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(10.00 am)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
    today's hearing. We are going to begin today by hearing
    further evidence from Mr Christopher Mort of Siderise.
    So my first task is to check that Mr Mort is with us and
    that he can see me and hear me clearly.
            MR CHRISTOPHER MORT (continued)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, Mr Mort.
THE WITNESS: Good morning. Yes, I can.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
            Well, as usual, I'm here today with my fellow panel
    members, Ms Istephan and Mr Akbor.
MS ISTEPHAN: Good morning.
MR AKBOR: Good morning.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And before we resume your evidence,
    Mr Mort, I think I'd better take you through the usual
    vexer, so to speak.
            Can you confirm that you're alone in the room from
    which you're giving your evidence?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
            Can you confirm that you have no documents or other
    materials with you?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
1
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
Can you confirm that your mobile phone is in another
room and that you don't have any other electronic device
with you that is capable of receiving messages?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Lovely, thank you very much.
Well, the procedure today is going to be the same as
it was yesterday. Your legal representatives again are
in the virtual hearing room. We will have a short break
during the morning, I'm not sure whether we will have
finished your evidence at that point or not, but again
the arrangements will be the same as they were
yesterday.
Is there anything you'd like to raise before we
start?
THE WITNESS: No, there isn't.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good. Very well, thank you very much.
In that case, I'm going to invite Ms Grange to put
some more questions to you.
Yes, Ms Grange, when you're ready.
Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY (continued)
MS GRANGE: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman.
Good morning, Mr Mort.
A. Good morning.
```
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Q. When we broke off yesterday I was asking you some
    questions about the Siderise marketing literature, and
    I have a few more questions on that topic before we turn
    to some of your specific involvement in the
    Grenfell Tower project.
            Can we return to a document at {SIL00000227}. This
    is the Siderise brochure entitled "Cavity barriers for
    rainscreen cladding" dated November 2013, which we were
    looking at yesterday. So there is the front page. We
    can see the date in the top right-hand corner.
            I want to go back to page 3{SIL00000227/3}, now,
        and look at that paragraph there on the right-hand side
    in the black text.
            Now, I asked you about the seal reaction times of
        1 minute, but I now want to ask you something else about
        that paragraph. We can see that it says that:
            "SIDERISE have tested a range of horizontal
        cavity barriers to the above mentioned standards with
        seal reaction times of 1 minute and seal temperatures
        remained below }18\mp@subsup{0}{}{\circ}\textrm{C}\mathrm{ and maintaining the [integrity and
        insulation] requirements ..."
            That's what El stands for, isn't it, integrity and
        insulation?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Yes:
```
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"... as detailed in Table 1 for up to 120
[ integrity] and 60 [insulation]."
Then we can see in table 1, can you see that first product there, the horizontal barrier for 120 and 90 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that?

Under "Thickness (mm)", it says, " $15 \times 75$ ". Does that mean --
A. It's actually 1.5 by 75 . That's the intumescent strip on its own.
Q. I see. Right, so the intumescent strip is $1.5 \times$ 75 millimetres?
A. By linear length.
Q. Right, I see, yes.

So we can see it's saying there very clearly that these barriers could go up to 120 minutes' integrity.

Can we look at the report that's referred to there. There is a test report with a number 328279. Can we go to that report again at $\{$ SIL00000212/31\}. We get the integrity results at the top of that page in the table.

Now, we can see from this table that only specimens $A$ and $D$ have achieved the integrity requirement of 120 . Do you see that?
A. That's correct, and that refers to the 120 product in the table of the datasheet.
Q. Yes. So specimen A was 120 millimetres thick, specimen $D$ was a graphite intumescent, specimens $B$ and $C$ were 90 millimetres thick and 75 millimetres thick respectively.

Can you just help us as to why, even though only two of those have got over the 120 , the results in B and C are not reflected in the marketing literature?
A. They are. If you go back to the table, and go back to the marketing literature and read the paragraph again, it says "performances up to 120 minutes".
Q. Right.
A. If you look at the table, then it has in there, for products B and $\mathrm{C}, 90$ minutes' integrity.
Q. I see. Okay. So you're satisfied, are you, that they're comfortably within those limits?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes, okay.

Now, this document that's entitled "Cavity barriers for rainscreen cladding", if we go back to page 1 of that document, \{SIL00000227/1\}. So that's its title, "Cavity barriers for rainscreen cladding".

It's right, isn't it, that nowhere within this document or any similar marketing literature has Siderise expressly stated that those barriers have never been tested as part of a rainscreen system but have only
ever been tested between concrete lintels? That's not made clear, is it?
A. Not in this context, no, but as I explained yesterday, testing cavity barriers on the furnace test, the temperatures are higher on the furnace than the failure criteria for an 8414, so therefore the cavity barrier would not be the weak component within an 8414 test.
Q. Yes, I understand that's your evidence.
A. I think the discussion yesterday on the 25 -millimetre air gap and the panel movement, I think it needs to be understood that the intumescent at 1.5 thick has an expansion coefficient of 25 to 1 , so it will expand to 37.5 millimetres. So it's overengineered for a 25 -millimetre gap.
Q. Yes, I understand you're saying that about the cavity barrier, but this is a document that is entitled "Cavity barriers for rainscreen cladding", and I just wanted to be clear on the point that in this document it does not state --I appreciate you say the reasons why that is -- that the barriers have been tested between concrete lintels and not with a rainscreen barrier on the outside.
A. As I said yesterday, this document contains the reference to the test reports. We frequently supply the datasheet and the test report to the end user, so they
get the full picture.
Q. Yes.

Now, let's look at another document now, \{RYD00039962\}. So here is a document from March 2015. You can see that it says "Version 1.4: March 2015" in the top right-hand side. This is entitled, "SIDERISE RH [horizontal] and RV [vertical] cavity barriers for use in the external envelope or fabric of buildings". At the top we can see, in the part with the picture,
"Façades: horizontal \& vertical cavity barriers for rainscreens".

If we go on to page $3\{$ RYD00039962/3\}, we have some similar text to that which we saw in the document we were just looking at on the right-hand side, and I'm not going to ask you about that again; we have gone through those points. But I want to ask you about some text about the 50 -millimetre air gaps on the bottom right - hand side there, "SIDERISE RH50 ... 'Open State' horizontal cavity barrier for maximum 50 mm air gaps". Do you see that paragraph?
A. Yes.
Q. If we could just go down the page so we can see the text underneath, it says there:
"SIDERISE have tested a range of horizontal
cavity barriers with 50 mm air gap to the above mentioned
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standards with seal reaction times of [less than] 1 minute and full closure at 2 minutes 22 seconds ..."

So you are using a full closure figure at this point in the marketing literature; yes?
A. This is a different void size and a different type of intumescent to that being used in the 25 millimetres, so therefore the reaction times are different.
Q. Yes, I understand that, and I'm going to take you to the report that this is based on. I understand it's based on different products and different tests. I'm just pointing out that here you have -- we had a debate yesterday about seal reaction times, but here what you have done is refer to a full closure time of 2 minutes 22 seconds; yes?
A. I believe that is a copy of the text that's within the test report.
Q. Yes. Let's look at that now. It's the BM Trada test report at $\{$ SIL00000288/18\}. So this is a table that we looked at yesterday. I think the 2 minutes 22 seconds comes at the bottom of that page in relation to the time it took for the cavity to seal for cavity barrier A; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, can you help us, so cavity barrier A was a 50 -millimetre gap, but cavity barrier C was also
Just moving away from the marketing literature now, but before we go to your Grenfell project work, can we just look at a document from January 2015, \{SIL00006559\}. This is an email chain relating to a Belfast Hospital project. If we look in the second email down in the chain, we can see on 19 January 2015, Kelvin Williams - - that's a Siderise employee; yes?
A. He was, yes.
Q. Yes - - says to Barnaby Carrick, who is also within Siderise, "Hi Bar", and he is referring to an email, and he says this. He says in the second paragraph:
"Chris $M$ issued a statement that all requests for these products would have to be 'OK' by him."
Now, can you recall what that statement was and what products had to be okayed by you?
A. Okay, yeah, if you look at the subject title --
Q. Yes.
A. -- it says, "Belfast Hospital - MSDS \& technical data sheets". I -- at the time, we were looking at resource level within the business as to how often we had these enquiries directly through to us to supply datasheets and MSDS information to a customer as opposed to our website.
Q. Yes, and what does MSDS stand for?
A. Material safety datasheet.
a 50-millimetre gap, and we can see in the table it's signified by two hashtags, and the two hash symbols below show that that cavity was sealed at 3 minutes 19 seconds.

Now, can you help us as to why it's the 2 minutes 22 seconds that's in the product literature rather than showing a range of 2 minutes 22 to 3 minutes 19 ?
A. Well, if you go back to the product descriptions in this test report, you will see that there's different types of -- quantities of intumescent in there.
Q. Right.
A. That is the reasoning why.
Q. I see. So you're only advertising the product that meets the 2 minutes 22 second; is that what you're saying?
A. That is the only -- that is the product we are using for manufacture, yes.
Q. Right, and you're not using the one that sealed at 3 minutes 19 ?
A. No.
Q. Right, okay.
A. It -- as I explained yesterday, these are R\&D tests, where you put multiple variations of a product on a test to get the optimum result.
Q. I see.
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Q. Yes.
A. So it is basically a $--I$ was keeping a tally on the number of times this was happening.
Q. Right, on the number of times that you had to supply datasheets to customers on projects?
A. Yeah, whereas -- as opposed to our downloads.
Q. Yes. Why were you keeping that tally? What was the reason?
A. Like I said, literally two seconds ago, it was to understand any resourcing level we needed within the business for that part of the works.
Q. I see, so you could understand that you might need to make resources available to provide technical support --
A. Correct.
Q. -- for those products -- for those projects?
A. For the products. Generally for products.
Q. I understand.

Let's turn now to the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project specifically. If we start with an email at \{SIL00000030\}. This is an email from Kevin Lamb to Barnaby Carrick at Siderise, and it's sent on 11 March 2015. We can see that Mr Lamb asks:
"Further to your recent help with horizontal \& vertical firebreaks within our rainscreen cladding, we wonder if you could assist with what would be the normal
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fire rating required.
"The building is a domestic block of flats, 24 stories [sic], fully overclad with ACM rainscreen cladding.
"Internal party walls will be 120 min .
"In your experience what would the rating be for horizontal and vertical breaks. This would help us to propose hopefully the correct product for building control to approve."

So we can see that Kevin Lamb, who is working for Harley at this point, is asking for advice from Siderise on those questions.

We can see that this query is forwarded to you on the same day, if we look at $\{$ SILO0000034 \}. So we can see that on the same day, 11 March 2015, Mr Carrick emails you and it says:
"Regarding: Harley Curtain Wall Limited."
He says:
"Hi Chris,
"Please could you check if the following response is suitable."

