18 183:10	181:8
125:13 127:13,16 133:24 138:5 143:23 148:5 151:11	briefly (3) 103:23 110:24 141:4	cassetterivet (1) 27:4	187:2,16 189:7,10 190:5,20 191:12 192:13,18	circumstances (20) 22:20 32:13 39:9 44:12,12	184:5 192:14 193:17 clg100000796 (1) 176:13	company (1) 131:6 comparable (1) 190:8
162:4 165:3,11 168:5	bring (3) 3:5 90:1 176:12	cassettes (1) 17:9 casual (1) 92:8	193:18,19,23 194:7,21	46:7,12 47:5,18 48:4,5,14	client (2) 162:12 194:17	compare (1) 101:4
174:5 175:17 176:24	bringing (2) 73:11 76:25	catalyst (1) 67:24	196:2 197:2	50:24 52:21 57:4 147:5	cline (1) 37:16	compared (4) 38:23 39:14
179:22	british (5) 1:6 4:21 14:16	category (2) 157:13 178:24	certificated (2) 79:19,20	149:14 150:12 159:15	close (12) 19:17 24:12 25:12	54:2 160:1
belief (4) 144:11 149:6 172:23 173:2	17:14 26:23 broadly (3) 13:13 29:22 69:4	caught (1) 82:21	certificates (53) 9:2 32:24 44:10 46:6,10 71:10 72:25	165:1 cladding (25) 25:1 33:19	41:24 42:3,9,19,24 43:14,20 49:4,5	competence (5) 72:8 151:25 155:4,8,9
	brochure (1) 62:7	caused (1) 184:14	75:2,10,21 76:2,6,8,15	60:4 68:25 70:22,25 71:1,5	closed (3) 29:23,25 102:5	competent (5) 96:9 128:19
believe (33) 7:6 10:16,17,20		caveat (2) 25:20 113:24				

complaint (8) 89:5,8,11,21 10:6 13:22 86:25 87:5 91:14.24 92:1.2 consequences (4) 47:1 74:23 complaints (3) 60:22 90:25 185:14.15 115:3 conservative (2) 77:25 78:3 complete (7) 41:23 42:3.18 consider (12) 55:18 56:8 43:19 49:6,14,23 69:19 118:23 135:7 140:11 completed (1) 60:23 145:8 146:12 147:1 151:21 completely (4) 85:5 101:22 152:19 157:8 178:3,19 consideration (15) 19:22 completing (2) 49:12 60:25 45:16 46:4,14 48:2,16 completion (1) 60:11 54:22 67:17 70:13 74:18 complex (1) 135:14 154:14.17.19.23.155:1 compliance (4) 16:20 72:15 considered (19) 8:14.16 9:16 73:20 177:14 25:12 46:12 48:6,15 52:17,25 54:25 56:12 complied (1) 101:11 complies (2) 172:15 176:21 65:13 82:24 83:22 101:14 comply (4) 47:1 78:8,14 80:2 165:6 175:6 182:24 183:7 complying (1) 192:11 considering (3) 47:10 118:24 component (2) 19:16 152:25 155.10 composite (4) 67:19,23 82:7 considers (2) 128:19 130:1 122:20 consist (1) 186:2 consistency (1) 180:13 comprehensive (1) 32:20 concentrate (1) 94:12 consistent (8) 30:23 43:21 concept (1) 152:13 45:1,2 53:16 87:14,21 concern (4) 112:2,8 183:3 190:8 184:14 consistently (1) 142:4 concerned (15) 56:12 91:10 consolation (1) 198:2 108.12 112.17 19 21 constitute (6) 65:19 68:6.15 115:21 124:10,11 159:12 70:1 82:25 83:22 181:25 182:18,21 constituted (1) 66:5 183:16.23 constitutes (1) 82:8 concerning (1) 31:21 construction (43) 7:15,23 9:24 10:2 11:5,14 26:20 concerns (18) 76:12 77:1 78:4,7,13 84:20 89:18,23 32:23 34:11,17,23 54:4 90.9 115.3 181.9 66.18 73.24 95.11 109.4 183:21.25 184:3.5.10 121:3.18 123:14.15.18 190:23 191:1 124:7 125:12 126:13,25 conclude (9) 128:11 134:16 134:20 135:5 169:23 170:1 135:11 138:23 144:14 172:11.14.18.25 173:16 155:19 161:1 179:2,8 175:1 176:18,20,23,25 177:11 183:4 187:17 188:5 concluded (3) 66:3 133:22 144:19 constructions (2) 121:7 conclusion (9) 53:3 136:2 100:17.18 102:23 103:3.7 consulted (1) 73:22 130:13.14 183:22 consulting (1) 156:8 conclusions (2) 130:11 145:3 contact (5) 26:18 57:23 60:9 conditions (7) 108:4,8 30:15,17,19,25 31:4,6 47:4 contacted (1) 85:17 conduct (2) 33:16 94:8 contained (4) 35:14 143:12 conducted (3) 80:3 154:13 159:20 192:10 186:1 contains (1) 192:13 conducting (1) 97:18 content (8) 11:9 86:1 99:11 confidence (4) 43:1 53:13,18 100:23 102:25 103:5 164:23 106:13 158:2 confident (1) 117:6 contents (1) 71:13 confidently (1) 173:10 context (7) 18:21 33:22 configuration (4) 22:22 56:16 61:6 64:20 67:15 28:12 122:10 170:10 150:15 confirm (13) 1:13,21,25 2:3 continue (10) 1:5,20 40:5 26:10 45:4 52:22 53:12 52:2 57:22 65:18 107:5,10 93:12 145:6 146:22 161:16 198:4 157:1.4 continued (5) 1:3 2:20 37:3 confirmation (17) 26:10 199:3,6 33:21 35:5 37:10 38:15,19 continuing (2) 40:14 52:14 contract (16) 30:2,7,10,20 47:6 48:12 51:1.13 60:16 61.5 21 62.10 102.6 11 31:2.18 32:2.3 46:17.19.23 179:6 47:14 54:10 63:25 64:5 confirmations (1) 35:15 194:10 confirmed (7) 19:5 20:1 contractual (4) 32:17 81:17 95:4 163:23 187:11 47:8.11 51:7 189:20 contradict (1) 73:3 confirming (3) 81:2 99:4 contradiction (3) 38:22 100:8 39:13 53:7 contradictory (1) 17:13 conflict (2) 96:13 97:17 conflicting (1) 52:13 contribute (8) 110:20 conflicts (4) 95:12,16 111:2.21 113:13 114:15 97:9.13 138:22 140:12 169:19 confused (1) 91:6 contributing (2) 136:12 confuses (1) 113:7 159:14 confusing (2) 179:5 188:13 control (9) 33:25 34:2,5 35:3 confusion (2) 140:23 141:1 60:18,23 72:15 163:5,11 conversation (17) 55:4 67:25 conjunction (1) 11:22 connection (2) 95:13 99:23 71:7 91:3.16.23 92:3.8 conscious (1) 49:11 102:21 115:9 13 14 18 consensus (2) 82:9.14 116:10 148:19.24 184:6 consequence (6) 3:17 8:11 cooper (1) 110:15

cooperate (2) 52:15 56:2 cooperating (1) 53:9 181.8 182:21 188:4 172:16 d2 (1) 5:6

cooperation (4) 52:8 55:1 56:15.16 coordinated (1) 97:2 coordinating (1) 60:7 cope (1) 40:3 copies (2) 60:23 143:18 copy (3) 37:25 60:20 118:10 copying (3) 37:16 168:16 core (18) 20:22.22.23 67:19 68:4.6.15 69:20 77:2.8.12 81:6 82:8,24 83:17 85:4 148:19 155:1 corner (2) 110:12 166:11 correct (28) 2:7 8:4 22:3 30:23 34:20 77:20 84:12 93:7.14.19.23 96:7 109:14 110:5 116:7 123:1.10 149:7 155:24 158:11 164:10 166:19 167:8 173:6 174:17 185:8 188:7.23 corrected (2) 134:22 136:4 corrections (1) 189:7 correctly (2) 6:12 103:19 correspondence (7) 35:24 36:15 88:19 169:3 170:22 180:23 181:2 corresponding (2) 17:1 88:18 cost (1) 168:25 couldnt (5) 53:12 54:4 56:1 113:4 183:21 counsel (2) 2:20 199:5 couple (1) 197:18 course (8) 77:18 78:10 81:9 86:4 96:22 101:17 127:11 cover (9) 22:19 45:9 46:6,11 63:1 68:4 83:17 173:16 covered (15) 12:16 14:6 15:10 20:16 21:9.16 23:16.18 66:2 80:16 81:6 124:24 140:1 150:25 covering (2) 162:25 194:8 covers (2) 20:2 24:2 credible (1) 142:5 criteria (18) 114:12,21 123:23 128:3 12:21 129:21.24 130:15.18 133:22 134:6.9.17 135:8,12,23 159:20 critical (4) 41:19 53:24 63:22 99:25 criticality (3) 77:8,17 78:9 criticism (1) 77:15 cs2 (1) 50:22 cstb (14) 50:10,13,20 58:9.11.13.17.19.23 59:4.9.12.15.17 ctar00000043 (1) 88:10 ctar000000434 (1) 88:16 current (8) 39:10 60:20 79:14 101:5 190:22 191:14 194:12 195:8 currently (2) 181:12 187:10 customary (2) 35:2,7 customer (1) 60:22 cwi (3) 194:16 195:16,20 D d0 (3) 5:8 6:15 50:22 daily (1) 139:13 damp (1) 165:15 danger (1) 70:1 dangerous (1) 179:15 dangerously (1) 179:13 data (53) 4:14 9:16 10:4 16:1.22 18:11 14 15 33:9 35:4 39:25 40:4,15,19 41:3 50:8 55:22 58:24 59:13 99:16 100:21 102:17.20

103:13 104:13 121:17

122:1.8 123:22 125:19 127.20 129.20 130.17 131:14 133:21 141:7.12.17 142:2.21 149:22 152:13 153:5 156:16.20.25 157:5,6,9,15,25 158:15 160:4 datasheets (1) 62:7 date (15) 34:22 104:25 109:12.18.19 110:13 120:1 129:14 156:9 166:11.13.23 167:9.11.12 dated (9) 88:14 109:11 110:7 132:20 143:1 156:1 167:1 179:24 187:6 dates (1) 109:17 dating (1) 72:12 dave (1) 115:20 day (4) 82:23 106:4 193:16 194:4 day106206 (1) 58:15 day10679 (1) 58:15 day106821620 (1) 44:4 day1071482 (1) 90:1 day1071677 (1) 143:22 day10717017 (1) 148:12 dav10723 (1) 59:10 dav10748 (1) 41:25 day10754 (1) 41:25 day10755 (1) 41:25 day10769 (1) 54:23 day10790 (1) 54:23 day107971822 (1) 70:24 day10817316 (1) 113:11 dav1081762 (1) 113:11 dav1095613 (1) 174:19 days (3) 79:7 184:17,24 dclg (4) 74:4,9 181:3,13 deal (5) 67:9 77:3 102:17 107:21 119:21 dealing (11) 13:17 17:6 19:11 26:3 46:5,9 64:20 67:11 81:23 111:17 191:10 dealings (1) 108:11 deals (2) 18:24 32:5 dealt (4) 16:1 89:17 90:6 100:7 dear (2) 79:12 181:11 debate (9) 65:22 68:5,7,14,16,17,20 73:23 82:8 debated (1) 84:12 decades (1) 10:15 december (15) 29:23 50:19 108:21 130:8 134:23 153:22 156:2 157:20 158:14 167:1 168:11,16 170:15 179:24 187:6 decide (4) 71:1 121:19 125:16 155:4 decided (5) 37:23 76:7 77:23 104:19 117:3 decision (26) 37:5 38:3,8,13 39:5,24 42:9 43:13 47:20,24 48:5,18 52:1 73:2 74.23 25 75.5 14 77.5 96:20 104:17 105:15 112:7 133:23 155:14 157:19 decisions (3) 49:1 64:14 176:2 declared (1) 55:14 declaring (1) 8:15 declined (1) 184:8 deduce (1) 138:20 deducing (1) 139:3 deduction (2) 144:11 149:5 deductions (1) 155:23 deem (2) 128:10 134:15 deemed (6) 5:10 87:2,7,12,16 88:5 defective (1) 126:20 defending (1) 96:16 defined (12) 5:7,15,21 9:21 19:19 26:22 65:6 141:2 142:12 145:22 152:3 171:15

defines (1) 82:3 definition (8) 66:2,13 68:3,13 81:7 82:20 83:5 95:24 definitive (1) 111:25 degree (1) 164:23 delay (3) 167:10 170:18 171:3 delays (2) 37:22 60:25 deliberate (2) 27:22 53:22 deliberately (3) 40:4,18 41:17 demonstrate (2) 15:14 143:10 demonstrating (1) 55:12 demonstrations (1) 101:6 denial (2) 44:2,7 density (2) 143:17 144:9 denyer (12) 87:4 131:3 132:16.17.18 182:11 184:25 185:4,9 186:1 190:12 193:1 denyers (3) 186:2 192:6 193:18 department (10) 26:3 38:6 68:19 74:5 95:18 96:12 97.19 117.2 12 131.19 depend (3) 48:3 147:5 149:14 dependent (1) 195:1 depending (1) 64:6 depends (1) 150:7 derived (1) 111:5 describe (4) 22:6 114:5 152.20 154.1 described (12) 6:25 7:16 44:19 51:22 58:22 79:18 92:2 119:12 146:13 163:24 173:12 188:17 description (5) 23:8 113:14 118:12 126:11 133:4 design (3) 33:22 35:16 61:6 designated (1) 60:6 designations (1) 19:4 designed (3) 40:2 103:13 126:12 desktop (9) 121:5,11,24 163:3,9,13 165:18,19,21 despite (4) 28:6 30:3 40:15 84:20 detail (9) 38:10 48:11 92:17 101:20.22.24 108:16 154:12 176:1 detailed (4) 18:23 29:5 62:3 128:14 details (21) 6:24 11:7 12:20 31:24 33:23 34:2 61:7 62:10 65:8 70:14 102:2,21 117:25 118:3 121:23 128:25 129:8 13 146:17 171:4 186:8 determine (1) 22:23 developed (1) 45:19 development (11) 110:20 111:2.22 113:13 114:15 117:16 136:13 138:22 140:13 159:14 169:19 devices (1) 2:5 diagram (22) 4:18 5:6,15,21,23 6:8,14 7:5,18 11:18 14:8,9,16 16:14 17:16,24 142:18 172:15,20 176:21 190:15 192:11 didnt (25) 18:15 36:2,9 39:16 43:15 56:7 67:9 70:12 78:1.16 79:4 86:7 89:7 111:12 112:20.22 120:24.24 151:24 154:12 160:5 170:23 184:9 190:22 197:14 difference (7) 26:7 90:11,21 138:1.10 159:18 188:7 different (47) 5:2 9:22 13:13.20 14:2.2.12.13.18.19.16:15

18:2 19:20,21 21:12

22.5 21 24.11 11 26.2 21 27.21 29.4 61.3 67.12 69:11 71:6 75:20 85:6 90:14 92:7 95:8 116:22.23 117:11 123:6 126:13 128:15 131:19 138:4,19 139:2 147:4,9 151:4,12 152:14 differently (1) 78:10 difficult (6) 46:14 131:8 151:20 165:14 174:14 186:4 diligence (1) 159:9 direct (4) 7:2 108:4,8 141:24 directed (1) 12:21 directly (3) 61:16 108:12 145:2 director (4) 47:22 90:6,7 91.22 directors (1) 91:17 disclose (2) 31:13 55:11 disclosed (1) 30:13 discretion (3) 36:25 39:1,8 discuss (11) 42:7 43:9,11 90:8 102:18 120:12 131:17 185:12,15 190:25 198:6 discussed (30) 15:25 43:12 44.18 20 21 45.11 18 21 46:8 47:2 48:17,20,25 73:15 74:20 89:17 90:25 91:13 120:14 133:12 139:16 182:13 184:21 185:3,3,4,7,9 186:6 194:6 discussion (6) 54:22 73:23 83.9 89.22 90.20 152.12 discussions (8) 29:10 74:4.9 91:18 119:23 120:3,6 185:12 disjointed (1) 91:3 displaying (1) 128:2 disproportionate (2) 52:18 53:1 dispute (1) 47:13 dissatisfied (1) 92:4 distance (1) 16:16 distinction (4) 13:18 123:16 125:1 159:25 dl2000 (1) 153:15 dl3300 (2) 153:17,20 document (51) 3:20 4:18,25 5:8.16 6:14 16:14 19:8 65:15.17 68:13 70:14 73:22 74:23 75:13.14 80:21,23,24 81:17,24 86:19 88:9,20 111:9 123:21,24 124:5 125:6,8 126:6 142:16 162:23 163:24 164:8 171:21.22 173:14 174:10 175:2.23.24 176:8.10 177:7 179:23 180:4 181:18 182:21 187:3 192:8 documentary (3) 132:10 133:11 175:21 documentation (5) 75:11 99.9 133.17 146.22 166.5 documented (9) 46:5,9 92:7 133:23 139:16 145:23 151:19 164:5 176:2 documents (46) 1:25 11:22,25 26:23 30:13 38:4 52:11 65:1 71:13 72:7,21 73:4.5 74:17 76:18 77:9.11.16 78:9 85:8 86:2,10,12 91:7 102:2,14 103:8 114:12:22 122:3 125:1.8.13.15.16.22 129:22 141:3 142:12 159:21 167:6 171:15 172:16 173:5,19 180:5 does (43) 10:3 15:9 22:18,19,21 28:9 61:4 64:8 82:10 85:5 99:15 105:3 111:1 112:2 4 4 8 10 120:7