Then he sets out a suggested draft response:
"We would confirm that to meet the requirements of Approved Document B (diagram 33 \& table A1, item 15), the area between compartment wall and outer cladding
needs only to be a cavity barrier ( 30 minutes integrity
\& 15 minutes insulation) which would mean that our open state cavity barrier system [then you give the name of the system, the 90/30 horizontal barriers and the 30/30 for the vertical barriers] would be suitable."

Now, can you recall receiving that email with Mr Lamb's query?
A. I can, yes.
Q. Can you help us as to what Mr Lamb was referring to when he says that Siderise had provided him with recent help with horizontal and vertical firebreaks? Can you help us as to what help Siderise had already provided?
A. I had had no interaction with Harley really prior to this. I believe there was a previous project where we'd supplied some curtain wall fire barriers on. Generally, Ricky Kay, who is extremely experienced in this part of the sales, would be giving advice based on what's contained within the datasheets, so there may have been some of that going on. From our email chain, we have no direct correspondence prior to this --
Q. Right.
A. -- on the project.
Q. I mean, we will be hearing from Mr Kay as the next witness. You can't help us as to what advice Siderise had been providing up to that point?
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[^0]A. Yes.
Q. Were you ever told what type of insulation was going to be used at Grenfell Tower?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever think about asking for that information as part of providing Mr Lamb and Harley with advice on the project?
A. If you look at my further emails where they've asked for further information, I've asked them categorically for specifications, for fire strategy, et cetera, et cetera, which they failed to produce.
Q. Yes. We will come on to those emails in just a moment.

If we now go to your response to Mr Lamb's query on 12 March 2015 at \{SILO0000038\}. So here we can see you email Mr Lamb on the following day, 12 March 2015, copying in Mr Carrick and others at Siderise.
Effectively, you have adopted Mr Carrick's suggestion; yes?
A. I believe the situation was Kevin Lamb chased for a response, Barnaby was either out on business or on annual leave, so then I forwarded his response.
Q. Yes, and in this email you've confirmed that:
" ... to meet the requirements of Approved Document B
... the area between the compartment wall and outer
cladding needs only to be a cavity barrier ( 30 minutes
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integrity \& 15 minutes insulation) which would mean that our open state cavity barrier system ... would be suitable."

## Yes?

## A. Yes.

Q. So you advised on the suitability of your system, given the request that was made. You say below that:
"If you need me to comment on a specific detail ... please forward over and I will respond immediately, apologise for the delay."

And you also attach diagram 33 so that they can see that below, and we can see from page 7 of this document run $\{$ SIL00000038/7\} that diagram 33 has been provided by you at that time. You have also provided some Siderise standard details. If we look, for example, at page 5 $\{$ SIL00000038/5\}, you have provided some standard details relating to the Siderise products; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. We can see on the right-hand side in the label to that drawing it's headed, "Siderise Standard Details, Compartmentation".

Now, you did not in this email say anything about the suitability or risks associated with using cavity barriers in conjunction with ACM rainscreen cladding; that's right, isn't it?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you explain why not? Why not identify those risks when you were responding at this time?
A. We were responding as to the suitability of the product for use within a common construction environment. The checks on the cladding suitability, et cetera, et cetera, are not the responsibility of Siderise; that's the responsibility of Harley Curtain Walling and the fire engineer and the approving authority on the project.
Q. You didn't explain that your cavity barriers had only ever been tested between concrete lintels and not in an ACM system. Why was that?
A. We test to the published standard. We are not --it's for -- under the CDM Regulations, the designer of the project is responsible to understand the overarching regulations required. They should understand the requirements of Approved Document B. And the testing for cavity barriers is in compliance with appendix -- in the table in appendix -- item 15, cavity barriers, $30 / 15$. The overall wall section in section 12 of Approved Document B is the responsibility of the façade contractor and the end users. It's not -- we don't supply the panels.
Q. Why couldn't you have said, for example, something along 17
the lines of: "Do bear in mind that if the ACM cladding fails, the cavity barriers will be ineffective, and we have only tested our cavity barriers in these limited scenarios"? Why didn't you spell that out in your response?
A. At that stage we weren't being asked that question. I answered the specific question.
Q. Yes, but wouldn't that be information that it would have been helpful for the design team to be aware of?
A. But the design team, under the CDM Regulations, should be aware of that situation anyway. It's not our responsibility to enforce the CDM Regulations.
Q. Yes.

Yesterday I showed you parts of Dr Lane's report where she identified the potential mechanism of failure of cavity barriers when used in combination with ACM or other metal cladding panels, and you accepted that, in general terms, the risks about the way in which these cavity barriers might behave in combination with rainscreen panels was appreciated by Siderise prior to the Grenfell project. For the transcript, you said that at $\{$ Day102/121\}. You said it was for that reason that Siderise had called out and requested partners to undertake more testing in conjunction with Siderise; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, given your awareness of the risks associated with this combination of cavity barriers and rainscreen panels, why not spell out these risks at this time to the professionals on the Grenfell project?
A. It's the responsibility of the professionals on the Grenfell project to understand this under the CDM Regulations.
Q. Yes, but --
A. We are not the designers of the project, we did not supply the panels.
Q. But aren't you in a unique position as a manufacturer of these barriers? You have very detailed knowledge of exactly what testing you've done, the limitations of that testing, what testing you would like to do in the future in order to better understand how it performs in other systems, real-world systems. Given you've got that particular unique knowledge, why not spell out more clearly to the professionals on this project that there were risks associated with using these barriers in this context?
A. There should and there were people of a higher level than ourselves on this project, like the fire engineers, the architects, the consultants, the building control, et cetera, et cetera, who have been through the approval
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process for these panels. It's not for us to question the approval process for those panels. We only manufacture and supply our barriers.
Q. Yes.

We know that around a year before this, in
March 2014, you had met with Celotex, and we spoke about this yesterday, and you were advising Jonathan Roper that it was very important that these barriers have a solid surface or, I think in your words, a hard bound to activate against. You were spelling that out to Celotex. Why not identify that clearly to the Grenfell professionals when they're seeking your advice about the suitability of your barriers on their project?
A. Okay, I' II come back to what I just said: under the CDM Regulations and the project, there are people on that project who are contracted to approve and control the process. We supply one component into that process. The overall approval for the panels on that project were not our responsibility .
Q. Yes, I understand that.

To put it another way, if you're providing a product into a construction system and you know that there is a risk that it's not going to work well with another product that you are aware of, you're told about, why isn't it reasonable for you to point out that your
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A. We're a manufacturer of cavity barriers. We do not see the end use of every project. Even now we don't see the end use of every project.
Q. Yes, that's helpful. I think what you have confirmed is so far as you can ascertain - - and I appreciate you may have been using third-party distributors, so you wouldn't always know -- you can't see evidence of Siderise providing their cavity barriers on a project involving ACM before this point; yes?
A. I cannot see technical queries come through, no.
Q. Okay.

Let's move forward in time now to 30 March 2015. If we can go to \{SIL00000068\}, this is an email from Ricky Kay of Siderise to you on 30 March 2015. What he's done is he's pasted into this email a communication from John Hoban of RBKC building control which had been sent to Harley, Studio E and others, Rydon, on the project. We can see that Mr Hoban is saying in his email, if we look at the main paragraph:
"Please find detailed below a copy of an email sent to various persons on the 20th of March 2015, concerning the topic relating [to] fire stopping of the compartment floors to the building. I would advise you that it is my interpretation of diagram 33 of Approved Document B is that the detail between compartment floors and
external cladding is not a cavity barrier, therefore it must be fire stopped to at least the standard of the existing compartment floor ( 120 minutes). Therefore the methods described in clause 9.13 would not be appropriate in this particular case."

So you can see what advice the building control officer was giving, and that's been sent to you.

Now, Mr Kay sends this to you with no covering email. Can you recall speaking to him about it around this time?
A. Quite possibly.
Q. Do you have any recollection of what you discussed?
A. No.
Q. Now, you deal with this email in your witness statement, if we can just look briefly at that, so back to your statement and page 5 \{SIL00000298/5\}, paragraph 25. You say here:
"I believe that Mr Hoban was confused between the requirements of a firestop and cavity barrier. This is still an ongoing misinterpretation of Approved Document B. To this day, I still get professionals requesting 120 minutes fire resistance, despite having explained to them that on testing to BS 8414-1 or BS 8414-2, the maximum achievable is 30 minutes due to the duration of the test, regardless of the performance
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of the cavity barrier, the façade is always the weak link. In this respect, although Diagram 33 of Approved Document B details the requirements, some professionals choose to ignore this diagram and still request that the fire resistance of the barrier should meet with the fire resistance of the floor i.e. 120 minutes. However, installing a 120 -minute fire barrier is not required and will not increase the performance of the cladding element."

So you give your explanation there as to why you think Mr Hoban was confused at this point.

Just going back to the main part of that paragraph on the previous page, I think you have made this point already, but can you explain why you're referring to 8414 testing there and the maximum achievable being 30 minutes due to the duration of the test? Why are you referring to that in this context?
A. Because you're looking at a system performance overall, and the weakest link in the system performance is not the cavity barrier. The cavity barrier is -- are not magic. (inaudible) 20. As we discussed yesterday, if you have, for example, a fire door tested for two hours, and you install it into a wall that is one hour, the weakness is not the fire door, the weakness is the wall. So therefore the performance of the door, although it's
proved for two hours, is reduced to one hour. And
that's exactly the same in this situation. If you've got - - you can install 120-minute fire barriers, yeah. On test, they will give you 120 minutes, on a furnace test. But if you put them into a system test, they are not the weak link, the weak link are other elements, and the maximum achievable duration of the test is
30 minutes because it's a 30 -minute test.
Q. Yes.

Did you ever explain this to the professionals on the Grenfell project who were seeking your advice from time to time? Did you ever explain: the façade is always the weak link, and explain this link back to the 8414 test and why it was that part of the system that they really needed to be focused on rather than the cavity barriers?
A. Unless there's an email, I haven't.
Q. In terms of why you have not raised those limitations, can we refer back to the answers that you just gave a moment ago when I was asking you why you never raised these risks with the professionals in the Grenfell project.
A. Well, it comes back to: we have got no design
responsibility on the project. We are not contracted for design. There's fire engineers, there's
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consultants, there's architects, there's approving authorities. They're the ones who are responsible for the project.
Q. Now, you say at paragraph 26 of your witness statement on page 6 \{SIL00000298/6\} -- we don't need to go to it -- that it's likely that you spoke to Mr Kay about this email, although you're not able to specifically recall. Does that remain the position, that you can't recall specifically discussing this with Mr Kay, although you think you probably would have done?
A. Correct.
Q. We can see, moving forward with the documents, if we go to $\{$ SIL00000070 that Mr Kay responded to Mr Hoban's email. This picks up on something you were mentioning earlier, that Ricky Kay goes back in this email to Ben Bailey and John Hoban, and he says, this is 30 March 2015:
"All,
"Please can somebody forward over a drawing of the build-up of the cladding so that my Technical Officer can evaluate and forward an official response with a SIDERISE product specification."

When he is referring there to "my Technical
Officer", is that you that he's referring to?
A. Yes, he is.

```
Q. Yes.
            So it's right, isn't it, that you considered that
    you needed a drawing of the overall build-up in order to
    provide an official response from Siderise; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. If we now turn to the response to this, {HAR00004006},
    we can see from this that, on }30\mathrm{ March 2015, Ben Bailey
    of Harley responds to Ricky Kay, copying in Kevin Lamb
    and Mark Stapley for Harley, and he says:
            "Please see details attached showing the section
        through the system and general location of firebreaks
        relative to window frames in the cladding zone.
            "Best Regards,
            "Ben."
            Then we can turn to the drawing that he attached,
        the first drawing. This is at {HAR00004008}.
            Just to note in that covering email that Mr Bailey
        was talking about "see [the] attached showing the
        section through the system and the general location of
        firebreaks relative to the window frames in the cladding
        zone", and this is what he's attached; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. At this time.
            You say in paragraph 28 of your statement
        {SIL00000298/6} - - we don't need to go to it -- that you
```
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weren't copied in to this email, however it was either forwarded to you or shown to you as you then marked up this drawing requesting three sections which you labelled as $A-A, B-B$ and $C-C$.

So that's the drawing, and we can see the firebreaks on it, the horizontal ones below, and the vertical ones on the column, yes, to the sides?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we turn to the next document in the run, \{RYD00037412\}, we can see that Ricky Kay has responded to Ben Bailey saying:
"To enable us to assess, please see attached mark up of section drawings that are required by my Technical Officer."

If we turn to the mark-up, this is at \{RYD00037413\}, and if we could blow that up, what we see is some red pen annotations on this drawing where you've identified three sections, section $A-A, B-B$ and $C-C$; yes? Can you see those?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this your writing?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. You have indicated, we can see from the label there, that you want section $A-A$ going through the cladding, you want section $B-B$ going through the cill, and you
want section $C-C$ showing that total section, so you can
see the whole thing.
A. The full build-up.
Q. Yes.

If we turn now to Mr Bailey's response to this
request for sections, this is at $\{$ HAR00019401\}, we can see that Ben Bailey responds on 30 March 2015 to Ricky Kay and copies you in:
"Ricky as discussed the two drawings attached represent section $A-A$ (window head) and $B-B$ (window cill ) which can be combined to create $C-C$, as we don't have a drawn detail to cover what Chris is requesting."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that strike you as odd, that they couldn't give you the combined section $C-C$, they were only going to give you the window head and the window cill details separately but not the whole section?
A. Yes. I would have expected to see section $C-C$ because it gives you the full picture of the make-up.
Q. Yes, and on other cladding projects, if you had requested that, would you have normally been provided with that?
A. It's normal, standard construction process.
Q. Yes.
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Mr Bailey's indicating here that it would be sufficient simply to imagine combining these drawings to create $C-C$; was that sufficient, in your view?
A. With my experience of façade curtain wall design,

I could combine the two --
Q. Right.
A. -- to understand what was going on, although section $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ would have clarified it.
Q. Yes.

Were you ever given any explanation as to why Harley couldn't provide that full section --
A. No.
Q. -- drawing to you?

We can see that in these emails people have been referring to firebreaks as opposed to cavity barriers or firestops. Was it common in the industry at this time for people to be referring to firebreaks as opposed to using the technical definitions in ADB?
A. It's still common today. People do not use the correct terminology. They mix up cavity barriers with firestopping, they call them smoke stops, they call them firebreaks.
Q. Yes.
A. There's common errors in the industry.
Q. Yes.

In your experience, does that sometimes have the potential to cause confusion to professionals working on projects if they're not using the correct language for those items of construction?
A. It depends on how they caveat the definition of "firebreak". If they say it 's a 30 -minute firebreak, then generally people in passive fire protection know that's a 30-minute cavity barrier.
Q. Yes, I see.

If we go, then, to look at paragraph 30 of your witness statement at this point on page 7
\{SIL00000298/7\}, what you tell us here is that therefore you proceeded based on the information that you had been provided with by Mr Bailey, and you say:
"Although I believed Mr Hoban to be confused as to the requirements (as explained above), as Ricky Kay had already explained the requirements of Approved Document $B$ and this appeared to have been rejected, I proposed a solution to meet with the higher fire resistance that Mr Hoban was requesting."

Then if we can turn to the email that you sent with that proposed solution, this is at \{HAR00018971\}, this is an email that you sent to Mr Bailey, Ben Bailey, and to Ricky Kay on 30 March 2015, and you say in the first paragraph:
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"I have reviewed the drawings sent over and sketch a proposal to alleviate the issues raised by the [building control officer] ..."

> That's what you mean by "BCO"; yes?

## A. Yes.

Q. "... also on the second page of the attachment I have highlighted the weak link so to speak in terms of fire and I think the BCO would have also noticed this."

We will come back to that weak link in a moment.
You say this in the second paragraph:
"The proposal requires the installation of
[horizontal] 90/60 product in two layers one at the head of the window aligning with the compartment floor and the other at the top of the existing up stand, therefore two layers of 60 minutes protection that overall would provide if tested over 120 minutes protection, at the window locations."

Now, is that paragraph effectively describing that doubling up option that you were proposing as part of this email?
A. Yes, and it's the -- in Approved Document $B$, there is a requirement, if needed for the compartment floor, to extend the compartmentation to the external leaf of the building, so you're extending the compartmentation to that leaf regardless of the fire performance of that

```
    external leaf.
Q. Yes.
A. That is documented in Approved Document B.
Q. Yes. Yes, thank you.
    We saw in the first paragraph that you've also
    highlighted what you're calling the "weak link so to
    speak in terms of fire"; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. You prepared two sketches, is this right: the first was
    to show the proposed solution to the building control
    officer 's requirements; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And the second was to highlight the weak link in terms
    of fire as you saw it based on the design at the head of
    the window; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And they were separate drawings and had separate
    purposes; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Right.
        Is it right that you were flagging the weak link
        point regardless of what solution was ultimately adopted
        as to the 120 minutes' fire resistance?
A. Correct.
Q. If we can look at this point at paragraph 31(c) of your
witness statement on page 8 \{SIL00000298/8\}, we can see you're dealing with this point at this point in your statement, and you say:
"My email also refers to the marked up A-A where I identified a 'weak link for fire '. By this, I was highlighting that there was nothing to stop fire in an internal compartment moving to an external cavity. The window head interface with the structure shows that there is a gap. It needed some form of protection. There should have been a design to protect this. As a supplier of a product, Siderise was not obliged to provide any general advice about fire safety and compliance with the Building Regulations and associated guidance. However, in this instance, I did highlight the weak link I identified despite it not relating directly to cavity barriers. It was a clear error and I felt I should highlight it. In my opinion Harley and/or Building Control should have picked it up already. It was their issue to deal with. I would have expected Harley to raise this issue with the main contractor by way of a Request for Further Information (RFI). A design should then have been designed and detailed and put in place by the main contractor and/or Harley."
So, in other words, the design that Harley had sent
```


## A. Not a gap between the window head and the

 cavity barrier, a gap between the window head and the structure.Q. Yes, I understand. We'll look at the drawing in just a moment, so you can help make that point then when we get to the drawing.

When you said that the gap needed -- you talk about it needing some form of protection; what did you have in mind when you drew attention to this?
A. We're not responsible for the design. There could have been a whole number of ways of that gap not being there. The location of the window could have been moved back to align with the concrete and sealed to the concrete.
There could have been metal pressings, there could have been plasterboards, there could have been all sorts of things in there that -- we're not the designers of it. But from the drawing, there was no obvious closure of that gap.
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## Q. Yes.

Let's just look at your sketches, actually, while we're discussing this, because it's going to be easier to have it in front of us. If we go to \{HAR00003948/2\} -- we will come back to page 1 in a moment -- this is the point at which you highlighted the weak link for fire, and is that your writing in red?

## A. Yes.

Q. With the bubble around the weak link?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. The point you were just making about it being a gap between the concrete and the cavity barrier, can you explain what you mean by that?
A. If you look at the drawing, where you have the ceiling level drawn, you can see in dotted line the existing frame of the window. That existing frame would have been sealed to the concrete, so therefore would have given you a protection from any direct passage of fire out into that external cavity.

Now, the window being replaced, the aluminium window within the cloud bubble is outside of the building line, the building line being the concrete.
Q. Yes.
A. So there is a gap between that window frame and the concrete. They've got bracketry and things drawn in
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there, but the brackets are normally localised, two to three per window, so there would have been a gap from the internal to the external.
Q. Yes.
A. How they would have sealed it or what they would have sealed it with ... but their drawings are very basic.
Q. Right, yes. Were these more basic than you would have expected to receive for a project --
A. It depends. This could have been an installation drawing and there could be other drawings that gave more detail.
Q. Yes.
A. There are many thousands of drawings on a project.
Q. Yes.
A. We don't see all of them, we only see what we're given, so we can only comment on what we are given.
Q. Yes, I understand.

Would it have been possible to position the cavity barrier immediately at the head of the window?
A. If it did, if you dropped that cavity barrier down, it wouldn't have made a difference, you've still got the gap between the window frame and the structure.
Q. Yes, I see.

Just to be clear, you describe it as a clear error; did you think that that should have been obvious to
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anybody looking at the drawings?
A. That should have been picked up by any of the senior project team.
Q. Yes. And by the building control officer?
A. Should have been picked up -- like I said, it should have been picked up by anybody in the senior project team.
Q. Yes.

Now, the drawings that Harley sent you -- and if we go back to the sketch at the top, page 1
\{HAR00003948/1\}, just to be clear, what you have done on
this sketch is you've suggested your doubling-up solution on the right-hand side; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So what you've done is, above each window, you've put two cavity barriers, both of 90/60, to give you 180/120 protection; yes?
A. Yeah, as you go up the building, you would have -you've got one at the cill, one at the head, one at the cill, one at the head, as you go up the building.
Q. Yes. Just to be clear, that doesn't solve the problem with the head of the window, does it, that you're addressing in the next sketch?
A. No, not at all.
Q. This was just your doubling-up solution for the
building control officer who wanted 120; yes?
A. In reality, the windows should be further into the building to align with the existing structure.
Q. Yes.

Now, these drawings that Harley had sent you did not include any cavity barriers at either the jambs of the window or the cill of the windows. Did you notice that at the time?
A. The vertical cavity barriers are drawn on the drawing, and without knowing the make-up of all the bracketry that's within the rainscreen system, the verticals seemed to be logically as close as possible within that window zone.

Again, the fire strategy should be detailing these things. It's ... the vertical cavity barriers are there. It appears from this to be contained within one compartment. The fire strategy would be the document that would enforce the use of cavity barriers around the windows completely as well. We weren't party to any of that design discussion on the project.
Q. I see. So I think what you're saying in terms of the jambs of the window is that -- is this right? -- it wasn't entirely clear from this drawing whether or not the vertical cavity barriers were as close to the windows as they could be; yes?