121:22.25 122:4 123:16.17

126:14 135:7 137:17

138:13 148:6 151:5 155:16 159-1 172-13 175-10 12 176:19 177:3.19.23 178:2.6 179:17 195:13 doesnt (22) 7:7 8:14 9:16 22:15 49:20 54:24 55:23 62:25 102:1 112:9 121:25 122:1 123:12,12 126:14,18,20 148:5 157:22 178:1 182:23 183:3 doing (10) 4:21 54:1 76:11 86:2 152:10 160:15.22.24 188:21 197:19 domain (3) 69:25 70:7 85:17 done (18) 10:1 29:1,2,13 30:9 50:12 51:17 78:11 102:22 103:11 121:24 129:11 148:4 151:9.19 155-17 193-17 194-25 dont (115) 1:25 2:2.4 8:23 10:16 11:19 15:12 18:21 25:4 29:13 34:6 38:5,11,20 40:2 41:16 43:17 45:3 46:11 47:2,12 53:21 54:18 55:3 57:3,3 62:14 67:8,18,21,23 71:19,25 72.18 74.16 23 75.14 78.11 17 83.24 84.15 85.7 86:5 87:9,16,19 88:7,22 89:9 91:13,24 93:24 94:18 99:3 101:21 102:1,9,21 106:18 111:4.15.23 115:6 118:7 120:5,9,19 123:4 124:3 126:23 129:10,14 131.20 133.13 19 20 136:16 137:23.23 139:6 145:14 147:23,24 149:13 151:17,18 154:7 155:6.12.14 157:2.6 158:7,23 160:14,15 161:2,9 166:5 167:5,14 168:1,6 176:6 178:21 179:15 184:2,4 186:7 190:18 196:24.24 197:1.3.5 doubt (4) 29:1,2 51:16 67:8 doubts (1) 68:24 down (21) 3:8 9:9 23:4,6 24:19 31:16 76:21 79:10 94:4,24 95:3 97:7 99:10 100:25 105:1 118:18 128:9 156:16 169:15 171:10 189:19 dr (3) 65:24 76:17 83:2 draft (11) 81:18 98:9 100:11 192:22,23 194:25 196:22,23,24 197:3,7 drafted (4) 37:25 117:9 174:15 186:7 drafting (9) 6:22 75:9 88:23 119:3 131:23 136:24 138:12 145:9 173:25 draw (4) 13:18 123:16 159:24 183:22 drawing (1) 123:17 drawn (3) 53:3 145:3 149:5 driven (1) 84:19 dropped (1) 50:21 dubai (1) 70:21 due (4) 89:11 96:22 159:9 187:16 durability (1) 25:2 duragloss (8) 21:1,14,19 22:1.2 23:9.15.24 during (23) 2:10 29:20 30:8,9 33:3 46:18 52:20 54:9 57:13 58:24 64:8 95:4.7.16 97:10 98:3 99:11 100:19 136:7 143:20 158:5 159:3 180:14 e (13) 16:9,13,16,25 17:9

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters

transcripts@opus2.com +44 (0)20 3008 5900

81:9 152:18

50:11,15,15,17,23 55:13

going (28) 1:5 2:24 3:1 8:8

11:7 29:15 30:1 39:11

55:24 68:16 76:5 97:5.22

earlier (4) 65:12 79:2 136:16 156:6 early (9) 10:25 68:18 69:3,6 72:12 86:16 119:23 120:2 170:14 east (5) 69:8 84:18,24 85:10,21 easy (1) 194:24 edition (2) 176:12 178:23 effect (4) 19:16 127:8 140:19 166:6 effectively (2) 21:25 163:25 effectiveness (1) 101:6 eight (1) 105:24 either (14) 4:21,23 6:14 50:14 87:4 99:19 100:4 113:19 115:15 145:25 174:1 178:21 190:12 197:4 electronic (1) 2:5 elements (3) 72:13 73:18 118:5 else (7) 22:2 26:18 111:8 167:25 169:10 178:17 198:7 elsewhere (9) 14:6 37:2 71:15 84:24 90:18 178:14 187.11 189.21 191.22 email (55) 24:16.17.19 25:24 28:14 29:6 37:13,15 60:1 61:9 79:5,10,11,11 80:5,13 81:14 132:19.19.24.25 133:9 168:15 169:12 170:24 181:6 182:5,9,10,15,16 184.5 10 17 21 185.8 186:18 187:23 188:2 189:1,18 190:4,16,20,23 192:6 193:4,5,14,15,16,19 194:1 195:7 196:14 emails (4) 115:12 132:11 168:14 192:5 emphasis (1) 49:15 emphasise (2) 11:1 49:22 employed (2) 108:5 197:12 employee (2) 118:24 146:11 employees (1) 95:22 employment (1) 141:9 en (3) 4:23 16:9 118:4 enable (3) 37:2 129:1 160:18 end (8) 23:7 50:12 58:24 95:23 118:18,19 129:3 198:12 endorse (1) 43:18 energy (2) 34:14 108:13 engineer (2) 70:15 152:12 engineering (3) 38:5 153:1 154:1 engineers (2) 85:12,24 england (7) 3:12,21 9:8 19:6 99:17 142:16 171:20 enormous (2) 177:14.16 enormously (1) 22:15 enough (1) 37:1 enquiring (1) 161:5 enquiry (2) 115:10,11 ensuing (1) 40:9 ensure (2) 157:14,25 enter (1) 63:25 entered (1) 30:20 entire (4) 10:7 39:20 177:16,18 entirely (6) 34:20 81:7 94:12 106:13 109:17 158:2 entirety (5) 10:3,13 47:9 177:23 178:8 entitled (2) 32:7 152:20 environment (1) 163:20 envisage (1) 40:16 envisaged (1) 40:19 equally (2) 113:16 147:14 equipment (3) 163:5,12 165:14 equivalence (5) 6:5,7 7:5 11:8.18 equivalent (3) 5:2 9:25 14:9 erny (1) 37:16

error (14) 27:23 33:18 117:4.6 136:6.18.21 158:10 160:6 182:1 188:16 190:18 191:21 193:10 escalate (2) 45:15 46:4 escalated (6) 44:17 45:8 46:13 48:1 90:17 92:5 escalation (1) 47:21 escape (2) 187:9 189:1 essential (1) 32:23 essentially (2) 2:9 192:23 establish (2) 116:10 193:25 established (1) 86:11 establishing (1) 37:8 estimated (1) 60:11 et (1) 62:6 etc (10) 66:1,13,18 68:2,10 74:11 82:19 83:5,20 176.17 euro (2) 157:6.13 euroclass (2) 6:15 17:18 european (10) 4:22 6:5 10:10,14,24 14:16 17:9,14 50:9,15 evaluate (2) 101:19,23 even (5) 17:23 36:12 54.21 24 116.15 event (1) 185:20 events (1) 65:22 eventually (1) 37:8 ever (25) 8:24 40:2 50:1 74:4.9 75:19.25 115:2 117:19 120:20,23 127:16 136:9,13 145:8 146:5 147.1 150.14 151.6 13 152:11 157:2.8 169:10 184:2 every (7) 45:10 73:18 74:23 75:14 93:6 176:3 178:3 everybody (2) 75:6,9 everyone (9) 1:4,10 10:9,23 57:21 74:21 75:9 107:4 161:15 evidence (55) 1:6.20.22 16:19 23:11 29:18 33:4 35:10 39:22 41:24 54:20 57:12,22 58:11,12,23,23 59:11,12 61:8 62:20 69:11,25 76:7 81:16 82:5 88:8,25 89:13,16 98:7 106:19 107:5 113:4 121:8 123:7.8 132:10 133:11.23 139:1 142:22 143:21 144:18,21 148:11 161:9,16 174:18 175:21 178:22 180:16 187:14,22 198:6 evidential (3) 111:13 115:22 117:14 evolved (1) 180:11 exact (3) 122:9,9 129:14 exactly (4) 102:2 109:16 121:2 147:8 examination (6) 94:15 103:9 109:21 163:3,9,13 examined (2) 38:22 102:2 examining (2) 94:14 103:8 example (12) 11:12 25:10 32:13 52:8 58:20 59:17 73:16 76:1 117:10 139:21 150:17.21 examples (1) 165:9 exbba (1) 95:25 exceed (1) 128:1 exceeding (1) 82:11 exception (4) 98:23 178:9 182:25 190:15 exceptional (1) 36:19 exchange (3) 29:3 168:8 181:2 exclusively (1) 173:15 excuse (1) 147:8 executive (3) 94:24 110:15 190:24 exemployee (1) 96:11 exercise (7) 84:11 130:10

165-19-21 exhibit (1) 144:9 exhibited (3) 88:10 143:19 153:5 existed (1) 86:6 existence (4) 55:11,21 66:1.12 existing (3) 122:21 123:10 164:12 exova (2) 26:6 71:23 expand (2) 150:20,24 expect (24) 10:2 18:12 41:1 43:12 48:17 19 70:1 119:17 126:3,5 131:13,16 150:1 152:1,9 158:17 166:4 175:19,20,22 176:1 179:6 190:10 198:3 expected (13) 18:2,10 36:4 39:2 42:6 47:7 48:14 51:5.8.12 58:13 61:20 160:16 expecting (1) 23:23 experience (12) 35:25 42:11 44:24 45:4 113:18 131:15 139:21,24 148:22,25 164:13 167:18 experienced (7) 37:19 72:6 90:12 131:5.11 144:5 182:20 expert (14) 65:24 71:5 72:2 86:8 96:4,6,9 97:3 131:19 140:5.8 150:1 152:1 155:4 expertise (2) 71:21 194:18 experts (7) 72:1,5 73:4 85.14 23 130.6 25 explain (26) 4:4 17:10 44:11 46:18 52:21 54:24 56:9 66:20 68:1 80:8 82:21 87:11 97:5 111:20 136:4.8 138:11,16 142:1 153:24 174:21 176:2 183:8 190:4,16 191:4 explained (12) 53:21 75:8 92:17 95:10 114:1 134:19 136:16 151:10 184:25 185:24 194:13 195:9 explanation (4) 127:1 128:14 149:13 184:13 explicitly (1) 177:25 explore (1) 126:22 exposed (2) 23:10,25 express (1) 120:20 expressed (2) 65:23 92:6 extent (1) 13:11 external (16) 4:20 9:9 66:18 69:15 71:20 72:3,13 76:2 85:12,23 122:20 152:12 175:3 176:18,24 181:19 extra (1) 94:7 extrapolate (11) 121:6 136:1 146:13 147:2 148:18 149:11.18.21.22 150:5.8 extrapolated (4) 20:10 143:15 144:7,13 extrapolating (2) 152:8,13 extrapolation (17) 143:23 144:15,20 145:4,13 146:5.24 147:17 148:9 151:3.15.17.21 152:7 154:13 155:17 158:21 extrapolations (3) 150:14 151:6 152:6 extreme (1) 36:19 extremely (2) 28:6 167:15 exxovvasic (1) 194:18 fabricated (2) 62:22 63:18 face (9) 11:16 23:10,25 153:16.16.18.18.21.21 facer (4) 153:11.12.14 154:25 facers (4) 152:25 154:25 155:6 162:16

facing (1) 143:17

facings (1) 122:20

143:23 145:13 155:17

factories (1) 163:18 factors (4) 3:7 4:6 110:18 169:16 factory (10) 33:25 34:1 35:3 44:3.7 59:3 162:13.24 163:19.23 factual (1) 114:16 failing (3) 47:1 56:2,3 failure (8) 27:23 44:16 45:7 55:11,16 77:6 85:3 159:9 fairly (1) 175:6 faith (1) 149:4 fall (3) 82:15 92:20 109:6 familiar (4) 10:18,21 45:12 61:23 familiarity (1) 163:19 fag (2) 86:12 88:25 faqs (4) 86:22 88:12,18 89.23 far (22) 16:21 20:12 68:23 77:5,9 89:7,13 92:5 93:11 96:18 104:20 108:3,19 115:3 117:8 125:23 149:4 156:24 167:23 168:1 190:6 197:10 fatal (1) 79:13 february (1) 153:10 fed (1) 90.10 fee (2) 49:20,20 feedback (2) 98:2,20 feel (3) 112:20,22 161:2 fees (1) 49:18 felt (4) 65:25 66:12 73:3 75:13 few (1) 79:6 field (3) 139:22 140:4.8 file (23) 6:24 31:4,7 94:21 103:9 132:10 143:12 145:4 146:22 148:1,5 151:19 152:24 153:5 154:4,5,11 159:23 160:4,13 166:6 167:7 175:21 files (4) 94:16 109:22 144:18 174:24 filler (18) 65:20 66:6.16 68:6,9,16 74:11 81:5 82:6,9,15,18,25 83:3,16,22 84:3 176:16 fillers (1) 83:4 final (3) 136:19 157:17 170:20 finally (2) 153:19 168:5 financial (1) 49:8 find (10) 62:8 79:13 102:3 133:4,8,19,20 151:19 155:21 192:18 finding (5) 98:4,5 99:22,23 179:7 findings (2) 186:9,14 finish (5) 19:15 21:23 39:16 55:5 66:7 finishes (1) 28:1 fire (161) 3:8,11,15 4:19 5:19 7:24 9:9 11:2 13:8 15:16,17 16:20 19:13,24 20.1 4 14 21.5 8 22:5,9,18,24 23:21 24:1.2.5 25:4.6.7.25 26:12 27:3.6.8.13.16 28:11.19 30:8 40:4.8.15.19.21 41:3 50:8 51:3,6,8 53:24 55:12 63:14 64:22 65:12,22 69:16.23 70:15 71:17 72:1.5 78:21.24 79:1.7.14.24 82:23 83:14 85:12.14.23.24 86:4 93:10 97:3 98:12 99:13 15 100:2,7 103:13 104:5,13 110:19,21 111:3,22 112:5,25 113:14 114:15 115:5 116:18 117:24 118:1,4 125:25 126:8 127:18 128:2.2 132:1.4.8 133:5.5.9.16.20 136:13 138:15.22 140:13 141:7,10,11,17,23

142.2 21 143.15 144:2,7,13,24 147:11,16 148:6 149:2 150:16.20.22.23 152:1.3.9.12 153:1 154:1 155:3 156:16,20 157:15,25 159:14 168:22 169:8.17.20 171:11 177:13,22 194:9,12,15 195:5,9,19,24 fires (12) 68:25 69:3,5 70:22.25 71:1.14 84:18.24 85:2.9.20 first (52) 1:11 3:4 24:19 40:7 51:24 62:3 66:22 107:20 108:8.17 112:12 114:9 116:2,4 118:11,19 125:3,10 126:4,23 127:2,3 130:21 131:15 142:19.24 143.8 144.14 155.22 156:24 157:16 158:7.8 161:17 162:1,9 164:1,21 166:12,17 168:9,12 172:23 173:11 192:20 194:6.21 195:3,6 196:2,3,3 firstly (1) 188:3 fit (1) 106:5 fitness (4) 27:6 124:20 171:5 194.9 five (5) 35:22 97:24 173:11 184:17,24 fix (2) 63:7,9 fixing (6) 16:8,12,25 27:3,20 55:13 flame (1) 156:17 flat (1) 49:20 flawed (2) 56:19 91:7 floor (1) 16:17 foam (4) 152:24 153:8 162:16 179:14 focus (5) 10:7 33:1 76:24 135:22 158:5 focused (1) 164:17 focusing (2) 3:4 162:9 foil (5) 122:20 153:11.12.14 154:25 folder (4) 144:23,25 145:17 149:3 folders (1) 143:13 follow (10) 62:25 64:8 116:5,15 135:7 139:17 152:5 155:16 194:11 195:8 followed (7) 42:13 48:8 91:15 101:1.4.9 139:10 following (8) 33:12 42:2 58:15 60:14 73:19 81:23 105:15 146:10 follows (1) 29:22 force (1) 30:21 foregoing (2) 31:24 32:10 form (16) 9:25 11:24 50:10.11.14 61:10 62:23 63:18 67:19 114:22 144:19 154:13 158:16 172:23 173:2 191:22 formal (4) 62:13 74:13 91:14 92:6 formally (1) 139:13 format (2) 104:7 180:11 formatting (1) 187:20 formed (8) 55:19.25 56:1 72:7 80:20 145:1 154:3 173:22 former (2) 33:5 95:22 forms (2) 1:19 132:11 formula (1) 144:12 formulation (1) 147:12 forthcoming (1) 157:9 forward (2) 57:15 59:21 forwarded (1) 80:6 found (7) 133:11,23 136:21 144:18 153:4 160:5 184:2 four (6) 17:5 47:23 93:5,6 95:25 162:9 fourth (1) 195:6 fr (8) 5:13 18:14 20:22 21:4,21 22:1,2 105:11

frame (1) 122:21 free (1) 153:8 frequency (1) 91:11 frequently (1) 86:22 front (23) 8:3 12:14.19 13:17,20 14:4,14,22 15:4,15,20 98:10,11,15 99:13,25 100:13 114:2 115:24 138:20 160:10 170:7 171:7 fs (1) 192:18 fulfil (1) 121:1 full (24) 7:20.23 8:6 11:4.21 12:20 16:19 22:19 23:22 25:8 31:13 34:2 42:23 96:24 97:1 100:5 112:6 113:23,25 114:10 118:10 128:22 140:1 186:8 fundamental (1) 124:3 fundamentally (1) 170:4 further (12) 12:24 31:16 48:16 50:7 65:8 98:7 100:25 139:15.19 179:6 197:6,15 future (3) 121:12 169:2 185:22 G gained (1) 49:8 gareth (2) 168:16,19 gasket (1) 66:17 gaskets (2) 66:17 176:17 gave (4) 53:6 91:25 149:14 167:9 gayetree (4) 131:3 185:2,10 193:8 general (9) 19:22 29:8 32:19 41:20 42:16,21 43:18 64:24 180:2 generality (2) 31:23 32:9 generally (3) 24:23 59:13 106:2 generated (2) 186:12,14 generic (2) 126:18 127:3 generous (1) 106:10 geoff (1) 95:10 george (14) 110:4 131:9 132:21 133:1.12 136:23 140:2 166:2 168:15 169:13 174:1.8 196:18 197:10 get (15) 13:25 14:10 40:11 43:19 65:16 69:10 98:5,6 106:15 127:7 132:9 151:2 170:23 173:2 193:11 getting (8) 27:10 37:10,20 41:21 42:17 55:1 106:2,3 giles (1) 95:11 give (15) 12:7.20 18:12 53:18 64:25 99:22 102:11 109:17,18 114:14 128:14,25 131:1 150:14 165-9 given (63) 10:5 11:2 13:8 15:18 16:10 18:3.4.6 20:2.5.7 29:2 32:12 33:14 38:8.24 39:1 40:13 42:23 45:14 46:3 51:15 52:13 53:8 68:13 70:14 74:18,21 78:12 80:19 88:17 89:13 90:13 98:3 106:7 113:20 114:5.11.12.17.20.21 115.23 117.25 118.3 122.2 123:6.20.21.23.126:8 129:8 138:2,20 154:14,23 155:2 159:20 166:23 179:13 180:2.13 190:6 gives (7) 11:23 12:21 60:8 125:6,9,18 143:24 giving (4) 1:22 14:19 129:12 142.4 glanced (1) 154:11 glass (6) 153:11,12,14,16,18,21 goes (5) 33:25 34:6 54:6