## A. Yes.

Q. Right.

What about the cills of the window? I mean, we can see in the basic drawing that's been sent to you there is nothing remotely in the location of the cill of the window.
A. That's why l've drawn it in.
Q. Yes, with the dotted line?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. So if we look on the right-hand side, that cavity barrier you've added there at the cill location, it 's not immediately at the cill, is it, it 's still
a little bit below it; yes?
A. In all fairness, what's drawn there is a schematic.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm not responsible for the overall design.
Q. I see.
A. It's a schematic drawing from the very poor drawings that were given by Harley.
Q. Yes, I understand. But did you intend that somebody looking at these annotations would appreciate from what you have put here that there also ought to be
cavity barriers at the cill of the window?
A. There should be, but like I said, the design team for the project, including the fire engineer and the
fire strategy, they would have -- they should have discussed the locations of all cavity barriers on the project. There should be a -- within the fire strategy, there should be clear drawings laying out the location of cavity barriers and firestopping on the project.
Q. Yes. Did you ever say that to Harley? Did you ever say verbally around this time, "These drawings are very, very basic drawings, you should have something better than this"?
A. Not my place to do that.
Q. Yes.

Did you ever raise this weak link point any more
widely than we see in these emails? Did you ever discuss it with anybody subsequently?
A. No.
Q. Let's return to your covering email, \{HAR00018971\}. This was the covering email we looked at earlier where you sent these sketches.

Just looking at the third paragraph down now, you say:
"Please note that without specific details of the overall construction of internal linings and or sight of the Fire Strategy for the project I can only offer the proposal above, and as this is a refurbishment I would imagine that the internal linings will remain in situ
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and made good to openings only, which does not aid the fire strategy."

Now, can you explain to us why you said that in this email?
A. On refurbishment projects, it 's quite -- from that drawing you can see there's an existing window frame. They do not -- on residential refurbishment projects, they don't move the residents out, so the existing window frame would have remained in place until the external items had been installed. Then they would remove, or crudely remove, the internal frame. From that drawing, they're quite clearly leaving the frame in place and making good around. It's a refurbishment strategy.
Q. Yes. Yes.

Did you feel that you were able to advise without sight of that fire strategy for the project?
A. No, because, like I said, I'm - at Siderise, we're not contracted to the project for the fire strategy. There would be a higher end fire engineer and/or business that would write a specific fire strategy for the project --
Q. Yes.
A. -- detailing all the requirements for the safe --
Q. Yes.
A. - - use of the building in the event of a fire.
Q. Yes.

Mr Kay says in his witness statement -- for the transcript, this is at page 2 \{SIL00000304/2\},
paragraph $7--$ that Siderise always request as much information as possible from the customer, in particular the fire strategy; yes?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. How might the fire strategy have influenced or changed your advice?
A. It wouldn't, quite honestly, have changed my advice that I gave, but it would have given me a further insight as to how this was going to be constructed.
Q. Yes.
A. But without sight of those documents, I can't really comment on the quality of what that document would have been.
Q. Yes.
A. But I would expect cavity barriers to be defined in the fire strategy, I'd expect compartmentation to be defined in the fire strategy, and that's not just in terms of fire performance, but actual location and where they would expect to see these components of passive fire protection.
Q. Yes, yes. Yes, thank you, that's helpful.

Mr Kay goes on to say that fire strategies are
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rarely provided on construction projects when they're asked for by Siderise. Do you agree with that?
A. Leading up -- rolling back a few years pre-Grenfell, we would request fire strategies. Quite a few -- the initial response would be, "Well, we haven't got one". Depending on the relationship with the customer, you might say, "Well, you have got one because you used it in your tender documents", because as a business, if you were -- as a façade business, if you're tendering a project, the fire strategy should be part of your tender documents that you receive.

Now, without fail, every time I ask for
a fire strategy, it appears.
Q. Right. Yes. That's post the Grenfell fire ; yes?
A. Correct.
Q. Yes.
A. And that's not to say there are more fire strategies, there's still the same quantity of buildings and there's still the same quantity of fire strategies, it's just now that the façade industry are more aware.
Q. Yes, thank you.

Now, for completeness, we can see that on
2 April 2015, if we go to \{SIL00000158\}, this is an email a couple of days later from Mr Bailey to Mr Kay, copying you in. So Ben Bailey to Ricky Kay and

```
    copied to you on 2 April 2015. He says:
        Morning Ricky,
        "As discussed please see drawing attached showing
    the placement of the firebreak at the head of the
    window. The BCO has agreed to the definition of
    a cavity so I believe that the 30/15 equivalent product
    can be used?"
        So he is telling you in the second sentence of this
    email that the building control officer has now agreed
    to it being a cavity barrier; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. If we just look at the drawing that was sent through at
    this point, {HAR00014533}, what we can see is what was
    sent appears to be -- well, we know it to be one of the
    Studio E tender drawings, and if you look in the top
    right - hand side, we can see that Mr Bailey, Ben Bailey,
    has highlighted a proposed section. If we could blow
    that up a little, what we can see is that in this
    drawing, in fact the cavity barrier is placed
    immediately at the head of the window; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember looking at that --
A. No.
Q. -- when it was sent through?
A. No.
```

Q. Did you ever have any further discussions with Harley,
Mr Bailey or Mr Lamb, about this --
A. No.
Q. -- after this time?
Again, just for completeness, we can see you respond
on the same day, if we can go to \{SIL00000169\}. This is
you to Mr Bailey and Mr Kay, 2 April, same day, and you
say:
"Hi Ben,
"Sense at last from the [building control officer ],
so I take it the meeting for Tuesday is not needed, if
you need any further assistance in the future please do
not hesitate in contacting us."
So just to be clear, did you ever receive any
confirmation back from Harley that they had understood
the point you were making about the weak link at the
head of the window?
A. No.
Q. And you didn't follow up on that at any stage
afterwards?
A. No.
Q. Sorry, did you say "No" just then?
A. I said "No", yes.
Q. Right.
Given that you were flagging a potential life safety
fire issue, did it occur to you to follow up on it and to check that Harley had understood the point you were making?
A. I'd given the advice in good faith to the project. They should be experienced enough to heed that warning, and there's others there who are responsible for the design of the project. We weren't responsible for the design. They could have been using, like I said, a whole host of different materials, not Siderise materials, to close that gap.
Q. Yes.
A. It wasn't evident from that drawing.
Q. Yes.

Can we go now to $\{$ HAR00019012/2\}. These are some exchanges that occurred in June 2015 on the subject of vertical cavity barriers and some queries that were raised.

So in the middle of the page there, on page 2 , we can see that on 17 June 2015 Ben Bailey emails Ricky Kay, subject, "Grenfell Tower Vertical firebreaks". He says:
"I'm after some technical advice ... we are putting vertical firebreaks up the building where there are party walls. I've marked where these are on the attached drawing; will we have to install the verticals
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anywhere else (like on the corners of the building) so we don't fall foul of some regulation etc?"

So that's the request.
Then we can see from the bottom of page 1 in this chain $\{$ HAR00019012/1\}, if we go up to the bottom of page 1, that Mr Kay forwards this email to you for a response. He says:

## "Hi Chris,

"Please may I ask you to respond to the below email from Ben with some advice about the locations of the vertical fire barriers. Marked up drawing attached."

Then we can see from the top email at page 1 that you respond, and you say:
"Hi Ben,
"We need further information in order to response as follows ..."

This is you to Ricky Kay, copying in Ben Bailey, and you say you need elevations, the fire strategy report, and then NHBC or not. Then:
"Upon receipt Barnaby will be able to respond accordingly."

Now, can you explain briefly why you considered that you needed those documents to be able to provide a response?
A. They'd only sent over a blurred floor plan for the

```
building, just one section out of the building. In
    order to understand the -- how the floor plan is made
    up, you need more information, and this is -- again, you
    see I'm asking for the fire strategy, because in the
    fire strategy it should be clear as to where the
    vertical breaks are --
Q. Yes.
A. -- in there.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm asking about the NHBC or not because Approved
    Document B requires vertical barriers at party wall
    locations or a change in direction on the building; NHBC
    have got a higher requirement, they require them every
    6 metres.
Q. Yes.
A. So I just needed to understand what was required for
    that --
Q. Yes.
A. -- element of works.
Q. You have told us at paragraph 35 of your witness
    statement {SILO0000298/9} -- we don't need to go to
    it -- that you cannot recall and can find no trace of
    ever receiving these documents or a response to these
    queries from Harley; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
```
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Q. Do you ever remember chasing up on this request?
A. It 'd come out in the next chain of emails. This was
happening very, very quickly. I sent this email and
then a phone call between myself and Ben Bailey to agree
the locations on them.
Q. Right.
A. They're under pressure on site to get this work done.
Q. Right.
A. So this is normal. It happens in the construction
industry all too often, unfortunately. You put in
a request for information and then you get an irate site
manager ranting, wanting the information now --
Q. Yes.
A. -- without giving you the full picture.
Q. Yes, I see.
Let's turn to that email, \{SIL00000108\}. This is
an email from Mr Ben Bailey to you dated 22 June 2015,
and he says:
"Chris.
"To confirm my understanding from our conversations,
we need vertical firebreaks on the columns (grids A1,
A5, D1 and D5) as well as the party walls?"
So as you just said, a conversation happened on the
telephone --
A. Yes.
Q. -- where Mr Bailey pressed you for advice?
A. Yes.
Q. How were you able to give advice to him if you hadn't received the documents you'd requested?
A. That would have been discussed during the phone call and I - it would have been a case of, "We just need to know, are they needed on various locations", which I confirmed to him, and there should be a diagram here marked up where they are required.
Q. Yes.
A. So I was just responding to the information that was given, for -- they didn't have -- whether they didn't have the fire strategy or the other documents, I can't say, but certainly from the timescale of the date stamp and time stamp on my request to this phone call, it's a case of: the email's received and has phoned in before the end of the day to get this resolved.
Q. Yes, yes.

Would you agree from this exchange, and from other exchanges that we've seen, that Harley was relying on you and Siderise generally for design advice in relation to cavity barriers?
A. I wouldn't say it 's design advice, I would say --
Q. How would you categorise it?
A. It's ... they're looking for advice as to the locations
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of the cavity barriers. We're not responsible for the design. They should themselves be fully conversant with location requirements of the cavity barriers from Approved Document B and from the fire strategy on the project.
Q. Yes. Did it concern you that Harley appeared to be dependent on your advice as to where to place cavity barriers and did not appear to have any independent expertise in the matter?
A. Even today we still get queries even from façade consultants and fire consultants as to, "Can you clarify the location of cavity barriers?"
Q. Right.
A. So it's not unique to Harley. We still get enquiries today.
Q. Yes. And back then, was that normal at the time, for a specialist cladding subcontractor to repeatedly approach a manufacturer for advice on cavity barriers?
A. Yes.
Q. Just finally on this topic, did you ever provide Harley with any advice about the positioning of cavity barriers within the architectural crown at the very top of the building?
A. I wasn't even aware there was a crown --
Q. Right.

```
A. -- up the building -- like I said, in that email, when
    I've asked them for the elevation drawings, the
    fire strategy --
Q. Yes.
A. -- if they had supplied that information to me, I may
    have been able to see what else was going on, but we can
    only respond to the information that we are given.
Q. Yes.
A. We're not contracted as part of the design team so we
    don't have access to all the documents.
MS GRANGE: Right.
            Now, my final topic is about installation and
        post-fire inspection.
            If we go to paragraph 55 of your witness statement
        on page 14 {SIL00000298/14} --
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Ms Grange, forgive my interrupting
        you, but do you have any idea how long this final topic
        might last?
MS GRANGE: It's fairly brief, Mr Chairman. I've got about
        six or seven pages of notes. I may not get it done in
        five minutes, but I would be reasonably confident of
        getting it done in 10 to 15 minutes, if I could be
        permitted to keep going, and then we could have the
        morning break, at which time further questions could be
        suggested.
```

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, I'm happy to do that,
but I thought we ought, just out of courtesy, ask
Mr Mort.
Are you happy to carry on a bit longer, Mr Mort,
while we try and finish this line of questions?
THE WITNESS: Yes, certainly.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
On you go, then, Ms Grange.
MS GRANGE: Thank you very much.
So if we go to page 14 \{SIL00000298/14\},
paragraph 55 , you tell us there that:
"On the 18th July 2018 [so just over a year after
the fire occurred], I attended Grenfell Tower to review
the installation of the remaining cavity barriers on the
project in areas of undamaged cladding and fire damaged
cladding."
Then you provide us with a number of comments.
Is it right that at that inspection you were able to
inspect the installation of the remaining
cavity barriers both in areas of undamaged and fire
damaged cladding; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Then between paragraphs 56 and 60 of your witness
statement, you set out basically a list of problems that
you identified with the installation of the
cavity barriers; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I don't want to spend time reading that all out, so what I' ll endeavour to do is just to summarise the problems you have identified, but please do correct me if I've summarised them unfairly or incorrectly.

So at paragraph 56 you're essentially saying that in some locations you were unable to identify support brackets or holes for support brackets, which suggested to you that cavity barriers either had not been installed at all or had been installed incorrectly without support brackets and perhaps with some silicone; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. What would be the effect of installing the cavity barriers with silicone rather than support brackets?
A. They're not installed in accordance to our guidance and in accordance with how they're tested.
Q. Yes.
A. Therefore they're non-compliant.
Q. Yes.

Then at paragraph 57 that begins at the bottom of page we're looking at there \{SIL00000298/14\}, you tell us that in areas where the cladding was undamaged, the
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horizontal cavity barriers you observed were not installed in accordance with published installation guidelines and, in particular, the gaps were too wide and therefore would not have been closed by the intumescent; yes?
A. Yes. We talked about the very large differences in installation guidance. Instead of it being a 25 -millimetre gap, you've got a 140 -millimetre gap. That's way beyond any form of sensible parameters. Q. Yes.

In respect of vertical cavity barriers, you noticed that in some places the horizontal support brackets had been used, thereby piercing the end of the cavity barrier; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Just to be clear, from recollection, when you looked at the vertical cavity barriers, did you actually see full fill vertical cavity barriers having been installed in that vertical position?
A. There were vertical barriers in there, but there was gaps and things. Without seeing the photographs of the full report, I ... it's difficult to comment.
Q. Right, yes. It's just because a number of the Inquiry's experts have seen horizontal barriers, and we have photographs of those, installed in the vertical
position. Did you see any evidence of that?
A. We only could see the barriers that were there at the
time. They could have been removed.
Q. Right, I see.
That piercing that you drew attention to, piercing
the end of the cavity barrier, the vertical
cavity barrier, what would be the impact of that
piercing in terms of its fire safety properties?
A. If you go back through my notes, I'm almost certain the
piercing actually indicated that there was a clear void
from the end of the vertical barrier to the cladding.
Q. Yes.
A. So the vertical barriers were totally ineffective. They
weren't installed in accordance with our guidance and
weren't installed as they -- how they had been tested.
Q. Yes. I think at paragraph 60 of your witness statement
\{SILoo000298/15\}, you actually tell us that the vertical
cavity barriers had air gaps of up to 50 millimetres.
A. Yes.
Q. Meaning that the compartments were not sealed. So
they're supposed to be full fill cavity barriers
installed under compression; yes?
A. Correct.
Q. And in fact they've got gaps of 50 millimetres; yes?
A. Yes. 57
Q. And that would render them ineffective; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Because they don't have intumescents, do they?
A. That's correct.
Q. At paragraph 59 \{SIL00000298/15\} you also tell us, as with the horizontal barriers, there were areas where you were unable to identify support brackets or holes for the vertical cavity barriers, suggesting that either they were not installed at all in those locations or they'd been installed incorrectly; yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Overall, how would you characterise what you saw during that inspection in terms of the quality of the cavity barrier installation?
A. It is probably of the poorest standard I've ever seen.
Q. Right.

You tell us at paragraph 61 of your statement at the end of page 15 that if you had been asked to inspect the installation during the construction, and it follows logically from your previous answer, that you would have said they were non-compliant and you would have instructed corrective actions, by which I think you mean remedial work to take place to correct all of it ; yes?
A. Yes, it -- we are very -- there's no grey area when it comes to inspection: it's either right or it's wrong.

If it 's wrong, and it's a minor and can be corrected, it gets corrected. If it's significantly wrong, like these barriers were, they'd have to be removed and replaced with new material.
Q. Yes.

Would it be fair to say that these were fundamental errors in the installation that no reasonable installer should have been making?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, we know it was Osborne Berry that installed these cavity barriers. Did you have any prior experience of working on projects in which Osborne Berry were involved?
A. No.
Q. What about Harley's installation ability, had you ever provided installation advice to Harley previously?
A. I believe there was one previous project, which was a curtain wall project, where an old contact of mine, Terry Nicolls, requested some assistance on site, which I handed over to Ricky Kay.
Q. Yes, we're going to come to that in just a moment.

Can we just turn to something called the ASFP Red Book. This is at \{SIL00002093\}. This is dated June 2016, just to be clear. So this is the Red Book of firestopping by the ASFP:
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"Fire-stopping:
"Linear joint seals, penetration seals \&
cavity barriers.
"4th Edition."
Did you have any involvement in the creation of this guidance?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. If we go to page 67 \{SIL00002093/67\}, under section 9.2, there is a section headed "Installer certification", and in the first paragraph it tells us that:
"Third Party Certification for installers is a process whereby the contracting company employs appropriately trained, competent staff to install the required passive fire protection system. Their work is independently audited by site inspections from the 3rd party organisation and a full record system is required as part of the scheme."

Then it tells us what an installer certification check involves.

Then if we look below that bold text, two paragraphs down, it says:
"The ASFP recommends that all passive fire protection is installed by third party certificated installers. In the case of fire-stopping this is particularly important as fire-stopping is often covered
up and inaccessible after installation, so it is important to get it right on installation."

So presumably, as you were involved in this guidance, you would have been familiar with these recommendations; yes?
A. Yes, and similar recommendations appear in Approved Document B.
Q. Did you ever have a conversation with Harley about whether they ought to be carrying out the installation of the Siderise cavity barriers using third-party certified installers?
A. No, I wouldn't have had that conversation with them.
Q. Did you ever discuss in any way that the competency of the installers ought to be evaluated by Harley?
A. No.
Q. Then just finally, that Waylands House project that you mention, if we go to $\{$ SIL00000321/2\}, this is an email dated 19 December 2014, it's in relation to the Waylands House project, and the subject is
"Fire Break/Lamatherm". It's from Ricky Kay to Terry Nicolls of Harley, but it's cc'd to you. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for context, Mr Swales tells us at paragraph 66 of his witness statement $\{$ SIL00000306/17\} -- we don't need
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& \text { to go to it }-- \text { that Siderise had supplied } \\
& \text { cavity barriers to Harley on four separate projects in } \\
& 2014 \text { to } 2015 \text { and one of those was Waylands House. Does } \\
& \text { that sound right to you? } \\
& \text { A. I wouldn't have an overall view of what sales -- } \\
& \text { Q. Right. } \\
& \text { A. -- would have sold. } \\
& \text { Q. Right. } \\
& \text { To your knowledge, was this the only other time that } \\
& \text { Siderise had inspected the work of Harley on a project? } \\
& \text { A. It was a function of Ricky Kay's duties. If it is the } \\
& \text { only one, it is the only one. } \\
& \text { Q. Right. } \\
& \text { A. I wouldn't be aware of Ricky's every day-to-day } \\
& \text { movements. } \\
& \text { Q. Right. } \\
& \text { We can see from the content of the email that Mr Kay } \\
& \text { says: } \\
& \text { "From my visit to site on the } 17 \text { th of December, } \\
& \text { I would like to make the following comments with regards } \\
& \text { to the install of our Lamatherm [curtain walling } \\
& \text { firestopping] system in a vertical application on your } \\
& \text { development at Wayland House." } \\
& \text { Yes? } \\
& \text { A. Yes. }
\end{aligned}
$$

```
Q. So this is curtain walling, it's not cavity barriers in
    cladding; yes?
A. Correct.
Q. And it would appear that Mr Kay had attended
    Waylands House to undertake an inspection.
        Just to be clear, were Siderise ever requested to
        undertake a similar inspection at Grenfell?
A. No.
Q. Was that service ever offered to Harley, the inspection
        service?
A. That would have been part of the normal sales
    negotiation/discussion between Ricky and Harley Curtain
    Walling. It's a service we offer and have offered since
    I joined Siderise in 2002. It's always a service level.
Q. Right.
A. We've always offered it.
Q. We don't need to go to all the detail of the email but
    I'm going to summarise. It appears from the text of the
    email that Mr Kay found a number of problems based on
    his inspection, including some firestops being installed
    in an incorrect orientation, some had been installed
    under insufficient compression, there were concerns over
    whether the correct quantity of brackets had been used,
    some of the firestops had been cut too small or cut
    poorly, leaving gaps.
```
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    Now, would you agree that a number of those installation issues do appear to be similar to the problems you identified on your inspection of Grenfell Tower after the fire?
A. Different product, different magnitude.
Q. I see. So --
A. They -- looking at this, they -- there are issues there, but they're nowhere near the magnitude of the issues that there were on Grenfell.
Q. I see. I see.

So just to confirm, did this prompt any
consideration within Siderise as to whether you ought to be offering to inspect the works at Grenfell Tower, just a few months later?
A. Like I said, I wasn't responsible for the account.