175:19 177:18

107:5 111:11 115:11 120:16 134:11.25 146:8 151:5 153:6 167:25 172:2.21 180:8.20 191:16 gold (1) 22:1 gone (6) 42:14 48:10 163:14 177:21,22 197:18 good (21) 1:4,9,10,16,17 2:17.21.22.23 57:15 58:2.5 69:12 83:15 96:8 101:6 107:4,16 154:21 160:20 161:20 governing (3) 64:15 80:24 125:16 government (1) 74:5 governs (1) 32:17 grades (1) 5:13 graham (1) 115:20 grange (32) 2:18,19,21 15:22.23.24 55:5.8 57:5 58:6,7 69:10 70:19,20 105:19,23 106:3,13 107:13,14,15 126:9,15,22 127.7 12 160.19 24 161-24 25 197-17 23 grateful (1) 61:1 great (2) 77:3 102:17 greatly (1) 116:21 greg (1) 110:15 gregorian (5) 23:11 24:17 28:15,16 29:11 grenfell (14) 20:14.15 30:8 65:22 78:21.24 79:7.14 82:13 83:13 87:1,7 93:10 127:18 grey (3) 21:9,22 22:2 greygreen (5) 20:25 21:3,4,18 22:1 ground (3) 16:18 66:16 176:16 grounds (2) 97:14.16 guess (1) 167:7 guessing (1) 129:15 guidance (13) 44:15 45:6,14 46:3 72:11,16,18 73:11,17 77:6 111:6 152:6 187:21 guided (1) 186:12 gurney (1) 95:10 guy (1) 181:8 н hadnt (2) 15:13 163:14 half (3) 3:6 11:11 106:4 halfway (1) 156:16 hamo (2) 24:22 28:22 hand (4) 27:19 38:4 49:7,14 handled (2) 45:10 182:11 handling (1) 45:19 hands (2) 37:24 38:17 hang (1) 38:14 happen (9) 43:15 44:1,6.9 56:17 77:18 78:2 84:14 124:10 happened (5) 40:6 48:1 90:19 168:3 180:19 happening (1) 167:22 happens (1) 164:17 happy (2) 97:23 105:23 havent (4) 9:1 41:6,13 133:23 having (19) 3:11,19 5:19 6:19 7:4 8:12 18:8 28:3 29:10 71:7 83:15 102:5.6 104:3 151:9 165:4 174:22 194:14 195:18 haynes (6) 131:24 132:4,7,22 133.1 12 hazard (1) 110:21 head (20) 26:2 34:10,13,17,22 39:3 43:10.12 45:23.24 48:8

90:7 95:9.10 108:13 109:4

laboratories (1) 26:12

110:14 117:2 155:10 157:22 headed (1) 176:14 header (1) 99:8 heading (9) 3:8 23:4 33:9 100:17 110:18,19 117:16,24 122:15 headings (1) 99:20 heads (1) 83:14 hear (4) 1:14 57:25 107:7 161:18 heard (8) 29:18 33:3 59:22 62:20 83:8 88:8.25 187:14 hearing (5) 1:5,5 57:22 107:5 198:15 hed (1) 97:19 height (16) 16:16,18 64:23 66:10 70:23 71:2.10 72:24 75:1 76:8 82:11 84:23 93:18 98:16 127:6 172:19 held (3) 34:12 84:4 162:14 help (66) 7:7 8:20 17:10 26:19 29:21 30:12 58:10,18 64:2 67:16 69:5 74:3,16 86:18,18 88:2,20 90:25 94:13,20 96:23 98.19 102.3 23 103.6 104.8 105.3 108.7 111.1 5 115:2 116:14 120:7,15 129:9,12,25 132:3 133:19 136:20 140:2 144:14 150:12 151:5.23.24 153:24 158:19 165:1 166:5 167:10,12,22 168:3 169:6 175.12 182.8 185.11 186:2.9.13 188:1 189:3 191:19 195:4,21 helpful (1) 15:24 helping (1) 133:20 helps (1) 113:7 hence (2) 194:9,21 here (16) 11:13 13:17 14:3,20 15:20 41:6 55:24 60:1 87:11 96:25 97:22 144:12 149:18 161:19 179:21 187:23 herself (3) 35:11,12,20 hes (8) 42:15,22,22 149:7 183:5,8,8,10 hesitating (2) 75:20 123:4 hi (4) 37:17 133:3 168:19 194:5 high (2) 163:19 164:22 higher (2) 42:14 83:12 highly (1) 69:21 highrise (3) 119:2,13,18 himself (3) 42:14 96:17 113:6 hindsight (2) 15:15 77:4 history (2) 38:8 51:15 holder (11) 35:2 36:3 44:3 49:19 51:23 52:14.20 102:7 108:2 150:18,25 holders (6) 36:11,18,21 52:9 75:22 84:7 holderuser (1) 80:2 honest (1) 129:15 hope (7) 58:3 107:10 135:13 138:10 160:8 161:21 169:1 hour (2) 106:16 197:20 hours (1) 193:22 housekeeping (1) 1:19 housing (2) 86:16 88:2 howard (1) 120:7 however (7) 52:10 65:25 158:3 162:13 181:20 183:14 194:24 human (1) 136:6 hunt (22) 110:5,14,25 113:4,10 117:10,13,19 131:18 133:2 136:9,18 140:8 145:25 155:21 159:7 166:3 168:17 174:2 175:10 192:20 197:10 hunts (1) 174:18 hypothetical (1) 18:1

id (3) 69:10 96:19 111:12 identical (14) 35:14 147:8,10,12,21 148:2 149:17,20,24,25 162:15,18 164:2,20 identification (1) 66:25 identified (8) 65:13 66:22 67:22 100:22 102:24 103:5 192:1 193:23 identify (2) 69:24 103:13 ie (11) 4:22 7:17 14:16 25:6 27:4 79:17 90:22 144:9 154:25 179:24 193:9 ignore (2) 114:8 125:24 ill (7) 28:19 37:5 57:22 147:25 160:23.25 184:20 im (93) 1:7 2:24 3:1 8:23 11:10 13:25 14:10 15:8,15 22:7.8 27:10 28:9 29:15 41:3 42:22 45:23 46:22 48:3,4 49:14 61:23,23,24 62:14 67:8,18 69:9 70:14.15.17.19 71:4 73:13 74:7 75:20 77:5 78:12 84:25 86:20 87:9 91:2 95:24 96:8,22,22 98:24 101:25 102:1.22 105:23 106:3,6 111:11 113:18 115:11 120:8 121:8 123:4 126:17,22 127:1,7 129:15 132:6 134:24,25 135:22 139:2.3 141:1 146:7.19 148:23 151:2.9 153:6 161:3,4,5,19 164:16,18 167:14 168:6 172:21 174:15 178:14 181:12 185:9 186:7 197:19,25 image (1) 98:15 imagine (4) 38:21 53:5 75:21 80:14 immediate (2) 84:14 182:12 immediately (6) 31:19 41:2 84:6,21 85:16 164:15 impact (1) 17:11 impartiality (1) 95:14 implement (2) 75:25 78:14 implementing (1) 76:14 implication (1) 56:7 imply (2) 187:4 192:16 implying (1) 73:7 importance (1) 10:11 important (12) 26:4 27:7 38:18 40:10 47:15 63:6 74:25 76:3 117:12 124:19 161:2 170:5 impose (1) 84:8 imposed (2) 27:22 65:4 impractical (2) 178:3,19 impression (1) 154:3 improve (2) 169:2 170:24 improved (3) 7:9 12:4 98:11 improvement (2) 168:25 171:2 improves (1) 170:6 inaccurate (11) 112:23.24 114:25 135:18,19,21,24 136:9,14 137:25 138:25 inappropriate (3) 116:6 159:18,25 incentivised (2) 49:5,7 include (5) 64:23 99:19 124:19 163:2 195:13 included (18) 27:16 55:17 99:16 100:20 101:5 116:3 121:16.17.23 137:3 140:12,18 141:24 145:11 181:16 187:2 188:16 195:2 includes (2) 98:10 118:12 including (18) 4:6 8:3 31:14.23 32:13 55:12 66:17 74:10 95:8 136:2 138:13 143:16 144:3,8 156:15 174:3 175:11 176:17

inclusion (4) 146:1 175:7 187.24 188.20 inconsistent (4) 27:11,18 149:13.16 incorporated (1) 98:21 incorrect (3) 44:8 54:10 137:13 increased (1) 116:21 index (1) 199:1 indicate (3) 4:3 36:2,9 indicated (1) 78:19 indicates (5) 12:18 14:25 137:7.12.15 indicating (3) 194:16 195:20,24 individual (19) 15:3,17 43:13 44:18 45:11,19 46:7 48:3 57:3 76:22 91:10 92:4 124-22 139-11 147-6 15 149:15 157:19 174:4 individuals (7) 56:12 103:10 120:8 121:5 131:22 197:12.15 industry (10) 10:15,18,21,23 32:24 72:11 73:10,24 75:19 140:24 inevitable (1) 138:6 inevitably (1) 135:11 infer (2) 5:3 178:5 inference (1) 145:6 inferred (3) 6:23 132:12 145:3 inferring (1) 177:15 influenced (2) 19:14 73:14 info (1) 37:21 informal (3) 91:16.22 92:3 informally (1) 139:13 information (75) 11:2,23 12:22 16:1 26:11 31:21 33:12 35:18 36:10,12 37:1,24 38:12,17,20 39:6,22 40:8,9,21,23 41:7,8,22 42:10,17,23,25 43:19 49:2 50:17 51:17.25 52:3.12 53:5 54:8.14 56:13,24 58:20 59:3,16 60:14 61:2 62:3 70:6 73:8,14 78:18 84:15 85:16 86:3,6 98:12 99:20,21 100:20 102:14,18 114:20 124:12:22 125:7.9.18 126:7 147:22 156:13.15 159:22 160:13 164:6 180:2 186:12 informed (4) 125:19 126:3 164:12 178:15 initial (10) 55:15 81:18 108:20 130:12 157:12 158:4 162:3,12 182:15 186:1 initially (7) 26:6 43:7 68:5.14.19 157:17 165:23 initiate (1) 60:12 inquiry (22) 2:20 3:25 65:24 74:2 88:11 89:14 102:15 107:24 119:21 128:6.8 134:13 137:2,4 138:14 142:25 146:10 154:12 159:6 169:4 191:10 199:5 inquirvs (1) 144:16 insert (1) 112:20 inserted (5) 23:12 25:15,18 187:16 188:4 inside (1) 89:11 insist (2) 84:6,22 insisted (2) 50:25 51:12 inspect (1) 163:17 inspection (1) 162:13 inspections (1) 80:4 installation (8) 20:14 22:22,25 62:7 121:2,20 122:3.5 installed (1) 20:15 instance (3) 43:16 73:9 147:22

instead (2) 143:14 146:13

instigated (1) 189:11 instruction (6) 25:16,17 41:20 42:16,21 43:3 instructs (1) 28:10 instrument (3) 69:14 83:12 125:14 instrumental (1) 73:11 instruments (1) 83:25 insulation (42) 65:14 66:16 79:18.20 107:18 108:10 110:9 111:18 112:25 117:18 122:19.21 126:13 130:6.25 138:13 139:23 140:3,4,5,9 147:7 150:21 152:24 162:16 168:18 172:11 176:14,16,24 180:10 181:18 183:12 189:23 190:1.9 192:9.15.21 194:7 195:22.24 integrity (1) 49:24 intended (5) 127:4 167:19 173:24 187:4 188:4 intent (1) 127:3 intention (6) 42:24 44:25 125:5 174:16 188:5 192:16 interaction (1) 139:13 interest (8) 82:18 95:12.16 96:13,16 97:10,13,18 interested (4) 36:9 69:10 96:23 178:14 internal (8) 68:20.23 72:8 74:15 162:22 187:9 189:2 192:5 internally (1) 74:20 international (1) 71:1 internet (1) 52:1 interpret (5) 7:21 141:7.11.16 142:2 interpretation (16) 6:25 12:9 63:3 65:1 67:4 68:12 71:24 72:3 74:10,13,22 75:3 76:16,16 83:8 186:15 interpreted (1) 96:14 interpreting (1) 72:6 interrupt (2) 15:23 69:9 intervals (1) 40:23 into (20) 11:7 30:21 34:16 40:8 46:15 63:25 70:6 72:24 85:16 98:22 106:6 136:19.21 160:24 175:24 187:16 193:10 197:6.15.23 introduce (2) 72:24 76:7 introduced (1) 129:13 invalidate (5) 33:23 37:11 61:7 62:11 102:8 invalidated (2) 51:14 102:12 investigate (3) 88:3 116:3 182:2 investigating (1) 117:4 investigation (13) 96:21 97:19.25 182:3.12 185:1 186:1,2,13,14 191:23 197:6,15 invitation (2) 184:8 191:1 invite (2) 2:18 107:12 involve (1) 48:8 involved (42) 6:22 38:6 55:3 61:16 64:7 66:25 68:17.21.25 71:20 74:21,22 75:9,23 86:20 87:10 88:23 91:4 94:15 96:18 103:10,21 108:17 116:8 119:3.6.23 120:2.6 130:9,20 131:22 132:12 146:16 148:3 157:11 163:6.12 168:1 170:12 172:8 173:25 involvement (4) 7:2 108:10 109:9 157:12 irrespective (2) 20:23 66:5 isnt (21) 6:6 25:11 27:10 28:2 49:16 50:24 69:17 87:15 92:13 96:13 114:25 123:20 125:10 126:12 162:2 167:15 178:4,20

183:11 185:5 193:2 iso (2) 101:8,15 isoiec17065 (1) 101:5 isolation (5) 8:5 113:22,25 178:11.13 issued (15) 28:25 29:12 40:7 50:10,13,20 76:2 86:13 96:12 97:20 112:16 134:23 157:16 164:18 182:1 issues (4) 118:15 124:12 158:11 182:22 issuing (1) 170:18 istephan (2) 1:8.9 italicised (1) 196:6 items (1) 34:7 its (143) 6:6,14 7:5 10:13 13:21 18:1 21:8,17,18 22:8.24.24 23:19.19 25:11.18.19 27:19.20.21 28:1.7.9 29:20 31:22 39:17 43:2,2 44:23 47:3,14,23 50:24 56:3 60:3 61:24 63:4 67:10 68:2,8 69:13,14,23 74:10 77:14 80:6,24 83:3,20 84:7 87:21 92:13 96:14,20 97:21 99:1,3 101-11 109-17 110-8 111.24 25 114.2 24 24 118:8 119:16 120:9,13,25 121:1,19 123:18,21,22 124:2,3,4,21,24,24,25 125:8 126:18 127:3.5 129:20 130:21 134:3,5 136:19,21 137:19 138:6 140.11 20 144.21 147.6 148:18 150:16 151:19 154:20,20 155:4,11 156:2 158:3,19,25 162:2 164:10 165:5 169:25 170:13 171:20,24 173:15 174:14 176:6,7,13 177:5,9,13,18,20,23 178:3,5,8,21,23,24,25 179:15.15 181:6 185:5 186:4 194:6.21 196:3.12 itself (6) 15:16 79:20,22 128:19 130:1 151:5 ive (18) 6:3 38:9 53:21 56:11 82:25 84:13 106:18 113:1 123:21 136:10 138:16 142:3 153:23 157:6 160:12 184:25 190:4 191:10 ivor (1) 156:2 january (4) 28:25 35:19 37:14 50:13 job (18) 29:9 37:21,22 39:16 41:24 42:3.9.19.24 43:2,14,20 45:10,17 48:17,18,19,20 jobcon (1) 192:18 jobs (4) 43:9,11 48:25 49:9 jog (1) 120:15 john (6) 1:3 28:18 148:21 181:11 194:5 199:3 ioined (1) 1:7 jon (11) 131:3 132:17 182:11,13 184:25 185:3,4,9 186:1 190:12 193:18 judge (3) 97:23 155:4,8 judged (5) 9:12,17 11:13 12:6 87:18 judgement (28) 11:19,24 37:2 56:14,18,20 70:16 72:9 76:21 86:1 122:5 125:19 126:4 128:20,23 129:4 130:2 135:13 147:19 149:24 150:10 154:7.8 155:5.13 165:6 171:5 188:13 judgements (5) 72:20 86:9 100:8 117:18 133:18 july (19) 93:12 94:1 109:13.20.24 153:15

192:7 193:6.7.15 june (5) 72:12,16 79:6 81:15 132:20 justification (2) 98:6 185:14 justified (1) 158:18 justify (2) 144:2 159:1 k15 (75) 105:21 107:18.22 108:18 109:2.5.11 110:9 111:17 113:20 118:16 119:25 120:4.9.12 122:14,18,25 123:10 125:11 126:24 127:13,16 131:23 133:7 135:8,12 140:15 142:20.23 143:4,5,12,14 144:17 145:1.11 146:6 147:21 148:2 151:8.14 153:2.5 154:2,4,25 155:22 156:21,25 157:15 158:1,20 159:5 162:1,4,18,21 163:1,2,7,21 164:3 168:17,21 170:3,9,14 177:6 179:12,13,24 189:23 190:2 196:2 k7 (1) 153:9 k8 (1) 153:13 k9 (2) 153:10,12 keen (1) 27:2 keep (4) 99:20 113:24 160:23 175:12 key (6) 3:7 4:6 10:11 110:17 169:15 176:2 kin000020932 (1) 168:15 kind (11) 26:19 62:9 83:25 98:5 136:18 148:15 149:9,19 194:6,21 196:3 kingspan (26) 105:21 107:17.18.25 108:2.8.12 120.21 142.22 143.16 144:1.8.24 154:10 157:9 159:4 162:13 163:8 164:3,9 168:8,11,17 170:17 171:1 194:10 kingspans (5) 138:13 145:10,19 162:24 164:19 knew (3) 102:16 147:12 183-24 know (76) 2.12 7.15 8.23 10:16 12:25 18:21 25:4 37:7 38:11,14,20 40:7 43:17 44:20 50:7 55:3 57:3.3 58:10 61:17 64:10 67:21 72:19 77:9 86:7 87:23 88:22 89:20 90.12 15 92.5 103.17 104:22 111:4.15.23 113:1 115:6 117:10 120:14 129:10 133:9,13 137:23 139:6 145:14 146:20 147:23,24 151:17,18,24 152:5,7 154:7 155:6,14 160:23 162:18 163:13 167:14 168:2.6 174:14.23 175:10 193:9 194:22 196:7.15.20.22.24.24 197:2,4 knowing (3) 127:15 171:4 183:21 knowledge (16) 10:19,22 49:3 70:17 71:14 96:8 107:24 139:11.23 141:9 148:22.24 152:21 164:12.23 173:4 known (8) 17:8 19:14 28:2 77:18 81:9 85:4 155:5 162:23 kooltherm (9) 107:18 110:9 122:14,18 133:7 153:15,17,20 168:17 koscuk (1) 37:15