I wouldn't have put the two together.
MS GRANGE: Okay.
Mr Chairman, thank you for that extra time. I've come to the end of my questions. We could perhaps have the normal morning break and then we can take in any further questions.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
Just so you understand where we are, Mr Mort, we will take our morning break now. We always have a break when counsel have finished asking questions, just to
MS GRANGE: Yes, just one question, Mr Chairman. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
MS GRANGE: Yes, Mr Mort, so we saw this morning that you did review the system design drawings and you identified the weak link, despite, in your own words, it not being relevant to the cavity barriers and it not being your responsibility .
Can you explain how doing that is consistent with your reasons for not alerting Harley to the risks and limitations of cavity barriers in an ACM rainscreen system?
A. The system -- well, the façade designers plus the whole project team should be aware under the CDM requirements of all the relevant approved documents, not just Approved Document B, but A, L, M, K, whatever approved document is relevant to that building, the project team should be fully aware of that document and the requirements of that document, and the requirements of the testing needed to comply with those documents.
The weak link was such a glaring, obvious issue that I had to highlight that. There was -- I could not see how that was designed to be closed.
Q. Yes, I see. But the risks and limitations of cavity barriers in an ACM rainscreen system, how was that to be gleaned from the relevant approved documents
at the time?
A. It's within section 12 of the external wall section of Approved Document B. Like I said, we manufacture and supply cavity barriers. We're not responsible for the external wall design, panel choice or panel testing. That's the responsibility of the project team, and we have to assume that they've done their due diligence and complied with that section.
MS GRANGE: Right. Yes. Thank you very much.
Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman, those are all the questions that we have for this witness.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you very much.
Well, Mr Mort, not as many questions as there might have been.

Anyway, it just remains, I think, now for me to thank you very much for making yourself available to give evidence to the Inquiry. I think all the members of the panel have found it really interesting and helpful to hear what you have been able to tell us, and so we are very grateful for your willingness to give evidence.

There aren't any more questions for you, so now it's sufficient for me to say, well, you're free to go, and thank you very much and goodbye.
THE WITNESS: Thank you and goodbye.
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## (The witness withdrew)

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, at this stage we will have another short break while we reorganise matters for the next witness. That will take ten minutes or so. I'm going to say we will aim to resume at midday with the next witness, or as soon as possible when all the arrangements have been made.

Good, thank you very much.
(11.48 am)
(A short break)
( 12.15 pm )
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. I'm sorry
about the delay, which has been slightly longer than we were expecting, but we are now ready to go on.

Our next witness is Mr Richard Kay of Siderise. I'm just going to check that he is there and able to see me and hear me.

MR RICHARD KAY (called)
THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah, good afternoon.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, Mr Kay.
You should have on the screen in front of you the
words of the affirmation which I think you're going to make. Do you have that there?
THE WITNESS: I do, yeah.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Could you please then make the

```
A. Correct, I can, yeah.
Q. Thank you very much.
            If you have any difficulty understanding any of the
    questions that I ask you, please ask me to repeat them
    or to put the question in another way.
            If you feel you need a break at any point, as
        the Chairman has said, please just let us know.
            Please also try to keep your voice up, so that the
        transcribers who are on this call and are writing down
        what you say get a clear note of your evidence.
A. Absolutely, will do.
Q. One point that we ask all the witnesses: a nod or
        a shake of the head doesn't go down on the transcript,
        so please endeavour to say "yes" or "no" in answer to
        the questions.
A. Sure.
Q. Thank you very much.
            You have made one witness statement, so could
        I please take you to that. It's at {SIL00000304},
        please.
            Can I ask you to confirm, is that your witness
        statement?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. If we go to the last page, page 10, we can see it's
    dated 28 September 2018.
```
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## A. Yeah.

Q. Is that your signature?
A. It is indeed, yeah.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to read that witness statement recently?
A. Yes, I've reviewed my witness statement, yes.
Q. Can you confirm that the contents are true?
A. Absolutely $100 \%$.
Q. Have you discussed your statement or your evidence with anybody else before coming here to give evidence today?
A. No, no.
Q. So l'd like to start with some questions about your background and your experience and your role at Siderise.

At paragraph 3 of your statement, that's at page 1 \{SIL00000304/1\}, you say you have been employed by Siderise since 1 April. Can we just have a look at that. In the second line, do you see that there?
A. Correct.
Q. Can I ask what you did before you joined Siderise?
A. I actually had a year out, went travelling, but prior to that my previous employer was Hilti GB, so within the construction sector, where I acted as manager of the Portsmouth Hilti Centre, before being then out on the road as one of their external sales representatives. So

I then left there some time within 2010, took a year out, like I said, went travelling, came back and joined Siderise due to my previous experience at Hilti.
Q. How were you recruited to Siderise?
A. My father was working for Siderise at the time. There was an opportunity that came up for an external account management role, in the construction account manager role, which I applied for, went through the standard interview processes and secured the job based on my previous experiences at Hilti.
Q. Now, is it right that you were initially employed as a construction account manager? Is that right?
A. It is, yeah.
Q. What were the qualification requirements of that role?
A. It was mainly a sales role, so there's not too many qualifications to be a sales account manager required, it was really based on my experience with Hilti. I'd be selling to similar clients, my target market was similar, being construction accounts, because it was more generalist, obviously we have systems that are not just suited for façade sector, and at the time my role was looking at interiors and façades when I was first employed for the business. So, yeah, it was a broad spectrum of sort of target market for our range of products at the time.
Q. Yes, I see. Would it be fair to say, therefore, that the role didn't require any technical qualifications?
A. No, I mean, obviously we had dedicated technical resources within the team, so yeah, it was more sales, business development, commercial perspective.
Q. Do you hold any technical qualifications?
A. No, no official technical qualifications, just outside of obviously my product knowledge within the business. I have to have a clear understanding of how our systems perform, the applications they're used in. I wouldn't be very good at my job if I didn't. So, yeah, I have a clear understanding of our products and their applications.
Q. Yes, I see.

Prior to joining Siderise, had you had any training or education in the application of the Building Regulations or the guidance in Approved Document B or any of the other approved documents?
A. It was something I picked up on. I mean, it's part of our standard CPD delivery. So as part of the learning curve for my job role, frequently delivering scripted CPDs that are scripted by, you know, our marketing and technical teams at the time, to ensure that the external sales teams are delivering the same message to the wider market. So, yes, my understanding was really learnt
from frequent delivery of things like CPDs.
Q. When you are talking about CPDs there, just to clarify, that's continuing professional development that you gave rather than continuing professional development that you were subject to; is that right?
A. Yeah. Obviously I shadowed many of our senior -- more senior people within the business prior to then me taking over and doing -- conducting CPDs myself. But like I say, the presentations were scripted, so, you know, you're going as per, you know, our marketing and technical teams' clear instruction. But, yeah, obviously as you're presenting it, you're learning about it, so that's kind of how I learnt about, you know, the regulatory requirements surrounding the products that we were specifying for use or selling for use on projects.
Q. Prior to joining Siderise, had you had any training or education in respect of fire engineering?
A. No.
Q. At the time of the Grenfell project, were you a member of any professional bodies or organisations?
A. Not personally, no.
Q. You say at paragraph 3 of your witness statement $\{$ SIL00000304/1\} that you were promoted to national façades manager in 2015. Do you see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
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Q. And you confirmed that at the time of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment you were the national façades manager; is that right?
A. That is correct, yeah.
Q. Do you recall whenabouts it was in 2015 that you were promoted?
A. Not specifically. Probably at the start of the year, I would have thought, as just part of the end of year review of roles within the business, I would have assumed. It would either be end of -- so 1 April in the financial year or it would have been as of January 1 , so one of the two, I can't be sure.
Q. Can you describe what this new role involved, the role of national façades manager?
A. Prior to that, being construction account manager, which was being more of a generalist, looking at interiors, looking at façades, we realised our focus product range was more applicable to the façade sector, and it was an area of the market which we wanted to focus on and look to generate sales. We felt we had a market-leading offer at the time from the site service, technical and product testing perspective, and we wanted to put a lot more focus on to that market sector. So I was moved into that role as a more, like I say, market-specific role, rather than just being a generalist construction
Q. Can you briefly explain your role in the hierarchy of positions at Siderise?
A. My role in the hierarchy of positions - I mean, at the time, being national façades manager, that wasn't management of any particular team; it was me covering the country. Living down in Brighton, not ideal geographically, but I certainly did a lot of travelling back then. So, yeah, it was really managing our national set of accounts. So when it's national façades manager, there was no particular team working underneath me, it was just me covering the country from an account management perspective of our target façade set of contractors.
Q. What about senior to you, who did you report to?
A. Back then I was reporting to ... it might have been my father at the time, for a very short period of time, and then Christopher Hall, who was brought in as sales director for the business. Not entirely sure off the top of my head of the timeframes there, but yeah, it kind of coincided when I moved into the national façades manager role, my father then moved into more of an export role, so global role, and at which point then both of us reported directly to the sales -- new sales director, or he might have been called commercial
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director back then, not entirely sure of the role, but that would have been Chris Hall.
Q. Are you still employed by Siderise?
A. I am indeed, yeah.
Q. In general terms, and very briefly, can you explain to us what products Siderise manufacture and provide?
A. On my side of the business that I work for -- we have our special products side that are very separate to us -- but they are cavity barriers and firestops for various façade types, be it masonry, ventilated rainscreen, curtain wall system, as well as various acoustic upgrades that we can provide to assisting with noise control in curtain wall buildings as well. So that - - in terms of product range that I look to promote, obtain specifications for and sale, they are the set of product ranges that I predominantly deal with on a daily basis and target for sales.
Q. Yes, and at paragraph 4 of your statement $\{$ SIL00000304/1\}, you say that your role was to look after key accounts and generate new accounts for the business.
A. Yeah.
Q. Can I just ask you what you considered a key account to be?
A. Market leaders, the guys that were taking on the biggest
Q. Were they considered to be a key account?
A. They would never have been a company that would have ever procured our materials, so no, they would not have
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been anyone that I would have been proactively looking to engage with, no.
Q. Can we turn to Mr Swales' witness statement briefly, \{SIL00000306/8\}. I want to look at paragraph 31.