166:25 167:4.8.23 168:4

184:17.24 189:3 191:19

laboratory (5) 20:1 69:23 147:16 148:6 150:23 lack (8) 6:7 52:8.19 53:2 55:1 56:15.16 193:12 lacrosse (1) 71:17 laminate (1) 153:9 lane (3) 65:24 76:17 83:2 language (2) 4:5 72:23 large (1) 165:14 largely (1) 140:4 largescale (1) 118:1 last (9) 2:10 3:18 37:19 55:23 97:6 134:4 194:15 195:19,23 lasted (1) 50:18 late (1) 37:18 later (17) 7:9,12 13:3 28:20 57:16 119:21 126:10 138:9.18 158:11 161:11 173:22 178:23 180:23 184:17,24 194:3 layer (2) 73:18 119:1 Idpe (1) 82:6 lead (5) 52:9 71:9 95:5,17 96:25 leader (2) 50:1 190:5 leading (1) 37:22 leap (3) 149:4 177:14,16 learned (1) 117:4 least (5) 17:4 38:15 48:11 127:2 188:23 leave (4) 15:7 182:10,13,17 led (10) 16:9 25:23 26:1 38:12 71:1 97:3 146:1 153:24 173:2 179:2 lee (22) 110:4 131:9 132:21 133:1,12 136:23 137:17 140:2.11 141:8 142:1 145:25 166:2 168:15,18 169:13 170:23 174:1,8,14 196:18 197:10 lees (1) 141:5 left (6) 90:16,23 95:6 97:23 137:23.24 lefthand (5) 31:11,11 32:4 110:12 166:10 less (3) 49:17 63:21 189:14 let (1) 123:6 lets (18) 9:5 18:25 23:1 76:24 81:14 86:12 89:25 110:7 111:14 127:19 142:7 171:9 176:9.12 179:20 181:2 184:16 186:19 letter (19) 33:6,7 35:5,11,12 46:25,25 59:24 61:3,10,10 147:14 150:18 153:15 156:1,4,5,6,9 letting (1) 57:6 level (12) 39:5 42:14 66:16 69:21 83:12 97:17 128:1 139:11 163:19 176:1.16 189:8 levels (2) 189:12,13 liaising (1) 139:24 liaison (1) 60:9 lifetime (3) 29:20 30:22 159:3 light (1) 153:24 lighter (1) 122:15 lightfastness (1) 23:19 like (13) 2:14 6:21 9:20 17:13 85:1 87:18 95:22 108:14 111:14 150:3 151:7 156:11 161:3 likelihood (1) 185:21 likely (8) 109:24 144:6.15 153:2 154:2 175:9.9 189:15 lilia (2) 37:15,17 limit (3) 22:15 27:2 70:10 limitation (3) 31:23 84:8 170:9 limitations (1) 127:6 limited (51) 12:19 27:19.20 66:4,9,19 72:14 73:19

98:25 122:2.6 156:20

160.7 197.2

77:13 82:3 84:5.9 113-17 21 128-2 137:7.12.15.19 140:15 17 24 141:14 20 150:17.22 172:12 173:18 176:18 177:1,2,3,5,12,15,24 178:2,16,25 179:3,7,8,17 181:20,21 183:7,13,15 187:4 191:24 192:9 limiting (1) 27:11 line (33) 23:6,7 25:2 33:19 37:1 42:7 45:11.18.20 47:2 48:16,25 55:5 62:12 64:2 94:25 104:7 118:14,18,19 134:4 139:12 143:24 163:4,11 165:24 166:1 169:15 180:10 195:17 196.3 6 21 lines (6) 94:4 105:1 127:23 162:9 173:11 195:6 linking (1) 145:2 list (7) 31:15 34:3,6,7 60:22 100:24 156:16 listed (2) 98:14 156:14 listened (1) 90:13 literature (10) 28:4 38:21 39:17 51:10 54:3.7 60:20 62:5 145:11,20 little (6) 23:1 100:24 108:4,16 144:21 168:7 llovd (2) 156:3.14 local (2) 86:16 88:1 location (1) 126:7 long (6) 6:3 13:24 167:15 193:20.24 198:2 longer (8) 39:9 49:17 55:6 106:16 116:12 117:17 190:21 191:14 look (59) 3:14,24 7:21 8:9 9:5 12:11,12 18:25 19:9 23:2,6 28:16 31:16 32:3 33:6 51:19 55:8 57:15 64:16.17 68:10 79:4 88:13 89:25 94:1.16 97:6 98:2 99:7 103:23 117:22 121:21 127:19,23 128:6,7,16 132:17 136:23 137:1 139:7 141:4 143:2,7 148:11 162:7,8 166:22 168:14 169:12 171:10 173:8.10 174:18 176:9 179:6 181:2 184:16 186:19 looked (13) 3:18 24:10,14 72:22 73:1,6 79:2 101:25 133:21 140:14 144:17 186:5 190:8 looking (13) 28:15 54:1,6 100:10 101:10 112:2 134:1.2.3 146:9 169:4 174:23 187:23 lot (1) 192:13 lovely (1) 2:8 low (3) 99:17 142:11 171:14 lower (1) 189:8 lunch (2) 105:24 106:16 lunchtime (1) 198:3 м m (1) 192:9 mail (1) 186:24 main (9) 31:17 32:2 60:9 72:14 99:15 112:5 122:14 156:4 180:3 maintain (2) 95:13 180:12 maintaining (1) 52:15 major (1) 160:5

makes (4) 13:10 24:4 32:6 80:1 making (20) 25:4 27:12 42:15,20,22 71:9 77:5,20 86:1 99:4 113:2 131:1,13 135:13 136:18 157:19 158:6 169:25 171:5 189:4 managed (1) 44:24

management (7) 45:12 47:2 49:1 131:17 139:12.19 189:13 manager (42) 33:5 38:1 39:3 42:7 43:8.8.9 45:18.20 46:19,22 47:8,21 48:1,15,16 54:20 60:6 61:11,13 108:9,25 110:4,4 130:12 131:9,11,24 132:20.21 138:12 144:23 145:15 155:9 157:17 164:7 165:23.24 166:1 196:9.11.15 managerial (1) 116:23 managers (25) 28:2 35:17 37:1 39:2 41:14,21,23 42:2,16 43:4,5 44:16 45:6.13.15 46:3 47:12.24 49:4.11 116:23 130:3 131:5 139:19 165:25 mandatory (1) 180:5 manner (3) 40:17 41:19 146:13 manufacture (3) 162:3,20 163:14 manufactured (2) 162:15,18 manufacturer (10) 38:14,23 39.14 17 40.3 41.1 53.17 54:12 147:7 164:6 manufacturers (6) 54:3,7 150:13 151:7 165:2.10 nanufacturing (10) 34:5 52:16 60:17 163:4,11,16 164:2,10,19 165:11 nany (4) 44:9 54:16 148:25.25 march (2) 1:1 198:16 maria (3) 33:5 34:8 50:16 market (2) 127:14,17 marketing (3) 28:3 145:10,20 marking (2) 60:21 62:5 martin (62) 1:4,11,16,18,24 2:3.8.17 15:7.21.23 55:7 57:8.15.21 58:2.5 69:9.19 70:4,8,18 105:22 106:2,9,15,22,25 107:4,9,12 126:9,17 127:1,10 160:22 161:4,15,20,23 181:3,7 182:7.19.23 184:6.16 186:12.19 187:24 188:15 190:16 191:7.18 192:23.24 193:14,16 197:22,24 198:9,12 martins (2) 183:19 184:21 masonry (27) 122:21 123:8 127:5 169:23 170:1,4 172:10,14,17,18,25 173:15 174:21 175:1.3.3 176:20.22 177:10.19 183:1.3 187:17 188:4 190:15 192:10,17 match (1) 150:24 material (24) 5:24 16:14,16 66:16 82:4.6 99:18 111:18 113:21 140:15,17 143:10 144:9 149:1 171:6 172:12 173:18 176:16 177:15.24 178:1 181:21 183:7.15 materials (39) 2:1 5:12 12:15,17 14:23 15:12 19:16,23 34:3 60:17 65:21 66:2 67:9.15 68:4 71:5 75:16 76:2,5 77:12 78:5 82:21 83:25 84:9 85:2.3 86:4 92:20 122:9 138:13 163:4.8.10 164:24 177:1 181:19,19 183:12,13 materialsproducts (2) 65:14 176:14 natter (13) 55:20,25 58:10 63:12 77:19 119:20 155:23

171:1 182:2 183:20,23

minor (1) 167:19

184:1 191:12

matters (5) 44:24 72:2

90:16.17.23 maybe (2) 112:15 126:19 mean (15) 21:15 22:7 23:15 64:4 80:8 103:11 105:3 111:1 150:7 174:20 190:1,2 195:5,21 196:17 meaning (4) 82:3 85:10,21 137:19 meanings (1) 140:24 means (10) 5:7,13 6:18 7:3 13:5,14 14:2 150:7 180:14 195:11 meant (9) 6:24 7:16 20:6 68:10 80:12 113:6 139:9 189:14 195:16 measures (2) 187:9 189:2 mechanical (2) 128:23 129:5 mechanism (2) 77:6 85:3 media (3) 79:15.18 90:18 meet (12) 9:12.17 11:13 12:7 43:10 82:7 87:19 101:7 129:23 184:7 190:24 191:2 meeting (10) 8:15 91:1 93:25 95:4,14 97:8 101:21 120:9,11,18 neetings (4) 43:7 44:19 119.23 120.3 meets (3) 128:3 134:6,8 melbourne (1) 71:17 melting (1) 77:7 member (8) 89:1,17,18,20,22 90:8,20 139:12 members (4) 1:7 79:12 95:25 116:11 membranes (1) 165:16 memory (6) 120:15 132:6 137:25 138:8 139:4 142:4 mention (3) 115:13 183:3 190:15 nentioned (2) 6:4 175:4 mentoring (1) 43:6 meredith (1) 156:2 merely (1) 139:3 merged (1) 34:16 message (2) 88:1 194:3 messages (1) 2:6 met (11) 5:22 90:8 120:8 128:13 134:17 135:8,12,23 136:15 172:20 181:12 met00053158p18176 (1) 86:14 met00053158p18177 (1) 86:21 metallic (3) 21:9,22 22:2 method (6) 16:8,12,25 27:4,20 55:13 methods (3) 5:2 11:8 18:12 meticulous (1) 32:22 metres (31) 6:16 10:12 76:13.20.23 77:2 78:5 80:15,19 81:4,12 84:1 123:2,11,13,14,19 124:2,8,18,25 125:12.21.22 126:2.19.25 170:3,9,14 177:1 mhclg (6) 74:5,9 115:10,11 180:24 184:7 mid2017 (1) 191:11 middle (12) 3:15 19:1 66:11 67:20 69:8 84:18,24 85:10,21 94:5 107:23 152:17 might (25) 51:2 54:15 63:8 69:21 83:17 85:11,22 97:16 110:24 118:25 120:15 124:10 147:13.17 150:18,23 157:8 170:18 173:23 174:12 188:22 190:10 195:21 197:3,7 mills (1) 168:16 mind (5) 3:23 70:12 174:12,14 194:20 minimum (2) 43:7 45:17

minutes (4) 105:24 194:3 197:18.20 misholdsic (1) 40:4 misinterpretation (5) 104:4.10.11 177:9 190:18 misinterpreted (1) 42:6 mislead (1) 40:18 misleading (18) 8:4,6 113:20 114:25 135:16,18,20,21,25 159:19.25 160:9 177:20 178:12 179:12.15 186:16 188:17 misrepresentation (1) 53:23 misrepresented (1) 40:13 misrepresenting (1) 41:18 missed (1) 34:15 missing (1) 38:18 mistake (1) 189:24 mixing (1) 15:15 mobile (1) 2:3 module (1) 74:3 moment (12) 13:1 37:6 40:6 43:23 57:7 121:22 147:25 160:20 172:22 184:20 190:13 197:18 monday (1) 1:1 monitored (1) 139:12 monthly (3) 42:8 43:7 45:17 months (4) 60:12 64:1 168:12 191:13 moore (19) 79:1,5,11 80:8 81:19 87:3 88:8.25 89:16,25 142:25 143:3,20 148:11 149:7,18 150:4 151.23 153.4 moorebick (44) 1:4,11,16,18,24 2:3,8,17 15:7,21,23 55:7 57:8,15,21 58:2.5 69:9.19 70:4.8.18 105:22 106:2,9,15,22,25 107:4,9,12 126:9,17 127:1,10 160:22 161:4,15,20,23 197:22,24 198:9.12 more (36) 2:18 13:13 16:17 18:23 36:4,6 40:8 50:12 59:13 66:15 72:2 78:14,24 83:9 88:12 90:12 98:10 102:17 107:13 108:9,16 113:7 115:23 117:8 126:14 139:13.23.24 144:6.21 148:25 155:12 174:22 175:21 176:15 197:20 morning (12) 1:4,9,10,11,16,17 2:11,21,22,23,24 12:3 most (2) 82:5 113:12 mostly (1) 94:11 move (4) 42:4 86:12 142:7 193:4 moved (3) 116:11.16 117:15 moving (1) 59:21 ms (61) 1:8,9 2:18,19,21 15:22,23,24 29:19 33:3,7 35:10,20,21 37:7,15 38:10 43.25 46.16 50.16 55.5 8 57:5 58:6,7,11 59:22 61:4 62:2.4.9.20.69:10.70:19.20 76:7 105:19.23 106:3.13 107:13.14.15 126:9.15.22 127:7,12 160:19,24 161:24,25 185:5,5 192:7 193:6 194:2 196:11,20 197:17.23 much (22) 1:16 2:8 7:10 51:16,24 55:6 57:8,16 58:2.7 70:18 72:2 106:6.22 107:9 160:25 161:5.11.20 197:22 198:9,13 muirie (1) 73:16 multiple (3) 52:22 54:13 102:10 must (15) 7:20 8:6 10:13 11:21.21 22:23 23:22 78:3 80:2 113:22.25 144:19 172:12 193:17 198:5

mutual (2) 58:16.18 myself (4) 68:18 78:16 85:7 155:13 N naive (3) 41:16 43:22 54:17 name (1) 60:8 namely (1) 127:2 names (1) 131:2 narrow (1) 64:10 national (11) 4:4 9:21 65:2,6 99:16 137:5,20 142:12 147:3 171:15 173:19 natural (1) 113:12 nature (7) 64:7 65:3 90:3 149:23 183:2 185:11 190:23 necessary (14) 12:22 15:13 28:11 33:11 47:3 51:25 53:6 64:23 70:6 75:13 77:21 126:6 144:22 159:22 need (9) 34:6 47:13 79:10 118:7 119:21 125:18 131:20 154:21 193:9 needed (8) 63:11.19 84:5 86:5 100:13.23 102:25 103:6 needing (1) 73:18 needs (1) 139:15 neither (4) 102:16 113:20 174:4 197:11 never (6) 49:23 50:5 52:24 91:4 157:4 184:6 nevertheless (1) 193:21 next (9) 63:24 105:20,24 119:20 127:9 179:23 193:4 194:13 195:10 nhbc (3) 115:9,13,18 nick (1) 181:9 nkomo (9) 35:22 41:20 42:5 43:5 59:7 61:8 70:21 71:4 96:3 nkomos (1) 54:20 noncombustible (3) 113:15,20 178:21 none (2) 16:22 154:24 nonloadbearing (1) 118:4 nonstandard (1) 120:22 nontechnical (3) 90:14 117:15 189:6 nontypical (1) 120:22 nor (3) 102:16 113:21 197:2 normal (9) 33:16 35:25 36:15 130:18,22 158:3,16 162.12 164.14 normally (4) 9:1 116:5 175:19 195:1 note (8) 72:16,18 79:1,6,13 80:1 81:14 193:6 noted (2) 64:22 101:3 notes (3) 6:8 120:18 132:11 nothing (4) 22:2 38:25 54:10 145:2 notice (3) 32:8.11 193:12 noticed (2) 62:21 77:22 notified (1) 60:19 notify (2) 31:19 58:13 november (3) 30:5 71:18 143:2 nowhere (3) 17:5 114:1 121:22 nuanced (1) 46:8 number (16) 4:9 29:19 33:14 35:17 36:5 50:2 60:8 95:7 98:5 99:22 108:2 111:11 144:24 168:20 186:22 191:24 numerical (2) 19:17 24:12 0 object (3) 97:14.16.25 objective (1) 160:3 objectively (1) 39:21

objectives (1) 139:14

obligation (2) 31:12,17

obligations (5) 31:10 46:20 47:9.12 51:7 observed (1) 187:5 obtain (3) 28:11 141:10 150:1 obtained (1) 159:4 obviously (4) 70:9 129:10 131:6 174:23 occasion (2) 146:25 165:20 occasions (5) 17:5 48:12 52:22 54:13 57:11 occur (11) 40:17 44:13 47:19 69:19 85:9.20 93:2 117:5,20 119:6 160:5 occurred (10) 30:8 41:19 71:15 91:11,19 95:16 97:10,13 165:2 168:8 occurrence (1) 130:18 occurrences (1) 69:7 occurring (1) 185:21 oclock (6) 105:25 106:11,17,23 198:5,10 october (26) 24:18 29:25 30:4 33:4,8 34:8,10 35:19 50:8 59:23 60:2 107:25 108:3,7 109:11 110:7,13 129.5 130.19 153-12 13 17 19 157-16 162:2 166:12 offer (1) 174:9 offered (6) 30:2,6 184:7 190:24 191:2 194:10 office (4) 50:2 91:17 92:9 191:18 officer (1) 155:7 official (1) 181:13 often (4) 22:18 36:11 93:2 180:14 okay (11) 29:14 48:10 87:20 106:21 129:17 150:3 161:10 182:16 198:8,9,11 old (4) 154:16,16,20,22 omitted (3) 15:20 17:18,21 once (11) 26:11 63:16 84:4 85:9.10.20.21 160:5 177:20 183:24 198:5 ongoing (4) 37:9 43:6,9 100:10 onto (1) 179:11 open (5) 63:3 104:4,10 186:15 190:17 opening (6) 7:21 95:4,14 97:8 126:11 156:5 operate (1) 187:10 operated (2) 52:16 96:17 operating (1) 189:3 operational (1) 116:8 opinion (29) 55:19,25 56:1 64:25 65:23 80:25 82:11 114:16:24:25 131:25 132:4.8.14.22 133:5.9.11.16.20 141:10 147:15 148:5,18 149:11 150:1,19 152:2 194:18 opinions (2) 83:1,23 opportunity (1) 180:9 opposed (1) 139:25 options (1) 14:15 oral (8) 29:18 33:3 54:20 58:12 62:20 89:16 143:20 174:18 order (6) 22:23 33:12 47:9 60:25 143:10 154:21 organisation (8) 49:17 69:23 71:6,22 95:6 117:16 150:19 189:14 organisations (1) 68:21 original (15) 7:11 30:20 31:1 39:25 46:17 47:14 54:9 58:24 63:1 87:22 100:10 101:16 158:7 181:25 194:20 originally (4) 65:7 194:23 196:7.15

others (13) 60:3 70:5 71:7

72:2 76:17 79:8 83:24

otherwise (3) 63:7 78:5 185:14 ought (6) 1:18 11:15 46:12 47:25 154:14 170:25 ourselves (1) 106:10 outcome (5) 90:10,15,21 92:4 182:3 outer (2) 119:1,18 outlined (1) 38:9 outset (1) 81:16 outside (8) 71:22 94:8 150:2,10 152:2 155:4,8,9 outstanding (1) 156:15 over (29) 4:9 6:15 34:4 35:18 45:24 48:22 52:16 64:1 65:16 76:13 77:2 106.20 117.18 123.2 11 125:12 126:19.25 139:16 142:15 156:15 165:25 167:11 170:3,9,14 176:25 192:12 198:7 over18metre (2) 127:14,17 overall (3) 27:5 43:3 101:1 overarching (1) 46:20 overcladding (1) 118:22 overlap (1) 116:25 overlooked (1) 136:7 overriding (1) 49:23 overrode (2) 91:9 188:14 oversight (6) 187:8,25 188:18,21 189:8,15 overview (1) 100:5 own (10) 44:24 70:16 101:11 104:17 109:9 129:1.20 145:10 148:22 174:5 paid (1) 99:12 paint (1) 26:3 pale (1) 110:10 panel (10) 1:8 18:14.16 69:20 72:13 83:17 104:3 105:2,3,6 panels (33) 3:11 4:3,3 5:19 6:19 8:15,21 9:12,17,20,25 11:13 12:6,15,17 14:23 15:11 16:2 18:8 25:1 33:19 50:15.18 60:4 64:15 82:7.10 84:5.9 85:13.15 105:11.12 para (2) 181:18 183:12 paradigm (1) 56:15 paragraph (78) 4:8,12 12:13 13:4 14:20 15:8 16:5 19:10 24:9,21 25:3 34:1 35:4,7 51:20 55:10.23 61:21 64:18 65:9.18 66:12 68:3 81:25 82:2,19 94:24 95:3 97:7 99:10 103:25 107:22 118:8 125:5 126:11 127:2.3.24 128:16 129:3 132:18,18 134:3 137:1 139:7 141:6 142:17 143:3 156:10 162:9.10 166:22 169:12 172:5.7 173:9 176:10,23 177:7,17 179:11,21 180:8 181:17 183:6,10,17 186:10 187:3,7 189:19 192:8 194:13 195:6,10,16,17 196.3 paragraphs (6) 3:18 4:10 81:23 142:17 156:5 171:23 parallel (2) 189:23 190:2 parameter (1) 63:22 parameters (3) 23:20 141:22 165:15 paramount (1) 49:25 part (48) 9:5 11:17 17:3 23:14 27:6.7 41:5 42:7 44:22,23 47:11 50:18 55:23 61:22 63:20 64:24 70:22 84:19 92:23 96:24 97:1.24 100:9 101:16

reading (7) 9:24 67:21

112:17 113:5.6.12 184:10

prevented (1) 55:16 112:14 124:19 139:14 62:15 70:6 92:12 100:22 102:24 103:5 115:14 116:4 141:25 144:16 145:1 156:4 158:3.5.16 159:6.9 162:25 117:1.2.7 144:15 149:2 164:23 164:7.14 168:22 169:7.21 165:19 185:18 188:10 173:17 180:1.6.18 181:13 189:12 191:12.17 188:10 193:14,22 163:7 169:3 182:19 particle (6) 118:13,21,25 placed (4) 144:23 145:4,15 price (1) 181:9 119:5,9,17 154:4 primary (1) 73:19 particular (28) 19:5 22:21,25 places (1) 19:17 23:12 25:7 49:15 55:3 plain (1) 96:13 124:3 165:7.8 65:20 72:9 73:9 88:18 plan (8) 37:8 62:4 162:23,24 99:12 100:1 107:17 108:17 163:2.24 164:8 165:20 print (1) 166:13 110:23 121:6.18.20 122:5 plans (1) 165:24 125:17 128:5 134:13 played (1) 170:18 please (19) 1:14,21 4:4 139:20 143:5 149:3 152:5 180:18 20:11 33:24 57:10 65:7 170:22 79:13 103:2 106:18,23 probably (6) 1:18 26:16 particularly (1) 176:6 particulars (4) 31:13,15,20 133:4 161:8.9 181:5 182:4 32.12 193:11 198:4.10 parties (1) 31:20 plethora (1) 28:1 67:23 70:9 151:18 partly (2) 83:10 188:23 pm (8) 107:1,3 161:12,14 194:22 196:5,7 198:14 parts (5) 4:22 14:2,13 26:23 157:5 pointing (1) 6:13 passage (3) 6:3 55:8 141:4 points (2) 23:2 169:13 158:4 past (1) 197:19 policies (4) 46:6,11 109:1 patterson (1) 97:3 133:14 policy (20) 25:5,20,23,25 pause (2) 123:3 187:12 pausing (1) 162:17 27.22 29.8 44.15 45.6 9 14 46:2 57:1,2 64:25 74:14 paying (1) 49:19 175:16 pe (10) 18:15 20:22 21:2,18 180:2,12 188:10,10,14 22:1 50:9,20,22 87:23 polyethylene (14) 65:20 proceeding (1) 31:2 105:11 66:3.8 68:6.15 69:20 pecored (1) 105:15 77:2,7 78:5 81:6 82:24 people (10) 10:25 53:3 85:4 105:4,6 43:2,23 47:21 48:7 63-4 8 67-25 77-15 94-15 pondering (2) 85:10,21 194:24 196:21.22 ponding (1) 77:7 perceived (1) 180:21 poor (3) 7:8 12:3,5 posed (3) 36:23 85:13,15 performance (48) 5:15 14:18 15:3.17.18 19:13 20:5.14 position (13) 26:13 30:18 136:7 139:15 141:15 22:9 23:18,20,20 24:1,2,5 34:12 42:6 74:14 75:19 146:16 148:3 151:21 25:5 27:3,14 37:4 38:21 76:1 79:16,25 80:9 117:17 40:14 41:18 51:3 157:3 191:7 164:2,10,13,14,20 53:7.14.19.23.24.55:13 possessed (1) 139:11 63:8 77:18 86:3 99:13 possession (1) 40:8 180:19 100:7 103:13 114:4.11.16 possibility (3) 47:17 145:8 processed (1) 30:3 116:18 128:24 129:5 182:24 possible (11) 12:20 19:19 132:1,8 148:16 149:9 153:2 154:2 155:6 42:25 54:25 67:10 87:3 100:22 98:23 120:19 140:11 182:4 performances (1) 19:3 101:2,4,5,7,10,11,14 performed (2) 50:8 128:22 190:7 102:24 103:4 116:18 perhaps (9) 10:24 11:11 possibly (9) 18:21 46:6 68:8 117:1.7 165:7.9 15:15 42:13 43:22 54:17 87:20 90:18 91:22 129:14 produce (2) 50:25 147:7 131:5.12 83:1 109:15 194:9 period (7) 34:13,16 35:19,23 post (1) 116:23 48:22 60:13 64:1 postcertification (2) 163:20 periodically (1) 40:20 164:15 permissible (2) 5:21 17:15 postpublication (2) 124:5,11 permitted (2) 16:13 151:22 potential (2) 28:10 187:16 perrior (1) 115:20 potentially (18) 8:5 14:18 person (2) 144:5 173:23 18:3.6 27:11 68:3 76:3 53:15.20.23 55:17 personal (5) 10:22 38:2 135:15 150:8 177:20 44:24 45:3 49:8 178:12 179:5.13 183:22 65:5 66:9.16 perspective (2) 26:5 80:14 186:16 188:12,16,23 pertaining (2) 25:19 39:12 practice (10) 33:16 35:7 phase (2) 88:11 105:20 43:25 44:5 69:24 73:3 phenolic (8) 111:18 112:24 86:11 128:25 129:12 122:19 143:16 144:8 153:8 162:12 155:1 179:14 pre (2) 78:20 127:18 126:12 127:4 128:3 phone (1) 2:4 precise (2) 69:16 87:20 132:2.5.9 133:4 photograph (3) 98:10.24.24 precisely (3) 30:17 34:24 134:6.8.16.21 phrase (16) 7:21 8:22,24 66:23 13:16 14:1,7,11 61:14 preferable (2) 134:21 135:2 87:19.20 111:1 113:13 prejudice (1) 32:9 114:1 115:3 134:2 140:12 premise (1) 121:15 142:11.13 143:9 phrases (1) 87:18 preparation (1) 172:8 physical (1) 164:21 prepare (1) 173:1 physics (1) 95:11 prepared (3) 79:1 147:17 pick (3) 4:12 16:4 160:9 150:23 158:24 162:11 163:2 presence (2) 68:9 83:5 picked (1) 158:10 169:22 171:13,18,24 picking (2) 129:3 143:24 present (6) 93:24 94:25 picture (1) 114:22 95:14 97:8,15 110:21 177:2,5,11 piece (1) 165:14 presentation (1) 104:5 pieces (1) 156:15 pressure (6) pigments (1) 19:15 49:3.6.10.11.13.23 niqued (1) 82:18 presumably (2) 103:8 186:6 productcolour (2) 20:5.18 place (24) 33:2 41:21 42:16

previous (3) 57:11 109:10 previously (9) 51:22 69:22 95:5.18 108:11 151:11 principle (6) 83:3,24 87:21 principles (2) 47:14 158:7 prior (11) 28:24 83:13 98:22 109:9 118:11 156:21 157:18 162:4 164:1 169:4 67:14 68:18 174:25 196:18 problem (5) 43:11 54:15 problems (2) 37:20 126:19 procedure (8) 2:9 34:5 46:15 60:18 91:14,14 152:8 procedures (18) 40:2,16 45:1 46:5,9 52:7 53:21 56:4,22 62.13 101.12 109.2 133.14 145-19 158-16 163-5 11 proceed (3) 39:2 56:5 156:12 process (52) 26:22 32:20,23 34:5 39:8 41:2,5 42:13 52.16 20 60.18 63.20 75:8.23 76:5 79:23 80:22 81:2 91:5 100:9 101:19,23 103:12,12,21 116:5,14 162:20 163:15,16,21,23 165:11,15 167:21 178:4 processes (21) 39:10 45:12 59:4 62:13 64:3 96:17 produced (2) 162:5 166:19 product (142) 4:16 5:8,9,22 6:1 7:25 8:16 10:12 11:7 12:16 15:19 16:8 19:4,17 20:20,21,25 21:3,4,8,21 24:6 26:8,21 27:17,22 33:17 40:14 41:18 51:9 58:14.21 62:22 63:15.18 67:12,13,16,19 76:19,22 77:17,24 87:1,6,12 98:12 104:12 105:5,21 107:19 110.11 111.17 114.4 117:16 122:13,15 125:16 135:2,6,8,10,12,19,23 136:2,12,14 138:19,21 139:20 140:1 141:20.21.22 147:4,10,11,21 148:2,18 149:11.17.20.22 150:5 151:11 152:20 153:2 154:2 172:12,18 173:4,13 176:16 178:4,5,16,20,20 179:3,17 180:13 181:16,21 183:6,14 187:4.17 190:6 192:16 15:6 17:20,23

production (8) 33:25 34:1

18:6.14.18.22 20:24

35.3 162.20 22 24 163:7.15 products (54) 3:19 7:17 8:12.17 19:23 20:15 22:1.13 24:3 26:3 28:8 34:11 40:20 59:16 60:15 67:23 76:13 77:1 92:19 109:5 114:23 117:18 124:20 138:8,13,17 141:19 143:16 144:8 147:2.8.25 148:14 149:8.18 150:13 151:7.16 152:14 154:10.24 158:22 162:14 19 25 163:17 164:3 165:3,9,12 172:10,25 173:16 176:24 professional (7) 7:15,23 10:2 11:5,15 54:4 182:20 professionals (2) 9:24 26:21 profit (2) 49:18.20 progress (1) 37:21 project (49) 28:2 33:5 35:17 41:14,21,22 42:2,16 43:4,8 44:15 45:6.13.15 46:3,19,22 47:8,12,20,24 48:1,14 49:4,11 60:6,12 61:11,13 110:3 116:22 130-3 11 131-5 9 11 132.20 133.18 138.12 139:19 144:22 145:14 155:9 157:17 164:7 165:23 196:9.11.15 projects (2) 34:18,23 pronounce (1) 147:3 proof (1) 165:15 propagation (1) 69:15 proper (4) 72:3 194:12 195:5,9 properly (3) 85:12,14,23 properties (4) 11:7 132:1,5,9 proportionate (1) 99:5 proposed (1) 170:13 proposes (2) 169:14 192:22 proposing (1) 168:13 protects (2) 23:10,25 protracted (1) 35:18 provide (7) 35:3 51:6,16 100:4 122:1 132:4 174:5 provided (22) 16:22 22:19 31:15 39:25 56:24 60:14 94:18 98:9 102:15 118:10.21 128:21 131:25 132:8 133:10.16 142:22.25 148:6 156:21 164:6 172:19 provides (3) 62:3 181:18 183:12 providing (2) 58:23 133:15 provision (1) 32:17 provisions (4) 142:14 171:19.25 173:14 public (3) 69:25 70:7 85:16 publication (4) 109:19 167:12.16 168:9 publications (1) 85:1 published (13) 88:9,21 108:21 109:10,13,16,24 166.25 167.3 8 25 168:5.13 purpose (11) 27:6 39:20 67:22 68:11 120:25 121:9.14 124:20 171:5 194:10,11 purposes (5) 7:18 14:9 17:25 147:9 169:4 putting (3) 75:1 126:17 131:7 nuzzled (1) 15:8 pvdf (6) 21:13,22 22:2 23:9.16.24 Q q (496) 2:24 6:11,18 7:1.7.12.15 8:2.7.19.24 9:4,16,23 10:6,19 11:5,12 12:1,10 13:11,16,25 14:20

21:7.12.21.25 22:7.11.15 23:1.23 24:8.16 25:15.18.23 26:14.19.25 27:10.18.24.28:6.13 29:2.7.10.14 31:2 32:22 33:1 34:19,22,25 35:10 36:2.6.9.14.21 37:5 38:7,14 39:11,20 40:6,19 41:6,12,20 42:12 43:4.15.18.24 44:11.15.20 45:5.14.20 46:1.9.16 47:5.17.25.48:10.19 49:3.10.16.50:1.5.7 51:11,19 53:9,12,18 54:1,12,20 56:7,15,19,23 59:1,7,15,20 61:20 62:1,16,19 63:6,11,16,23 64:8.13 66:25 67:3.6.10.16.19 68:1.14.20.24.69:3.5 71:9,12,16,20 72:1,10,22 73:6,10,16,23 74:2.9.13.16.25 75:7,11,16,19,24 76:7,11,24 77:20 78:3,12,20,24 79:1 80.12 17 81.1 13 21 83.7 13 19 84.2 17 85.9 19 86:7,12,21 87:11,16,23 88:1,8,16,23,25 89:5.10.15.23.25 90:25 91:10.14.18.21.24 92:10,17,23 93:2,6,9,16,21 94:1,11,16,20,23 95:3,22 96.2 11 16 22 97.4 16 98.1 99:1.6 100:4.12.15 101:14,19,23 102:3,10,16,23 103:3.11.16.23 104:15.21 105:7,14 108:15,21,24 109:4,8,18,23 110:1,7,17 111:5,8,11,16,20,24 112:2.9.12.17.19.22 113:3.10.19.24 114:7.13.19.24 115:2,8,11,18,21 116:1,14 117:3,10,19,22 118:3,7,18 119:6,11,16,20 120:2,6,11,16,20 121:8,15,21 122:7,12,25 123:6.16.25 124:9.15.17 125:3.23 127:16.19 129:7.12.17.25 130:7,14,17,23 131:4,9,13,18,20 132:7,14,16 133:14,19,25 134:11 135:7,11,17,22 136:3,9,18,23 137:11,14,17 138:2,11,20 139:7 140:7,11,22 141:4.16 142:1.6 144:17 145:7.18.25 146:4.8.24 147:20,24 148:5,9,11 149:16 150:3,11 151:1,13,21 152:4,11,16 154:9.13.23 155:7.16.21 156:1.19.24 157:3.8.14.20.24 158:10.13.19 159:3,7,11,24 160:5,11,14 162:7 163:9,25 164:9,16,25 165:8,17 166:2,5,8,17,21 167:6.10.15.18.22 168:3.7 169:6,10,12 170:7.12.17.23 171:8 173:2.7 174:1.8.18 175:16.22 176:5.9.12 177:5,16 178:1,7,14 179:1,10,19 181:1 182:16,23 183:5,10,19,24 184:4,9,15,24 185:4.7.11.15.23 186:9.17 188:8.19 189:1.16 190:1.11.13 191:4.15.21