Now, Mr Swales is the chief commercial officer at Siderise; is that right?
A. This is correct, yeah.
Q. If we have a look at paragraph 31, it says there:
"Siderise recognise that installation is crucial to the function of its product and so we do provide assistance, either through instruction via the datasheets and/or onsite training. Additionally, in September 2016 a Youtube video was launched, as well as the App (January 2016). In addition to installation training, post installation inspection is also offered. There is no additional charge for this. There has however traditionally been a slow up take to this, which is why we clarified the extent of the 'Siderise Site Services' offer and actively began to promote these in 2016. Part of this was the development of an App that would provide assistance to contractors to correctly install the materials and subsequently inspect and report on the installation. The use of the App provides a standardised and detailed means of checking that the key elements of product installation have been
undertaken correctly."
Pausing there, we can see that the app was launched
in January 2016, but Mr Swales sets out at paragraph 29
\{SIL00000306/7\} -- we don't need to turn to it -- that
it was trialled during 2015 with some of Siderise's key
accounts.
To your knowledge, was Harley involved in that
trial ?
A. No, no.
Q. What about Celotex?
A. No.
Q. I'm sorry, I spoke over you. Do you want to repeat that
answer?
A. No, Harley were not involved with any part of the
development of the app, or it wasn't trialled on any of
their sites.
Q. What about Celotex, were they involved in its
development?
A. Again, we wouldn't be inspecting -- Celotex wouldn't be
procuring or installing our materials, so we wouldn't
inspect Celotex materials, so we'd only ever inspect our
own, and like I say, they were not an installer of our
products, so no.
Q. As at the time of the Grenfell Tower project, did key
accounts qualify for different or better services from

## Siderise?

A. I wouldn't say different or better. Maybe frequency of visits that we'd offer, and in terms of complimentary visits, we'd be more prepared to go the extra mile in terms of assisting with more frequent visits. It was all down to resource, really, but obviously the higher spending key accounts we would look to offer that -you know, go that extra mile where we could.
Q. You referred there to complimentary visits; does that mean that for other accounts Siderise would charge for provision of site services and site visits?
A. No, no, they were always complimentary, but they were limited, you know, again depending on order value. If you had a project that was an 18 -month programme with six blocks, having three complimentary inspections throughout that period is not really going to be sufficient, so that's down to myself, the account manager, to agree on the level and frequency of visits upfront with the project management team and, you know, we'd maybe then increase to doing two per block rather than it being two throughout the whole duration of the project programme. It was just something that we'd sort out at an early stage to confirm, and again, depending on project programme and overall project value to Siderise whether or not we -- you know, there was
resource that could be pumped in to facilitate the inspection needs.
Q. Yes, I see.

Now, returning to your witness statement at \{SIL00000304/1\}, at paragraph 4, you say there in the third line down:
"At the time of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment ... in 2015, my focus was on growing Siderise's market share. This included converting our business from distribution led enquiries/sales to direct enquiries/sales, where appropriate."

Could you just describe briefly, what are distribution led enquiries/sales?
A. We would -- the market leading distribution entities on the insulation side, you know, we'd often receive enquiries for, which were -- you know, if we required further technical info, everything was always dealt with in via a third party, and these distribution people that were approaching us, these third parties, were -- they could be supplying 200 different products to the same project, so their actual experience and knowledge of our product was rather limited. So we'd prefer to always deal with the end user or the installer in terms of assisting with design, and a lot of our competitors were owned by these third-party distributors, so we also
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found that a lot of work that we would have put in with architects on designs and specifications that we would have felt that we'd secured, when the tenders then go out and they go via a third party, we were finding a lot of, "Oh, yeah, we can promise for Siderise, but we can also offer you an alternative", albeit perhaps not as well tested and well qualified for the job, which was a deviation from the spec, and we were finding that we were being undercut commercially and losing orders based on that. And it was something I identified with my Hilti background of really only selling direct to end users and not engaging third parties. It was a strategy for the business, when I joined and went into being more façade focused, was: look, we need to be dealing with end users here, (a) for clarity of design and getting things right, and they weren't really offering these third parties anything more than (inaudible).

We were prepared to take these façade contractors direct because we wanted to hold the relationships with the end users, so they were fully aware of what our service offers were from a technical and on-site perspective, because a lot of that was being lost in translation with these third parties with their reluctance to introduce us to the end user, probably for
fear that they'd be cut out of the agreement.

> So, yeah, it was more of a focus for the business for me to be approaching end users and targeting end users rather than dealing via distributors. It gave us no real indication of what projects our materials were being used in.
Q. Yes, I see.

You say at paragraph 6 of your witness statement on page 2 \{SIL00000304/2\}:
"My role is for the most part dealing with the commercial aspects of our customers' requirements. If I receive fire or acoustic technical enquiries, I usually refer these to our technical department. However, if I do receive an enquiry for a standard application, which can be answered by our fire or acoustic test data and installation guidance in our data sheets, then I refer our customers to the relevant documents. Based upon my experience and knowledge of our product range, I am able to advise customers on their general requirements. If there are specific enquiries that I cannot deal with, then these are referred to our technical department."

> Do you see that there?
A. Yep.
Q. At the top of this page, we can see that you also
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provide, at the bottom of paragraph 4, training sessions/CPDs, and you have touched on those already in your evidence.
A. Yeah.
Q. And at paragraph 5, that you conduct installation inspections and installation training; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And provide mock-up installation on site.
A. Correct.
Q. So in order to undertake those parts of your role, would you agree that it required a degree of technical knowledge or expertise?
A. I mean, that's just standard installation and application of our products. I mean, if I wasn't fully versed on that, I wouldn't be very good at my sales job. You know, these are all just standard things that are -generally the process would be: design would be finalised by our design team, approved then by the project supervising authorities, and once the designs have been finalised and accepted by all the key stakeholders on the project, that's when I would or our now site services team would then arrive on site and, with those set of design details that would have been approved, and then come up with the mock-up in accordance with those.

## Q. Yes, I understand.

A. (inaudible) and fully the installation processes of our products into specific details once those details have been finalised by all the necessary stakeholders, you know, such as our technical team and the project supervising authorities.

So I am responsible for - - or at the time was responsible for carrying out those things, but only after the engagement from our sort of technical and design teams and the project supervising authorities, and everyone had been satisfied and approved those details to move them forward to site start-up.
Q. Yes, I see, thank you.

Now, we have considered there some of the general support that you provided to customers. In terms of that general support, did you ever receive feedback, either directly or indirectly, as to the clarity of Siderise's installation guidance for cavity barriers?
A. Nothing that I can recall, no.
Q. Now, returning to paragraph 6 there $\{$ SILO0000304/2\}, you say at the fourth line from the bottom of the paragraph, and we covered it a moment ago:
"Based on my experience and knowledge of our product range, I am able to advise customers on their general requirements. If there are specific enquiries that
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I cannot deal with, then these are referred to our technical department."

So can you just clarify for me where you draw the line in terms of general enquiries you can deal with and when you think those need to be passed to the technical department?
A. If I could refer you back to my comments about how I frequently deliver CPDs and the scripted content within our CPDs that was authored by our marketing and technical teams, a lot of that explains what the regulatory requirements are in the application of our barriers. So, you know, stuff that's within the public domain and documents that we publish, you know, I'm fully versed on. But when it comes to project-specific enquiries where designs may deviate from standard application or standard installation instruction, that's when obviously I look to then engage our technical officers and our wider technical team for their advice and input, which is then directly relayed on to the customer.
Q. You have talked about CPDs, continuing professional developments. What would typically be covered in such CPD talks?
A. An agenda for a typical CPD on ventilated rainscreen would be what the regulatory requirements are,
specifically how our products are tested at the product level, then there's guidance on what tests are available to do full-scale testing at the system level, and we also talk about the functionality of a ventilated façade and how it needs to function for drainage and ventilation or pressure equalisation, depending on what panel type's being used, throughout its design life, and then how our cavity barriers accommodate those standard functionalities of the ventilated façade throughout the design, that then will act to form a compartmentation seal in the event of a fire. So we explain how cavity barriers react in the event of a fire and, like I say, the general process --
Q. Yes, thank you.

Were those CPD talks provided free of charge?
A. Absolutely, yeah, upon request. They were then and they are now.
Q. Presumably that was also an opportunity for you to market Siderise's products to contractors or subcontractors, potential customers?
A. I mean, at the time there were RIBA approved ones, so we were able to talk about commercial elements to them as well. It was more of an understanding of what the requirements are and then obviously how our systems are tested to the most relevant standards.
Q. Now, we know from the witness statement of Mr Swales, and we don't need to turn to it, that the three most popular CPD presentations at that time were: (1) perimeter barrier firestops in curtain wall façades; (2) cavity barriers in rainscreen façades; and (3) sound transmission in curtain wall buildings.

Just focusing on that second presentation, cavity barriers in rainscreen façades, very briefly, what were the contents of that CPD?
A. Exactly what I just explained. That was the agenda specifically for that CPD.
Q. Thank you, that's helpful.

Did you or anyone else at Siderise to your knowledge ever provide any of those presentations to Harley?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever offer any training to them?
A. Yeah, I mean, as -- there was meetings, which I'm sure we'll come to, that took place, 20, whenever it was, 13,
14, I can't remember the dates off by heart, where I visited their office. Part of my standard introduction to Siderise pitch, should I say, is explaining what our levels of service offer are. We would have spoken about the installation of our system in comparison to the one which they were using predominantly on the majority of their projects. So all
of that would have been gone through. It's my standard approach and pitch to prospects, you know, as a sales engineer for Siderise. So, yes.
Q. Yes, I see.

We know that Siderise produce a range of written guidance. We will come to some specific examples later.

Did you have any involvement in the development of any of that written guidance?
A. No, no, those guidance documents are not authored by myself, no.
Q. At paragraph 5 of your statement $\{$ SIL00000304/2\}, you refer to providing installation training during site visits
A. Yeah.
Q. Can I just ask you what topics would be covered in a training that was provided on site as distinct from the CPDs that you have already told us about?
A. So installation training on site, again, we'd be looking to engage with technical to see if there was any design or technical advice that I need to consider when demonstrating the installation. Installation of our materials, whilst functionally they're installed in pretty much the same way, how they interface with obviously every curtain wall and rainscreen cladding system design and subframe that supports them deviates
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from project to project. So we always recommend and offer installation training, even if they've had it before on a previous project. The offer is then available again on the next one, because how the system -- albeit it's installed in the same way in terms of our manufacturer guidance, if there's anything that is bespoke to that particular product that we've dealt with at design stage, I would familiarise myself with that before then attending site to ensure that what I was demonstrating in terms of project-specific training, coinciding with the mock-up that I would have produced on site, coincided with what we had agreed at design stage.
Q. Yes, I see.

Were there particular recurring issues with the installation of cavity barriers which often needed to be addressed by training in such a manner?
A. It's not uncommon. If people don't take us up on the complimentary service, it 's certainly not uncommon for companies that don't install the system on a frequent basis to then come on to us after they've installed a bit of work, and they would have said, "We've had building control out, we've had NHBC out, they've highlighted these areas of concerns, can you pop down and do an inspection yourselves?" And then it's kind
of, "You should have got us in for the installation
training at the start and you probably wouldn't have had these issues". These are all complimentary services that were on offer to every single person who was procuring materials from us on every single project.
Q. You referred there to undertaking installation
inspections. At the time of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment, broadly speaking, what proportion of Siderise projects would you undertake an inspection of the installation on?
A. Difficult to tell. It's a reactive service. It's, as I say, part of my sales pitch, for want of a better phrase, to prospects when I'm looking to bring them on board. Even existing accounts, they are fully aware of the levels of service that are on offer. Some take them up on some projects and not the next because they feel they're confident in what they're doing. For me to proactively be insisting on it on every single job, I'd be working 72 hours a day and many more days a week than I currently do to be able to facilitate that, you know, for every single project that every single contractor does.