192:3 193:1,4,21 194:1

195:13.16.23 196:2.5.11.13.19 197:1.6.9.14 ga (2) 88:9.20 qualification (2) 124:19 127:8 qualified (11) 70:15 83:2 85:12,14,23 111:24 121:5 126:1 147:15 155:3,12 qualify (1) 190:19 qualifying (1) 191:6 quality (14) 34:5 37:8 60:18.23 62:4 162:23.24 163:2,5,11,24 164:7 165:20.24 queries (3) 115:2,5,8 question (44) 4:1,1 11:11 13:7.24 15:2.4 18:18 36:23 40:11 45:5.8 46:1 54:12 70:8 85:19 90:2.3 96:14.20 97:21 107:23 119:20 128:8,8,9 134:14,14,24 144:4 146:10.20 148:20 151:23 160:22 161:17 172:3,4 174:20 175:5 181:16,21 183:14 184:12 questioning (2) 55:6 77:4 questions (18) 2:18.20.24 3:2 18:23 58:8 64:13 86:22 92:11 105:20 107:13 111:12 127:6 137:2 144:16 161:1 191:9 199:5 quickly (2) 78:15 139:24 quite (8) 15:12 24:7 26:4 72:5 78:20 131:8 136:3 151:1 quote (3) 17:17 65:17 186:22 quoted (5) 15:18 17:18 19:25 20:8 21:13 quotes (1) 81:25 quoting (2) 4:10 27:13 R rainscreen (12) 110:9 118:22 119:1 122:15,19 168:17 172:17 173:17 189:22 190:1,9 192:21 raise (2) 2:14 184:14 raised (4) 26:9 70:4 89:23 99:23 ramkorun (8) 131:3 185:2.5 192:7 193:6 194:2 196:11,20 randall (9) 95:5,18,22 96:3,5,16,24 97:14,18 range (5) 20:3 22:19 25:8,9 140:1 rare (4) 187:8,25 188:18,21 rather (6) 11:16 16:9 111:12 115:24 116:24 144:11 rating (10) 87:2,8,12 88:5 137:7,12,15 158:24,25 173.18 ratings (1) 17:13 rationale (3) 74:19 175:23 176:3 raw (4) 34:3 60:17 163:4.10 re (2) 28:19 186:22 reached (1) 158:21 reacted (1) 78:10 reaction (12) 3:11 4:19 5:19 7:24 19:13 22:24 25:5.25 63:14 156:16 182:8.17 read (36) 7:20.23 8:6.17 10:2,13 11:3,16,21,22 12:17 14:20 15:11 23:22.23 47:14 103:4 112:6 113:22,25 114:10 124:22 126:5 154:9 160:8 167:2 169:2 177:21.22.22 178:8 179:16 183:5.19 184:20 186:5 reader (17) 11:3 12:21 23:14 112:5 114:7,13 121:19

reads (2) 65:15 97:11 ready (8) 57:22 58:3.6 107:10.14 161:15.21.24 realised (1) 178:8 reality (2) 27:25 49:16 really (14) 26:4 38:11 47:3 67:23 70:13,14 80:11 96:14 97:21 120:9 127:7 139-6 141-18 183-2 realworld (1) 121:6 reason (27) 5:17 19:24 25:19 37:23 52:11 54:18 56:21 70:22 74:22 83:11 97:25 105:4 119:16 138:3 141:10 154:5 157:8 159:21 160:3.12 167:10 174:9 175.6 11 180.4 189.7 197:14 reasonable (5) 79:16 90:16,22 149:5 160:17 reasoning (2) 174:2,12 reasons (4) 54:16 128:24 136:16 175:14 reassurance (2) 38:25 53:6 recalcitrant (1) 36:2 recall (42) 6.9 26.14 28.23 29:7,10,13 45:9 62:14,16 67:18 68:23 74:1,7,12 89:7,13,19 91:5,13 94:18 96:19 101:22 102:1.9.21 108:3,19 115:23 117:21 119:22 120:5,9,19 129:14 144.10 152.15 157.7 168.1 169:5 186:4 194:14 195:18 receipt (3) 55:20 182:5,15 receive (6) 2:5 37:21 38:2 115:2,5 156:24 received (13) 51:23 56:5 89:8 102:6 156:8,12 157:4,15 158:1 168:20 169:6 182:9 196:13 receiving (1) 88:19 recent (1) 60:23 recently (4) 168:20 174:23 175:6 181:23 recognised (3) 43:22 104:4,10 recognition (1) 83:23 recommended (2) 99:19,22 recommending (1) 26:20 recommends (1) 40:22 record (7) 38:2 74:17,17 91:18,24 132:23 175:17 recorded (2) 7:19 132:14 records (7) 94:13,14 109:21 156:8 175:12,15 191:25 recourse (1) 125:7 recur (1) 189:15 redirected (1) 182:11 reduces (1) 28:9 reducing (1) 28:7 refer (12) 10:3 27:23 30:25 71:2 74:6 77:11 96:19 99.21 112.4 134.21 135.2 189:18 reference (46) 4:5 15:20 17:18 35:13 39:21 64:23 68:2 77:10 82:17.19 83:20 88:17 98:12,15 100:6 122:25 125:4 128:25 129:7.13 172:5.9.24 174:3.9.25 175:1.2 178:9 179:2,3,22 180:17,22 181:24 182:24.25 183:5 187:2.7.15.18 188:9.22 195:2 196:5 referenced (1) 144:9 references (6) 17:20 62:23 63:7 105:10 180:4 187:20 referred (10) 14:12 48:15 95:8 96:3,6 105:4 118:15 148:1 151:8 193:14 referring (8) 25:24 33:18 121:9 125:14 149:18

pretty (1) 74:25

123:22 125:7,9,24 135:11

170:9 178:8.15 179:1.6

196:11.14.24 refers (6) 13:15 73:17 81:25 105:6,11 195:5 reflecting (1) 75:16 regard (2) 58:17.25 regarded (27) 3:11,19 5:19 6:19 7:4 8:12,18,21 12:15 13:5,6,12,16,19,20,23 14:1,5,7,11,23 18:8,20 87:18 88:4 104:3 126:20 regarding (5) 15:4 34:1 79:13 181:10 186:24 regardless (2) 84:3 126:10 regards (2) 28:21 182:6 regime (1) 64:15 regret (3) 160:9,14,15 regs (1) 80:2 regular (5) 42:8 44:21 48:25 92:24 130:18 regularly (2) 127:14,17 regulation (1) 69:13 regulations (16) 3:10,21 5:18 9:7,21 65:2,6 80:21 85:18 111:8 142:13 171:16 173:20 180:3 181:14 187:21 regulatory (4) 64:15 76:20 81.24 91.6 reigniting (1) 77:7 reissue (21) 30:2,6,9 64:4,5,6 76:9 84:7 93:22 98:17.22 100:9.11 104:22 112:14 158:5,5 187:6 189:10 194:15 195:19 reissued (10) 79:24 93:17.22 103:18.20 115:16 159:17 180:25 190:21 191:13 reiterate (2) 112:6 171:4 relate (3) 13:9 59:8 180:7 related (7) 69:11 93:21 115:6 172:24 173:15 174:21,25 relates (8) 14:15,17 119:20 122:18 133:6 134:19 135:4 172:10 relating (9) 31:13 57:12 75:11 99:13 152:24 165:20 173:13 192:18 198:6 relation (31) 3:8,10,15,20 5:18 13:12 17:15 70:10 71:21 74:7 76:4 93:13 98:11 99:15 100:2 101:2 110:18 115:3 117:24 123:1 125:25 126:7 127:2 146:6 159:7 165:18 168:21 169:15,16 171:11 191:11 relationship (3) 58:25 107:25 137:19 relevant (13) 6:6 9:17 18:15 58:20 59:3,16 61:2 64:14 99:21 101:15 116:15 131:7 146:14 relied (2) 59:5 91:8 rely (2) 11:6,9 relying (4) 120:22 138:8 139:4 142:4 remained (1) 30:21 remaining (2) 64:9 161:1 remains (1) 40:23 remember (20) 24:14 34:22 67:8,24 68:16 87:5,9 88:7 90:5 91:2 104:20 112:12.17.18 113:5 120:2.11 184:21 186:7 190:12 removal (1) 180:17 remove (3) 7:10 63:7 105:2 removed (13) 62:24 104:2.9 112:14,19 179:23 180:5 181:24 187:5,19,25 188:9,12 removing (1) 112:18 remy (2) 62:3,6 reoccur (1) 56:22 repeat (2) 78:16 158:4 repeated (2) 61:22 117:6

repeating (2) 85:6 180:2 rephrase (2) 11:11 103:2 replacement (2) 112:15 115:16 replicate (1) 145:20 replicated (2) 119:13,15 reply (7) 37:18 61:1 132:23 156:9 192:22,23,24 report (31) 20:2 22:18 25:7 37:25 50:11.13 88:11 93:25 94:1.3.11 95:9 101:25 102:4 103:3 118:10 128:12.22.25 129:7,12,19,20,23 133:5 134:4 147:11 150:16,23 153:20 154:22 reported (1) 159:6 reports (29) 27:16 50:20 51:6 55:12 79:15 143:11.12.15.18 144:2,7,13,22,24 145:5,15 146:14 147:2 149:2 152:9.24 153:3.23.25 154:9,15,19 157:7 160:17 represent (2) 37:3 65:3 representative (3) 98:10 121.17 124.6 representing (1) 95:1 reproduce (1) 121:2 reproduced (3) 187:11 189:21 191:22 request (8) 23:12 35:14 50:19 61:5,22 98:7 105:14 132:23 requested (5) 48:12 56:25 62:17 156:13 157:10 requesting (2) 99:2 132:22 requests (11) 35:18,20,22 36:12 41:7,12 48:21 51:24 56:3 61:14 102:11 require (7) 5:1 22:21 35:2 60:14 77:12 129:22 133:5 required (15) 5:5 37:21 60:13 62:23 64:22 66:4 69:24 104:19 125:7.9.13 141:22 143:11 173:19 194:9 requirement (5) 9:9,9 66:2 69:17 72:21 requirements (24) 4:19,24 5:22 9:13 18 11:14 24 16:20 46:23 65:1 72:6.20 78:8 80:20 81:24 82:5.7 83:12 86:9 101:4,7 122:2,3 172:19 requires (4) 47:22 69:14 129:23 192:8 requiring (2) 5:14 146:14 research (3) 69:22 70:6 84:25 resist (1) 69:15 resistance (1) 118:4 respect (8) 5:20 77:3 91:11 97:21 110:3 123:12 124:9 181:4 respectively (1) 110:5 respond (3) 36:11 56:3 62:2 responded (4) 52:24 54:13 182:14 184:13 responding (2) 36:19.22 responds (1) 194:2 response (30) 13:7 28:16 36:4,6,6,7,22 48:23 51:23 52:19 53:1 54:17.19.25 55:20 56:5 91:25 133:8,15 134:18 137:5 156:6 168:23 170:24 184:16.22 186:11.19 191:9.18 responsibility (7) 62:22 63:17 95:19 109:6 157:14,24 158:3 responsible (9) 41:1 60:7 77:15 85:17 109:1 145:9 155:22 181:13 182:20 rest (2) 26:12 160:8 restrict (1) 68:12

restricted (4) 66:10 77:25 83:4 125:21 restriction (16) 27:8 70:12:23 71:2:10 72:24 75:1 83:11 84:23 93:18 98:16 123:20 172:13,19 176:19 177:19 restrictions (5) 17:1 64:24 65:5 76:8 126:7 result (7) 5:4,10 19:17 24:12 98:19 136:1 187:19 resulted (1) 168:4 results (12) 5:3 8:15 10:10 25:8 27:13 104:5,6 121:6 128:20 129:2 130:2 159:4 retained (2) 103:9 109:21 retardant (1) 21:8 retested (1) 59:17 retesting (1) 40:20 return (4) 31:3 74:2 106:11 191:17 returned (2) 182:13,17 reveal (1) 148:5 review (54) 29:22,24,24 30:1,4,6,25 32:19,22 33:2,12 35:3,25 36:15 37:22.25 41:5.23 42:3.18 43.20 46.16 24 25 25 49:17,21 52:10,20 53:10 54:4,6 59:21,22 60:7,13 61:1,17,18 63:25 64:4,20 93:21 94:12 101:19.23 102:5 187:10 189:17,20 190:11 191:16 193:13,22 reviewed (10) 28:3 47:8 79:23 99:11 103:19 130:11,13,14 157:18 188:11 reviewing (1) 28:23 reviews (19) 3:2 29:16,19 30:12,13,18,20 31:3 49:4,5,12 50:3 51:24 54:1 55:16 61:14 91:11 92:12 180:15 revise (1) 180:9 revised (5) 12:23 100:23 103:1,6 181:24 revision (2) 180:6 194:25 revisions (1) 104:19 revisiting (1) 76:1 reward (1) 49:8 rewording (1) 180:14 revnobond (28) 3:1 4:2 5:9,12 24:25 25:19 27:25 28:3 31:7 50:9,14,15,20,22 58:20,25 59:16 60:3 87:1,6,23 88:4 91:12 93:14 95:19 102:18 103:18 105:16 reynolux (1) 62:8 righthand (5) 9:10 23:8 94:4.6 98:6 rigid (2) 68:12 122:19 risk (6) 4:15 25:9 99:18 142:11 143:10 171:14 risks (2) 85:13,15 rivet (6) 17:23 18:3,19 27:14 50:14.21 riveted (4) 16:11 18:4.7 27:17 rivetfix (1) 18:8 riveting (1) 27:23 robust (2) 116:19 117:8 role (5) 38:3 71:6 117:15 120:25 170:17 roofing (1) 147:10 room (2) 1:22 2:4 roughly (1) 66:24 route (2) 72:14 73:20 run (2) 1:18 106:5 rush (1) 161:4 rushing (1) 161:3

s3 (2) 95:9 96:12

safety (14) 41:19 53:24 63:22 68:24 76:12 77:1.8.21 84:19 181:9 182:1 183:20.23 184:1 sake (1) 1:19 salesperson (1) 90:14 sam (1) 95:11 same (36) 2:9 5:14,25 17:25 21:16 23:21 43:10 61:20 117:22 118:14 119:16 122.9 127.22 136.16 139:25 151:1.11 154:24 162:15 163:4,4,5,5,6,10,10,11,12 171:14 185:18,19 189:24 190:7,10 193:16 194:4 sample (4) 20:22,25 21:8,21 sanctions (1) 52:7 sarah (2) 26:16 120:7 sarking (1) 153:9 satisfied (2) 133:22 181:17 satisfy (3) 4:24 72:14 177:10 saw (6) 23:11 35:10,17 80:13 94:20 116:2 saying (44) 9:23 10:6 13:4,11,13 14:4,7 21:2,7 22.12 24.2 27.19 36.16 42.12 22 45.20 46.10 48.3 50:11 52:24 67:10 72:22 81:8 83:15 84:20 100:12 114:7 121:9 133:2 134:5 148:23 149:7 150:3 151:13 159:24 163:25 164:4 168:18 171:24 178:7 179:1 183-10 184-9 195-23 scale (2) 16:19 165:14 scenario (10) 43:11 44:8 45:10 46:21 48:24 119:4,8 149:25 151:1.10 scenarios (1) 45:18 schmidt (1) 60:2 scientific (4) 111:13 113:1 115:21 155:7 scientist (3) 90:12 91:4 193:1 scientists (2) 90:15,22 scope (16) 21:25 22:4,5,7 64:10 65:3 92:20 93:21 110:11 122:13,15 141:19 150:17,20,22 192:17 scotland (1) 99:18 scratching (1) 83:14 screen (2) 61:9 97:6 scrutinise (1) 39:20 sealants (2) 66:17 176:17 second (44) 3:23 9:8 11:10 12:11,24 13:2 15:8 16:3 17:5,6 19:9 23:4 24:19 25:2 29:24 33:19 51:19 55:8 64:16 79:10 92:18 93:16.21 94:24 103:24 104:2.25 108:19.21 118:14 128:8 134:22 153:6 156:10 167:1 170:21 180:6 183:10 191:2 195:11,16,17,17 196:6 section (60) 3:14,16 7:24 8:17 9:6 10:4 11:2 12:21 13:21 15:16 20:11 24:1.4 26:2 28:24 29:11 64:19.22 65:15 66:1,13 67:21 68:10 82:1,21 95:8,9 99:13,21 100:6 110:22 112:5.10 114:1.6.17.21 117:23.25 122:13 126:8 127:21 134:22 135:3.17 140:19 142:7.10 168:22 169:8 171:10.12 172:6.11.15 176:21 177:13,23 180:6,18 sections (9) 3:17 8:11 13:22 20:6,9,18 95:8 180:14 192:14 sector (1) 108:10 see (182) 1:13 2:25 3:8.13.25 9:8.10.14.23 13:21 15:6 16:2 17:20

20:11 21:12 23:5.23 24:20 26.25 27.24 30.12 31:9.10.12.17.32:4.33:20 34:3.7.22 35:7 36:14 38:7 42:12 46:17.20.22 47:3 52:11 57:5,24 60:1 61:9 62:19 63:24 65:7 66:14 72:22 73:16 74:16 75:11 79:7 80:5 83:7 84:17 86:21.23 87:11.16.17.19 88:14,17 91:24 92:10 93:6 94:3.25 97:5.25 98:1.4.17 99:1.6.9.100:12.25 104:21,24 105:7,8,9 106:22 107:7,23 109:18 110:8,10,13,18,21,24 114:24 116:1 117:3.10.23.25 118:18 121:15 122:14.16.23 125:23 126:23 127:22.23 130:7,14 132:25 133:6 134:8,9,12 137:9 138:2 140:7.22 142:6.9.18.19 143:3 145:7 150:11 151:7 152:4 153:8 156:3,5,17 158:10 159:24 160:19 161-1 11 18 163-25 164-25 165.17 166.2 5 10 13 15 169:15 171:8,21 173:7 174:17 175:20,21,22 176:1.19 179:1.10.19 181:1.7 184:15.17 185:23 188:6,8,19 189:16,18,22 190:10,11,13 191:15 192:3.7 193:5.21 194:2 195:17.23 198:10 seeing (2) 57:16 157:7 seek (5) 72:3 84:7 116:7 126:18 150:18 seeking (6) 50:16 71:20 78:12 126:22 127:7 161:4 seems (7) 52:17 69:12 82:5 157:3 175:8 187:7 195:2 seen (13) 9:3 14:8 40:21 61:20 93:25 100:19 101:1 142:3 157:6 159:6 163:14,16 169:3 sell (1) 105:15 send (2) 15:25 193:5 sending (1) 88:1 sends (3) 37:13 62:6 79:5 senior (3) 39:5 144:5 193:1 sense (1) 61:4 sensible (1) 178:5 sent (18) 35:10,11,17,20,22 46:25 47:5 59:24 60:2 61:4 79:8 80:6 86:15 182:10 184:22 185:8 193:15 194:18 sentence (13) 11:20 14:24 15:9 23:24 97:6 112:8.9.13 114:8 125:24 134:13 135:20 169:24 separate (2) 47:5 69:14 september (3) 88:14 105:2 156.6 series (4) 143:15 144:7,13 192:4 serious (5) 28:6 182:1 183:20.23 184:1 set (6) 32:15 131:21 139:14 157:7 170:7 184:5 sets (3) 4:19 169:13 192:22 setting (2) 37:9 175:23 several (2) 35:21 37:20 severe (1) 37:22 shall (2) 32:7 107:12 share (2) 59:12.16 shared (1) 76:17 sharing (3) 36:10 58:19 59:2 sheets (1) 60:24 shes (2) 44:8 196:24 short (6) 57:19 58:8 107:2 161:6.13 172:4 shortly (5) 80:6 89:2 93:10

should (66) 10:9 11:5,9,19 19:5 26:20 27:15 32:20 38:6 41:9 11.23 42:8.13.13.18.44:17.25 45:7.21 49:22 55:14 62:16 66:18 68:10,12 72:13 80:18.19 81:3.4.11 82:10,12 84:1 100:4 101:25 109:15 112:6,7 114:8.10.13 129:2 132:15 133:14.17 145:22 154:17.19.23 155:1 158:13.13 167:20 171:2.5 175:16 176:18 177:1 178:12 179:16 181:19 183:13 189:5 190:6 shouldnt (5) 41:10,13 56:23 124:17 126:20 show (1) 4:14 showed (1) 159:5 showing (2) 50:2 156:25 shown (2) 6:2,3 side (8) 9:10 23:8 31:11 32:4 94:4,6 98:6 116:9 sides (1) 154:25 signature (2) 47:22 157:22 signed (9) 30:3 34:7 37:8 110.14 117.13 156.2 159:11 165:24 192:19 significance (7) 76:21 78:1,17,19 84:13 85:6 180:22 significant (9) 26:7 52:4 53:9 73:17 75:5 158:23 175:13 176.5 6 significantly (1) 189:14 signing (2) 116:24 160:14 signoff (1) 155:22 similar (33) 3:13 4:14 12:17 17:4 35:11,12 66:17 143:15,16 144:7,8 148:15,15,16,19 149:8,10,11,19,19,21,22,25 150:5 151:16 158:21 162:14.16.19 165:10.11 176:17 194:11 simon (1) 156:3 simple (2) 41:9 189:6 since (7) 65:21 116:21 137:24 172:16 180:11 189:11 191:13 single (6) 7:22 11:20 74:23 112:7 176:3 178:3 sir (44) 1:4,11,16,18,24 2:3,8,17 15:7,21,23 55:7 57:8,15,21 58:2,5 69:9,19 70:4,8,18 105:22 106:2,9,15,22,25 107:4.9.12 126:9.17 127:1.10 160:22 161:4.15.20.23 197:22.24 198:9.12 site (1) 121:2 sitting (1) 167:24 situation (13) 36:13,17 39:12 40:3.16 42:7 48:21 53:22 91:6 125:17 151:14 175:9 191:10 situations (9) 4:25 5:5.10.14.23 36:25 44:10 45:19 165:13 six (1) 35:20 sixmonthly (1) 163:18 slight (1) 89:20 slightly (12) 15:8 18:1 22:4 42:5.23 69:11 81:19 91:3,5 105:25 106:10.16 slipped (1) 193:10 slow (3) 36:11,18,22 small (1) 166:13 smoke (1) 110:21 solely (4) 13:12 72:22 73:6 93:13 somebody (4) 23:23 150:10

157:24 195:1

104:23 168:8

somehow (1) 67:22

someone (9) 26:18 40:17 41:17 89:11 97:23 133:21 144:12 158:13 193:11 something (23) 3:13 8:21 9:20 17:4 25:1 41:15 61:11 63:11,19 104:16 108:14 109:23 113:14,17 138:4 139:9 148:20,21,23 152:2 167:25 175:5 178:6 ometimes (1) 56:17 somewhere (1) 111:8 soon (1) 182:4 sort (1) 70:9 sought (1) 30:16 sounded (1) 149:1 sounds (2) 106:9 150:3 source (2) 73:7 128:2 sources (3) 38:12 52:1 73:14 space (1) 12:19 sparse (1) 175:15 speak (5) 39:3 44:23 117:19 136:9,13 specialise (1) 139:20 specialising (1) 71:5 specialist (2) 71:14 140:2 specific (38) 2:25 13:7,9,15 15.2 18.11 14 19.23 25 20.8 21 22.1 13 17 17 24:3,3 25:6 26:1 27:17 28:8 29:9 45:9 70:13 84:3 125:11 126:24 134:20 135:4 144:23 145:17 169:23 170:1,3,10 180:18 188:9 191:11 specifically (10) 6:8 30:15 69:7 76:4 77:11 92:17 115:6,16 132:3,6 specification (5) 23:5 32:14 33:22 61:6 147:13 specifics (4) 90:5 91:2 94:22 120:14 specified (4) 31:22,25 127:14.17 specifier (7) 28:10 121:18 124:21 125:18 126:3 129:1 177:22 specify (2) 33:24 170:2 specifying (1) 76:22 speculate (3) 111:10,12 196:12 speculating (1) 188:22 speculation (2) 44:22,23 speedy (1) 170:23 spoke (3) 26:15 45:23 136:11 spoken (1) 174:1 spotted (1) 67:3 spread (4) 9:10 99:17 128:2 156:17 st (3) 105:2,3,5 staff (18) 74:21 89:1.17.18.21.22 90:8.20 116:7.11.15.17.23 131:7.7 139:12 163:6,12 stage (15) 10:25 50:5,7 74:3,11 111:11 118:23 119:21 120:20 140:23 142:22 157:11 170:17 173:22 174:1 stages (14) 66:20 110:21 111:2.22 113:13 114:15 135:1 136:13 138:22 140:13 147:20 159:14 169:19 170:21 stand (1) 83:6 standalone (2) 125:6,8 standard (25) 4:15,21 5:9,13 6:1 7:25 14:16 17:14 14 20:22.25 25:15 26:23 46:24,25 61:10,17,18,23 64:3 101:15 104:7 105:5,6 128:25 standards (6) 93:4,6 144:25 151:22 152:3 180:5 stands (1) 43:23 start (6) 2:24 39:16 47:9 75:1 144:10 192:5

v

vaguely (1) 84:17

started (3) 29:23,25 30:4 starts (1) 4:8 stated (15) 33:10 51:3 63:8 74:14 79:25 80:9.18 81:3 127:25 128:3 134:6.9 135:4 143:9 183:22 statement (122) 3:24 6:4,13,23,25 7:10,17,22 9:19,22 10:3 11:15 12:8,11 13:5 14:6 15:13 16:3.4 17:4.5.6 19:9 23:12 24:9 25:4 26:17 34:15 20 51:20 53:14 19 55:9 56:7 64:16,19 65:10 82:17 83:19 86:23 87:4 92:18 103:24 104:17 107:21,21 110:2 111:23,25 112:24 113:2 114:2.14 115:22.25 117:14 118:7.9 125:3.25 126:18 128:7.17 131:20 132:7,16 134:11 135:22 136:10,11,14,23 137:3,22 138:14.24 139:8 140:19 141:5 142:3 143:1,19 144:2,10 146:1,8 152:16 153:6 156:19 159:2,19 160.1 2 11 18 162.7 166.21 171.6 172.2 173:1,6,8,12,25 174:8 178:17 179:20 185:25 186:6.11.15 187:13.22 188:3.6.22 191:6.6 194:15 195:13,19,24 statements (9) 8:2 12:7 17:11 23:17 142:24 145:24 158:17 174:6 188:15 states (7) 5:18 12:14 14:22 143:6 156:10 171:13 172:11 stating (4) 5:25 80:14 183:6,8 statutory (3) 83:12,25 125:14 staying (1) 194:1 steel (1) 122:21 steelframe (9) 122:25 123:9,10,13,15,18 124:2,17 126:1 steelframed (1) 127:5 step (1) 63:24 stephen (1) 120:7 stepping (1) 27:1 steps (9) 47:23 73:4 75:25 84:6,21 88:2,6 155:18,21 still (15) 17:23 18:7,20 40:23 80:23 83:3 85:25 116:8 160:23 166:11,17 171:13 185:17,17 197:12 stonelite (1) 33:19 stop (3) 106:10,17 198:4 storey (4) 66:15 123:2 176:15.25 straightforward (3) 81:11 167:21 189:6 string (1) 60:1 stronger (2) 79:25 80:9 structural (1) 23:19 structures (1) 123:9 struggling (3) 46:22 91:2 95:24 study (1) 154:12 style (1) 180:11 stylistic (1) 180:19 sub (1) 192:13 subject (10) 31:14,22,24 32:15 119:24 120:3 133:6 181:9 184:7 192:5 subjective (2) 46:14 160:2 subjectivity (2) 128:23 129:4 subsequent (3) 55:15 84:25 187:6 subsequently (7) 26:9 29:17 81:19 82:25 89:10 179:23 187:25 substance (1) 172:22 substantiate (1) 115:1

substrate (1) 123:8 subtle (1) 46:7 succeed (2) 37:7,10 sufficient (4) 39:6 56:13 72:8 178:22 suggest (7) 8:14 9:16 47:25 126:9 131:16 174:11,13 suggested (4) 54:9,15 72:12 168:23 suggesting (9) 11:12 42:20 127:1 139:3 146:4 148:9 151:10 170:24 174:15 suggestion (1) 173:5 suggests (1) 15:9 suitability (2) 22:25 31:22 suitable (5) 69:21 122:4 124:4,7 172:18 suitably (3) 121:5 147:15 155.3 suits (1) 160:21 summarise (2) 99:15 153:7 summarised (1) 153:23 summarising (1) 134:4 summary (10) 79:16 90:19 94:24 98:11,15 99:14 100:4,13 110:11 122:16 superseded (1) 166:25 supplied (2) 31:20 33:11 support (2) 104:13 125:15 supported (3) 100:21 102:19 138:25 supporting (6) 16:19 65:2 142:12 159:22 171:15 173:19 suppose (1) 160:12 supposed (2) 59:2 106:7 sure (20) 2:12 6:24 11:10 26:16 28:9 61:17 78:20 86:20 87:9 96:8.22 98:24 102:22 113:16 134:24 146:19,23 181:12 185:9,10 surely (3) 39:20 78:3 124:11 surface (13) 3:12,19 5:20 6:1.20 7:4 8:13 18:9 99:17 104:3.9.13 156:17 surfaces (2) 4:20 8:18 surprised (3) 26:8 45:2 61:24 surveillance (16) 37:9 52:16 59:3,9 62:4 92:24 94:8 100:22 102:24 103:4,11,12 163:20 164:14,22 165:4 survey (1) 33:17 suspend (4) 32:7,10 48:7 56:6 suspended (3) 39:10 44:10 56:23 suspension (19) 32:6,18 44:1,6,9,13 45:16 46:4,5,10,12 47:10,18,23 48:2,15 52:9 54:22,24 suspicion (2) 41:14.17 system (21) 4:23 5:3.4 10:14,16,24 19:19 79:17,19 118:22 119:1 120:22 129:23 135:5,10,15 157:13 173:17 190:5 194:8,8 systems (6) 14:17 17:15 92:19 101:7 139:9 172:17 table (4) 94:4 105:9,10 131:21 taken (20) 8:5 30:7 31:6 52:7 61:11 73:4 84:14 85:5 105:10 113:22.24 144:15 145:19 178:11,12 180:9 191:17 192:14 193:20,24 takes (1) 49:17 taking (9) 62:22 63:17 66:20 71:9 74:25 77:25 78:3 147:20 193:22 talk (4) 15:16 57:11 106:18 161:9 talked (1) 58:16

talking (8) 7:12,13 20:20 22:7.8 68:20 129:25 130:3 talks (1) 14:14 tally (1) 50:2 task (1) 1:11 team (14) 29:4 34:14 38:1 39:1,3,4 43:8,9 44:25 50:3 54:20 75:20 139:22,25 teams (5) 34:16,17 43:21 45.1.2 technical (45) 11:6 23:5 25:19 31:4 32:14 38:21 49:24 51:10 52:4 60:20 62:5,6 68:19 71:4 72:16,18 75:14 81:18,20 94:16 103:11 108:9,25 117:17 130:6,25 131:19,24 132:21 133:17 143:4 144:23 145:23 146:17.21 147:18 152:23 154:7 155:22 165:6 176:2 190:7 194:22 195:1 197:12 technically (1) 190:7 telephone (2) 35:21 91:16 telling (8) 14:1,3,11 83:7,19 148:22 164:10 188:19 tells (7) 23:6.8 109:23 110.19 127.4 142.10 15 temperature (1) 127:25 template (4) 61:17,18,24 62:15 ten (4) 137:23 138:8,18 139:4 tend (1) 174:11 term (2) 10:23 165:5 terms (38) 10:11.17.20 12:6 16:15 21:5 22:8 27:2,3,12 30:11,11,14,19,20,25 31:3,4,6 32:2 34:20 42:12,14 46:17,19,23 47:3 62:3 68:2 79:25 80:10 81:25 83:11 92:7 97:18 141:1 188:9,15 test (100) 5:2 10:4 16:1,20 18:11.14.15 19:7 20:1 23:1 25:7 26:19 27:16 40:4,8,15,19,21 50:8,9 51:6 55:12 59:12 69:23 82:4 100:21 102:17,19 104:5,13 118:1,1,4,10,12,14 120:21.25 121:3.9.17.23 122:1.8 123:7 124:6.15.23 127:20,25 128:20,22 129:20 130:2,17 131:14,15 132:22 133:21 134:19 135:4,5,6,10,10,14,15 141:7,11,17 142:21 143:11 144:13,22,24 146:14 147:2,11 149:2,22 150:16.20.22 151:22 152:3.9.13 153:5,9,10,12,23 156:20,25 157:5,15,25 158:15 159:4 194:9 tested (13) 8:1 13:10 19:20 22:23 87:24 122:9 134:20 153:11,14,16,18 169:22,25 testing (9) 11:8 19:14 20:12 25:6.25 86:25 87:6 123:8 144:18 tests (5) 6:6 15:13 40:22 50:12 156:25 text (9) 4:16 17:2 28:19,24 29:5,11 168:24 180:3 183:9 thank (42) 1:16.24 2:8.16.17.21 15:21 39:11 57:6,8,14,16,17 58:2,5,7 59:1,20 62:1 70:18 96:2 105:19 106:21,22,24,25 107:9,15 108:15,24 109:8 110:1 129:17 161:5,20,23,25 186:24 193:12 197:22 198:9.13

thanks (2) 28:18 161:11

141:9 145:19 148:4

thats (58) 2:7 3:6 7:6 12:12 15:24 21:5 22:4 26:17 30:5.10.32:17.33:6.34:15 35:19.22 40:25 46:14 54:7 59:7 69:17 72:23 85:19 87:14 107:21 109:5,16,18 110:13 111:5 113:17 114:16 118:13 120:17 121:15 129:7 132:2,11 134:24 135:22 137:13 139:8 141:18 142:19 149:13 151:4.17 164:16 167:9 169:25 171:9.14 174:16 176:7 187:21 193:2 196:9 198:2,12 themselves (4) 11:23 54:5 104:6 163:15 therefore (8) 22:24 95:13 99:18 128:1 142:13 144:19 171:18.24 therein (1) 128:13 theres (5) 23:7 49:7 89:20 120:18 178:17 thermal (8) 122:20 126:12 138:12 139:22 140:3,4,5,9 thermocouples (1) 128:1 theyre (3) 121:15,17 141:2 thickness (3) 150:21.22.24 thing (3) 41:10 151:4 178:3 thinking (4) 68:1 70:9 75:8 162:1 third (33) 3:8 14:24 23:6 24:20 25:3 31:20 94:25 95:3 97:7 99:10 107:20 110.2 19 118.8 18 19 128:6 131:20 134:11 139:7 146:8 152:16 162:7 166:21 169:12,15 172:2 173:8 179:20 186:10 189:18 195:6 196:20 thirdparty (1) 151:4 thorough (2) 32:20 193:21 though (7) 11:1 17:23 45:4 54:17 71:14 90:16 106:9 thought (16) 59:8 61:18 63:4 70:11,21 73:2 76:24 82:16 83:17 85:25 87:3 116:6 138:4 142:1 174:22 193:17 thoughts (2) 194:20 196:6 thouria (1) 1:8 three (13) 21:25 22:13 28:7 34:16 94:4 95:25 127:23 167:11 171:3 185:2.7.12 193:22 threehour (1) 101:21 through (9) 1:19 30:5 38:9 43:6 48:10 76:5 89:13 155:18 187:13 throughout (1) 105:5 thrust (4) 176:23 177:17,18 183:16 thursday (2) 6:21 27:15 tighter (1) 161:7 time (128) 8:22 10:14,18,21 11:3 18:21 25:20 26:2 30:14.14 32:8 34:9.10 35:1 36:13,25 39:1,12 42:2,21 43:21 44:22 45:22 46:18 48:22.22 49:10.15 50:10.16 52:17 53:6 54:21 55:14,20 56:1,11,20 57:1,2 59:21 60:11 61:12,14,19 62:13,15,21,24 64:3,5,8,14 68:1.22 69:12 70:10 72:4 73:21,25 75:13 77:4,16 78:1.11 82:24 83:14 18.22 84:11.16 85:25 87:15.23 88:7.9 89:9 94:11.17 95:7 99:24 102:16 103:22 106:7 110:15 112:19 113:5 116:17,21 117:8 124:12 127:25 129:16 130:10.20.22 131:6.12 132:13 137:21 138:1.7.10.17.24 139:5

151:13.15 155:11 158:14 159.24 167.15 168.7 174.2 175:9.16 178:23 180:20.21 182:15 190:20 191:2 192:2 193:1.6 timed (1) 184:18 times (2) 36:23 38:15 timescale (1) 131:8 tissue (6) 153:11.12.14.16.18.21 title (2) 165:24 186:23 today (6) 1:5 106:16 161:1,7 191:5 193:9 todays (2) 1:5 198:12 todds (1) 88:11 together (3) 11:16 138:5 154:11 told (13) 51:5 82:16 113:4 120:17 125:3 148:20.21 153:4 159:11 167:6 187:15,18,22 tomorrow (7) 106:6 160:25 197:19,23 198:1,5,10 too (2) 137:11 198:1 took (7) 11:3 33:2 81:15 88:3 92:12 165:19 191:7 topic (1) 74:2 topics (2) 106:14 161:2 total (1) 35:22 touch (2) 1:12 37:20 towards (1) 110:12 tower (13) 20:14,15 30:8 78:21,24 79:7,14 82:13 83:13 87:1,7 93:10 127:18 toxic (1) 110:21 training (7) 43:6 47:11 74:21 75:16 116:17,21 139:15 transcript (6) 35:13 90:1 113:10 143:22 148:12 174:19 transfer (1) 147:13 transition (3) 19:18 24:13 25:13 treated (1) 17:25 tried (5) 83:1.23 138:16 190:4 191:5 triggered (1) 67:16 true (3) 40:25 113:16 114:4 trust (3) 32:23 164:9,19 trying (5) 13:25 14:10 83:10 151:2 190:19 tuesday (1) 198:16 turn (3) 29:15 118:8 131:21 turnover (1) 131:7 twice (1) 184:7 twoday (1) 106:8 twoyear (1) 48:22 type (16) 21:23 94:6 130:21 143:17 147:18 164:24 180:13 185:19 189:5.15 190:6 191:25 193:11.18.20.24 types (3) 21:12 27:22 126:13 typically (1) 93:2 typographical (1) 33:18 11 uae (1) 70:21 uk (3) 60:20 62:5 105:16 ukas (45) 26:11 89:2,5,7,11 92:11,14,18,24 93:2,7,11 94:1,8,16 95:5,10,13,17,23 96:1.15.19 97:3.11.23 98:3.20 99:2.25 100:4 101:10,19 102:4,16,18,23 103:3,17 104:16,20 141:7,20 147:16 148:6 ultimately (4) 47:22 48:8 76:18 116:24 unable (2) 146:16 156:11 unaware (2) 55:21 182:19 uncertainty (1) 109:15 unchanged (1) 75:3 uncommon (1) 150:16 underestimate (1) 55:24 underlying (1) 40:21

undermine (2) 40:9 52:23 undermining (4) 38:16 47:7 48:13 51:1 underneath (4) 100:24 110:10 156:14 166:12 understand (45) 6:12 7:1,1 11:21 15:12 23:15 24:1 30:18 42:12 47:17 59:7 76:11 78:1,12,17 80:12 81:1 83:10 93:11 103:18 105:14 111:16.16 116:16:20 121:1 122:8.10 123:4 125:25 127:7 135:14 138:1,9 141:23 151:2 184:4,9,13 190:22,25 191:4 195:4 196:13,16 understanding (20) 30:24 44:11 52:3 61:16 70:25 79.15 91.6 105.17 121.4 137:4.11.14.18.22 138:7,15,16,24 139:5 141:14 understood (13) 10:23 29:21 47:12,16 61:8 77:16 80:8 85:15 121:10,13 148:13 184:12 198:8 undertaken (1) 101:3 undertaking (1) 59:9 undertook (1) 136:24 unfaced (1) 153:8 unfamiliar (1) 10:25 unfinished (2) 119:5,8 unfortunate (5) 136:6 187:8,24 188:18,20 unfortunately (2) 37:19 63:3 unique (5) 36:12,16,24 48:24 56:17 unknown (1) 147:7 unless (6) 19:25 106:11 151:10 152:7 154:6 192:10 unlikely (4) 82:5 121:1 140:20 195:2 unsatisfactory (4) 31:25 55:19 56:8.10 until (11) 56:23 59:5 77:13 85:8 109:13 136:4 156:12 164:21 166:25 191:11 198:15 unusual (12) 36:13,16,24 48:21,24 119:4,8 148:14,17 149:8 150:4 167:18 unwise (1) 106:12 update (3) 51:8 73:5 164:7 updated (7) 63:11 81:19 85:8 98:9 104:6 105:8 163:1 updates (2) 42:8 88:17 updating (5) 64:23 76:6 80:22 81:2 103:21 upon (3) 25:15 31:10 91:8 urgency (6) 63:12.13.16.21 77:19 171:1 urgent (2) 78:24 194:3 urgently (2) 76:14 193:9 used (61) 4:5,24 5:3,9,13 8:22 10:15 16:17 22:23 66:18 76:19 23 79:25 80:10.15.19 81:4.12 82:6.11.12 84:1 87:1.6.13 114:23 118:25 119:17 121:4,11,14 122:1 123:10 124:8.18 125:11.17 126:24 142:14 147:10 151:11 152:25 153:1,25 154:6,21 168:22 169:7 170:3 171:18.24 172:12.18 176:17.24 177:6 181:19 194:23 195:14 196:7,16 usefulness (2) 28:7,10 uselessness (1) 22:16 users (2) 31:24 33:17 using (3) 4:23 10:15 162:15 usual (3) 1:7 26:17 94:8

usually (1) 116:15

valentina (1) 29:19 valid (3) 40:24 185:17,19 validate (1) 40:1 validated (2) 163:22 164:14 validation (1) 164:21 value (4) 11:16 136:17 190:19 191:5 variant (1) 63:2 variety (1) 141:22 various (7) 23:9,20,25 131:23 147:2 152:25 156:14 varv (2) 64:6 165:15 ventilation (2) 34:14 108:13 verbal (3) 75:18 94:14 103:9 verbally (1) 74:20 verifiable (1) 39:22 version (13) 17:22,24 21:3,4 35:12 88:18 136:19 166:18 168:9 170:19 194:12 195:8 197:1 versions (3) 5:22 35:11 104:12 via (3) 82:4 139:13,14 views (1) 73:15 vintage (1) 79:23 visit (9) 89:5 93:12.16 94:1.7.7 104:20 164:22 165:4 visited (1) 89:2 visits (4) 44:3,7 59:9 89:11 void (1) 41:6 volume (10) 4:18 35:24 36:14 65:15 142:17.18 171:21.25 173:15 181:17 w waiting (2) 38:1 167:24 wales (7) 3:12,22 9:8 19:6 99:17 142:16 171:20 wall (19) 4:3 60:4 66:18 72:13 73:18 76:2 92:19 172:14,17 176:18,20,23,25 177:11 187:17 192:10,14 195:22,24 walls (15) 4:20 69:15 122:22 123:1.11 124:18 127:5 169:23 170:1.4 174:21 175:3.3 181:19 192:17 wants (1) 150:25 warrington (1) 26:6 warringtonfire (1) 71:23 wasnt (40) 25:16 34:20 40:10,19 48:20 56:15 63:6.11 73:10 74:25 76:13 77:16.24 81:7 82:17 89:8 91:4 96:18 116:5,14 117:12 119:3 120:10 124:18 130:20 132:12 147:21 148:3.13 149:4.8 158:10 168:1 170:5 176:5 182:14 183:2 188:5 189:25 191:7 way (30) 12:4 23:21 39:2 43:10 44:24 53:9 58:22 85:4 91:9 92:7 113:19 114:5 119:15 123:6 124:4 127:15 132:11 136:19,21 139:23 140:5 141:18 158:21 162:15.18 173:5 174:16 177:9 183:24 188:6 ways (2) 14:13 52:15 website (2) 88:13,21 wed (1) 148:17 week (2) 2:10 3:18 wehrle (2) 37:16 60:2 weight (1) 114:13 welcome (5) 1:4 57:21 107:4.9 161:15 went (4) 30:5 38:9 79:2 89:16 werent (4) 36:9 63:15 129:7 160:6

weve (11) 29:20 40:20 61:8	writing (9) 32:8 35:20 38:15	105 (1) 19:22	173:15 179:25 181:17	14:8,9,16 16:14 17:
105:4 121:23 122:14	86:18 87:5 92:5 132:14	106 (1) 19:24	184:18 194:1 199:5	142:18
140:14 187:13,14,23	137:21 139:6	107 (1) 20:4	20 (2) 79:6 81:15	430 (1) 197:19
197:25	written (24) 33:16,21	108 (1) 20:11	200 (1) 107:3	431 (1) 198:14
whatever (1) 23:16	35:4,14,22,23 37:10 44:15	109 (1) 20:12	2003 (3) 153:17,19,22	44 (1) 179:22
whats (1) 169:24	45:5,14 46:2,11 48:12	11 (8) 23:5 35:23 36:23	2004 (2) 156:2,6	44a (1) 141:6
whereas (1) 14:6	50:25 60:16 61:5,21 74:16	38:15 41:7,12 47:5 48:11	2006 (1) 176:12	45 (1) 197:20
.,			.,	
whereby (2) 56:4 190:5	82:23 102:6,10 116:22	111 (4) 12:13 14:20 15:8	2007 (4) 24:18 26:16 30:21	47 (1) 186:10
whistleblower (2) 89:1,6	133:15 175:23	166:22	31:2	476 (6) 6:5 18:12,15
white (1) 158:25	wrong (4) 70:24 89:8 150:4,6	1122 (1) 57:18	2008 (31) 3:1 4:2 28:25	144:22 157:7
whole (10) 25:9 31:14 34:3	wrongly (1) 51:3	113 (1) 172:7	59:18 79:22 88:3 107:25	4766 (12) 87:24 143:
94:21 115:6 126:5 135:20	wrote (8) 33:5 81:17,18 87:4	1140 (2) 57:10,20	108:4,7 109:11 110:7,13	144:18 151:22
176:23 177:21 179:16	125:13 138:24 168:11	12 (7) 30:4 60:2 93:12	117:1 119:7 123:1 127:13	153:4,11,14,17,20
wholly (5) 56:19 73:1 114:24	190:20	109:13,20 166:25 167:8	129:5 130:19 132:20	156:21,25 157:5
135:18,24		1214 (2) 184:18 193:16	137:14 138:4 154:16	4767 (5) 143:11
whom (1) 165:20	Y	122 (2) 16:5,7	157:16 162:2 166:12	153:9,10,13,19
whose (1) 157:14		123 (1) 16:13	168:11,16 170:15 180:12	49 (1) 173:9
wide (1) 141:21	yeah (1) 90:12	124 (1) 16:24	181:16 191:10	
widened (4) 66:1,13 68:3	year (7) 37:19 50:18 93:6	125 (4) 142:17 171:23	2009 (2) 108:9,25	5
82:20	139:16 194:15 195:19,23	179:21,25	2010 (10) 29:23 109:12	
	years (13) 40:9 95:6 97:24			5 (10) 3:14 8:9 18:25
widens (1) 83:5	137:23 138:8,18 139:4	1252 (1) 107:1	166:14,24 167:12,23 176:9	95:6 117:22,23 127
wider (6) 67:15 73:24 140:24	148:25 154:16,20 165:25	126 (3) 142:17 171:23 180:8	187:1 189:12 192:19	136:10 142:8
180:19 187:19 191:22	167:11 171:3	127 (51) 65:14,17 66:21	<b>2011 (4)</b> 29:23,24 50:8 96:5	50 (1) 107:22
widerreaching (1) 70:16	yet (1) 84:20	74:10,13 81:7 82:1,18,19	20122013 (1) 108:13	5000 (2) 21:14,19
wish (2) 114:5 168:24		83:8,15 85:11,22	2013 (28) 29:25 33:2,4,8	
wishes (1) 169:17	youd (1) 54:12	171:23,25 172:5,10,11,24	34:8,10,12,24 35:19 50:12	55 (1) 88:4
withdraw (2) 32:7,10	youre (54) 1:21,22 4:1,10	173:14 174:3,10 175:24	108:22 109:1,5,13,20,24	5b (1) 16:1
withdrawal (4) 32:5,18 47:18	6:13 7:13 13:11,17,25	176:10,13 177:7,14,17	130:8 134:23 136:5 157:20	
52:10	14:6,10 18:17 19:11 21:2,7	178:9,10 179:3,11,22	158:14 166:25	6
withdrawing (2) 52:18,25	22:12 23:23 24:2 25:23	180:7,17,22 181:17,18	167:1,4,8,23 168:4 187:6	6 (11) 4:22 12:21 25
witness (67) 1:15,17,23	27:13 34:10 36:15 42:12	182:25 183:1,6,12,17	2014 (16) 50:13,19 61:4	6 (11) 4:22 12:21 26: 28:24 20:11 74:3 00
2:2,7,16 3:24 6:12 12:11	54:1 58:3,6 59:15 64:20	187:3,7,15,18,24 192:8	71:18 72:12,16,19	28:24 29:11 74:3 99
16:3 19:9 51:20 55:9	72:1 77:3,20 78:20 81:23	195:2,14	112:15,16 119:23 120:2	109:12 166:14,24 1
57:14,17 58:1,4 64:16	83:7,19 107:10,14 109:9	13 (1) 32:5	184:24 189:3 191:19	600c (1) 128:1
	123:4,16 124:10 128:9	.,		61 (9) 3:17 8:11 10:4
65:24 82:17 83:19 92:18	134:14 146:4 148:21 150:3	135 (19) 16:21 127:20	193:6,7	20:6,9,18,24 21:17
103:24 106:4,8,21,24	155:7 159:24 161:21,24	128:4,12,15,21	20142015 (1) 129:15	62 (8) 3:17 8:11 13:22
107:8,11,20 110:2 118:7,8	164:4 178:7 188:19,21	129:18,21,24 130:15,18	2015 (14) 29:25 30:1 33:2	20:6,9,18 21:7,21
125:3 126:16 127:10 128:6		131:14 133:22 134:7,17	35:19 37:14 45:22 59:5,18	63 (5) 3:14,16 4:8 8:1
131:20 132:16 134:11	yourself (3) 8:24 146:5	135:8,12,23 136:15	96:5 102:5 112:15,16,18	64 (4) 19:1 20:11 24:4
136:23 139:7 141:5 142:24	154:10	135011 (2) 4:23 16:9	115:16	66 (3) 4:12,14 10:4
143:1 146:8 152:16 153:6	yourselves (1) 168:25	13641 (1) 118:4	2016 (14) 30:4,5,5,7,9	67 (1) 4:18
156:19 161:19,22 162:7	youve (11) 7:1 41:7,8	138 (2) 51:20,21	59:21,22,23 60:2	68 (1) 5:1
166:21 172:2 173:1,8	84:17,18 148:20 151:15	14 (2) 28:25 98:4	61:15,22,24 64:20 73:17	<b>69 (1)</b> 5:5
174:6,8 179:20 185:25	187:15,18,22 191:5	142 (1) 55:10	2017 (17) 7:13 12:25 65:12	1
186:11 187:13 188:3 191:5		145134 (1) 143:9	66:23 68:18 69:3,6 71:9	6millimetre (1) 118:1
197:21 198:8,11	0	149 (2) 65:7,9	79:6 86:16 88:14 93:12,16	6th (2) 187:1 192:19
witnesses (2) 48:11 120:16		<b>15 (6)</b> 93:16 143:7,8	94:2 98:18 105:1,2	7
wonder (1) 47:13	0 (96) 3:12,19 4:4	154:16,20 192:7	2019 (5) 34:12 77:14 85:8	
wondered (1) 70:11	5:5,10,14,20,23	150 (1) 65:18	109:5 138:2	7 (26) 4:22 26:24 31:1
.,	6:1,6,14,19 7:4,17		<b>2020 (1)</b> 143:2	87:24 105:8 110:22
wont (3) 55:6 106:6 160:25	8:1,12,15,16,17	151 (1) 66:7		
wording (70) 2:25 3:4,9	9:12,17,18,20,25	154 (1) 103:25	2021 (2) 1:1 198:16	114:1,6,17,21 117:2
7:8,16 8:20 9:14 12:3,5,23	10:7,8,16,22 11:14	16 (9) 81:23 143:7,14	<b>21 (4)</b> 51:22 146:9 152:16,17	126:8 139:8 140:19
22:20 24:23 25:15 65:14	12:7,15,17	184:17,24 191:19	22 (3) 1:1 88:14 105:2	144:18 151:22 153:4
66:21 67:7 69:16 70:23	13:5,6,12,14,16,19,21,23	193:6,7,15	23 (3) 137:1,5 198:16	156:6,21,25 157:5 1
75:2 80:11 84:4	14:1,5,7,9,12,23 15:11,14	17 (8) 3:25 81:23 108:21	23d (1) 146:10	70 (2) 5:12 146:15
87:11,14,16,21 93:18	17:8,11,19,20,25	134:23 157:20 167:1	24 (3) 118:9 168:11,16	71 (6) 5:17 117:25 12
104:2,6,9 110:24 113:5,19	17:8,11,19,20,25 18:4,7,9,20 87:2,7,12	179:24 187:6	25 (2) 128:7 139:7	134:3 152:22 171:14
115:5,17,19 116:6 120:13		17065 (1) 101:15	26 (2) 128:17 139:18	72 (3) 5:25 142:7,10
121:21 128:5 144:11	88:5,5 99:17 104:3,9,12	177 (1) 86:21	27 (5) 19:10 109:11 110:7,13	74 (1) 162:9
159:19 160:1,2,10	137:5,7,11,15,20 140:24	18 (35) 6:16 10:12 72:16	166:12	77 (1) 99:9
168:13,22 169:7 170:25	142:11,19,23 143:6 144:2	76:13,20,23 77:2 78:5	27i (1) 128:8	7a (1) 31:12
175:7,11 176:10 180:1,9	145:11,21 146:1,6 147:3	80:15,19 81:4,12,25 84:1	27k (1) 134:14	7g (1) 31:16
185:13,15,17,19,20,21	151:8,14 152:20 155:19	123:2,11,13,14,19	<b>28 (1)</b> 12:12	
190:7,10,17,21 191:13	157:1 158:20,24,25 159:5	124:2,8,18,25		
190:7,10,17,21 191:13 194:12,17 195:5,9,11,13	160:3,11 169:18 171:14	124:2,8,18,25 125:12,21,22 126:2,19,25	3	<u> </u>
	178:23			8 (1) 33:8
work (12) 30:8 49:6,14,23	084510 (6) 29:20 93:13	143:2 170:3,9,14 177:1	3 (9) 23:3 31:9 34:1 35:4	84 (1) 142:17
60:10,13 64:6,7 78:24	94:13 96:12 98:9 99:14	192:9	60:22 81:22 94:23 192:6	8414 (13) 118:10 121
95:25 151:18 156:12	08452 (3) 181:10,15,23	184 (1) 186:10	193:4	122:8 127:20 128:20
worked (14) 39:4 95:5,7,18	084582 (2) 143:8 187:2	18m (10) 16:18 66:10,15	30 (1) 16:4	130:2,17 131:14 132
97:19 100:12 131:11	0low (3) 4:15 25:9 143:10	80:1,10 82:11 98:13	<b>31 (2)</b> 50:13 172:3	133:4,21 134:4 135:
137:24 140:4 174:4 194:23		172:12 173:18 176:15		84141 (8) 118:1,12,15
196:7,15 197:11	1	18metre (3) 70:10 84:8	<b>322 (1)</b> 161:12	
working (14) 9:2 29:4 61:12	·	98:16	335 (2) 161:8,14	120:21 123:7 124:1
95:23 96:8 116:8,12	1 (42) 4:6 10:8 19:8 33:15	19 (1) 82:2	34 (5) 172:15,20 176:21	169:22,25
117:11 131:19 138:7,17,19	60:16 88:11,13 109:11,12	<b>191 (1)</b> 173:9	190:15 192:11	84142 (3) 123:9 124:6
139:25,25		<b>1991 (1)</b> 153:9	35 (3) 55:9 173:12 194:3	86 (1) 118:8
works (2) 139:22 141:18	110:3,3,7,17 122:12	1993 (3) 153:10,12,13	36 (1) 65:9	
world (1) 69:1	131:25,25 134:1	<b>1995 (3)</b> 153:10,12,13 <b>1994 (1)</b> 153:15	37 (1) 103:25	9
	136:12,19,20 140:13	100- (1) 100.10	3m (1) 143:3	
worst (2) 17:16,17	142:7,17 156:22			9 (3) 132:20 172:15 1
wouldnt (18) 23:14 46:19	159:8,8,13 166:9 167:3,7	2	4	921 (3) 193:6,7,15
	168:10 170:19 171:9,13			94 (1) 128:16
47:7 63:16 73:1 92:2 96:16		<b>a</b> ( <b>a</b> 7) 4 10 0 6 33 0 30 35 7	4 (11) 32:3 50:19 59:25	940 (1) 192:7
116:16,19 117:3 119:17	172:24 173:23 174:3,11	2 (27) 4:18 9:6 33:8,20 35:7		
116:16,19 117:3 119:17 126:3 131:18 135:20 148:4	172:24 173:23 174:3,11 175:18 181:4 184:11 199:3	2 (27) 4:18 9:6 33:8,20 35:7 60:20 65:15 105:25	60:12,23 88:16 98:18	95 (2) 64:18,21
116:16,19 117:3 119:17			60:12,23 88:16 98:18 100:16 105:1 143:2 192:12	95 (2) 64:18,21 950 (1) 168:16
116:16,19 117:3 119:17 126:3 131:18 135:20 148:4	175:18 181:4 184:11 199:3	60:20 65:15 105:25		