Normally when we've delivered installation training to a specific contractor on a specific product, more often than not, especially in curtain walling, they're
going to be installing the same type of their system,
especially if they're a curtain wall manufacturer as well as installer, project to project, so how our system would be installed into that particular -- on that project would be like-for-like on the next.

Not on every single project do we get the request,
but if we did get the request, they may well have to
wait a couple of weeks due to resource, but certainly we would honour those requests.
Q. Were there recurring problems with installation in your experience?
A. There is $--I$ mean, don't be fooled, these are very simple systems to install. There's no rocket science to the installation of our systems. The areas of non-conformance that we commonly see are really around carelessness and workmanship, leaving 1, 2 -millimetre gaps, you know, penetrating our barrier with various subframes, which is, you know, very common, is accepted on a lot of projects, but it's then making good where the penetration's taken place. You know, 1, 2, 3, $4-$ millimetre gaps are routes for smoke and possibly fire to be spreading.

So they're the areas of non-conformance that we generally see from project to project, rather than being a complete deviation from what our standard installation
instruction is. So really it's down - - the areas of non-conformance are predominantly due to carelessness and poor workmanship.
Q. Did you ever take any steps to ensure that the recommendations arising from your inspections were carried out?
A. Again, for us to proactively follow up every single one where there's areas of non-conformance, I mean, you will see on the - - which I'm sure we will come to --
Waylands House inspection that I carried out, my closing paragraph on that report was, "Please reach out to us once you've put these areas of suggested remediation right". Again, for me to keep a log on every single one and follow up every single one isn't really practical. We put our recommendations across and it's then kind of up to the contractor and the project supervising authority to ensure that that's been done to allow for sign-off. Sign-off doesn't come from us, it comes from the project supervising authority, so really it's over to them after we've left our recommendation.
Q. You say at paragraph 8 of your statement, that's at \{SIL00000304/2\}, in the first line there:
"Siderise recognise that installation is crucial to the function of its product. One of the main focuses of the company is installation; specifically providing
assistance to its customers."
You then go on in paragraph 8 to detail a range of sources of installation advice that Siderise provide, and I' II summarise those now: datasheets, which include written installation instruction; installation training; installation inspection; and then over the page, to page 3 \{SIL00000304/3\}, a YouTube video and an installation inspection template via the iAuditor app.
A. Yeah.
Q. So a range of sources of guidance for customers; is that right?
A. Absolutely. All upon request, or they're in the public domain, many of these things, so, you know, easy for everyone to access, yeah.
Q. We will come to it in more detail shortly, but it's right that you inspected the firestopping installation at Waylands House on that Harley project, didn't you?
(Pause)
I'm sorry, I'm not sure that the audio picked up your answer there.
A. Correct. Can you hear me now?
Q. Yes, thank you.

If we turn to your email report, $\{$ SIL00000321/2\}, you identify there a number of problems with the
Q. Can we turn now to $\{$ SIL00000227\}. This, when it appears, will be a Siderise brochure entitled "Cavity barriers for rainscreen cladding". We can see from the top right-hand corner that it's dated November 2013, issue 1. Do you see that there?
A. I do indeed, yeah.
Q. Is this a document that you were familiar with?
A. I can't recall, many moons ago, it's forever evolving, but, yeah, I'm sure at the time I would have seen it.
Q. If we look there under the heading "Benefits", there is a list of bullet points, and the penultimate bullet point is "Ease of installation"; do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Would you agree that Siderise were presenting in their Would you agree that Siderise were presenting in their
marketing material that one of the key benefits of its cavity barrier product was that it was easy to install?
A. If you can imagine having a sheet of Rockwool, cutting
A. If you can imagine having a sheet of Rockwool, cutting it in a certain direction, sticking two brackets into it and then fixing them to the wall, whilst from job to job
there may well be certain interfaces and obstructions, and then fixing them to the wall, whilst from job to job
there may well be certain interfaces and obstructions, in terms of the actual installation process for that particular product, as you've probably gleaned from my short explanation there, that's all there is to it, and
installation, and again I will summarise those, but if
you think I've summarised them unfairly, then please correct me.

You deal there with: installation in the incorrect
orientation ; the second bullet point down, insufficient
fixings of the brackets; inadequate or no compression of
the product; no RFT tape where the products were joined;
then over on page 3 \{SIL00000321/3\}, the vertical
fire barriers sitting between the vertical cladding
rails have been cut too small so air gaps between the firestopping and the structure.

In light of the extensive guidance on installation that Siderise appears to have deemed necessary, and the number of problems you identified there at
Waylands House, would you agree that installation is not a straightforward process?
A. It is a straightforward process. I mean, this was quite shocking, if I'm honest, to see this many areas of non-conformance in a system, that if you were to witness the installation of it you would kind of query, especially with the installation guidance that was readily available to Harley, how they got so many elements of this wrong. So this was actually quite an extreme example of quite a, you know, astonishing amount of non-conformances here.
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I would say that this was certainly unusual to see this many in relation to this particular product.
then joining up the joints with tape. There's not really an awful lot of rocket science to it.

There's a lot of technicalities that go into the composition of our particular product to ensure that it performs in the way that it does, but in terms of installation, it 's a very, very, very simple system to install. Like I say, the non-conformances that we usually see or that I usually pick up on from project to project are general carelessness, so holes being punched, stuff being treated on site, you know, the product not being handled properly and being damaged, holes then appearing, which are simple things to remediate and put right.
Q. Yes, I understand.
A. As far as a non-conformance when I'm out and inspecting, yes, it would.
Q. Would you agree that presenting the cavity barriers as easy to install might suggest to a potential customer that lesser skilled installers would be required than was in fact the case?
A. That what, sorry, lesser scaled?
Q. Lesser skilled installers. I will put the question again.

Would you agree that presenting the cavity barriers as easy to install in the product literature might
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suggest to a potential customer that lesser skilled
installers were required than was actually the case?
A. Erm, it's how it's interpreted, really. I mean, it's just, you know, advertising that the product is simple to install. It doesn't suggest that someone less qualified than a standard façade installer -- it doesn't really lead down that route. It's just advising that it 's a simple system to install, which it is .
Q. You say in the penultimate line of your witness statement at paragraph 8, if we turn to that, \{SIL00000304/2\}:
"In addition, Siderise have always to my knowledge, offered their customers installation training and post installation inspection - our full service offer, which outlines our on-site support, as in the Siderise 'Site Services' document, which since 2016 has been available on the Siderise website."

So can we turn to that document, which is at \{SIL00004265\}. We can see this is a document entitled "Siderise site services", "Version 1: January 2016" in the top right - hand corner; do you see that there?
A. I do indeed, yeah.
Q. Is it right that this is a composite document which sets out all of the services that Siderise offers to its customers?

```
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Can you help us with why it was felt this document was
    needed in January 2016?
A. It was us identifying in the market that we were perhaps
    offering something our competitors weren't. We wanted
    to formalise that offer into an official document that
    we could look to communicate with prospects that we were
    looking to bring on board, and we felt it was something
    that differentiated ourselves from other manufacturers
    in the market, to offer these extra levels of service
    that we were already mindful were becoming more and more
    requested for within the market, and we were looking to
    develop an offer to meet those market demands.
Q. This is, as we can see from the top right-hand corner,
    version 1. So would it be fair to say that this was the
    first time that Siderise had published one composite
    document?
A. An official document to outline our offer, but that's
    certainly not to say that the contents within this
    document were not available at a much earlier stage. It
    was just something that was more formalised as our,
    you know, company grew and our service offer was
    evolving.
Q. Yes, I see.
    It says there under the heading:
```
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"The SIDERISE technical team offers a wide range of
services to ensure that everything from product
selection to final installation runs smoothly."
So would it be fair to say, therefore, that prior to
2016 and this document being published, customers would
have to make an express request to find out what support
services Siderise could offer?
A. No, it was my responsibility to ensure that any
prospects that I was bringing on board and my general
account management were all fully versed on the levels
of service that were on offer, and it was a standard
part of my pitch to any prospect that I was looking to
bring on board who would subsequently place orders for
our materials.

I can confidently say that the likes of Harley would have been acutely aware of the services that were offered to them because they actually took us up on those offers on the Waylands House project, which was prior to what happened at Grenfell, you know, the installation that commenced the Grenfell. So they were aware of the levels of service that were on offer because they took us up on them and I carried them out. MR LAKING: Yes, thank you.

Mr Chairman, I note the time. I wonder whether that might be an appropriate moment to take the lunch break.

```
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, I think it would, thank you.
            Now, Mr Kay, we're going to have a break now so that
    we can all get some lunch. We will resume at 2 o'clock,
    please. I have to ask you, please, not to speak to
    anyone about your evidence or anything relating to it
    over the break. All right?
THE WITNESS: No issues.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. See you at
    2 o'clock. Thank you.
(1.00 pm)
            (The short adjournment)
(2.00 pm)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good afternoon, everyone, welcome
    back. We are going to continue hearing evidence from
    Richard Kay.
        Mr Kay, are you there? Can you see me and hear me
    all right?
THE WITNESS: I can indeed, yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much. Ready to
    keep going?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good, thank you.
            Well, then, Mr Laking, when you're ready, on you go.
MR LAKING: Thank you very much, sir.
    Can we turn briefly to Exova assessment report
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    number 311394. That's at {SIL00000211}. Mr Kay, when
    it appears, this is an Exova report entitled, "The
    Fire Resistance Performance of Lamatherm Rainscreen
    Fire Barriers", and we can see that on the right-hand
    side of the page at the top right -hand corner. Do you
    see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. This was a test report produced by Exova on Siderise's
    cavity barriers; is that right?
A. I assume so, yeah.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Sorry to interrupt you, Mr Laking.
            Have you seen this document before, Mr Kay?
A. Hard to judge just from what I'm looking at on the
    screen there. I mean, we have many fire test
    certificates. I mean, for me to know the report
    numbers, it's not really my remit to know that. I may
    well have done, but I can't recall specifically.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right.
            Yes, all right, sorry. Thank you, Mr Laking, carry
    on.
MR LAKING: Thank you.
            If we go to page 4 of this report {SIL00000211/4},
    you can see there there's a heading that says
    " Installation" towards the bottom of the page.
A. Yeah.
```

```
Q. It says there:
            "It is assumed that the barriers will be installed
    by competent installers in a professional manner. The
    use of 3rd party certificated installers is
    recommended."
            Do you see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. Were you aware of that at the time?
A. I'm aware it's an industry preference or recommendation
    to have third-party certified installers to install this
    sort of stuff. In my experience, the quality of work
    done by third-party installers is no better or worse
    than that done by façade contractors themselves, because
    third - party certified installers could be installing
    a whole host of different passive fire protection
    products from project to project, they're not
    specifically cavity barriers installers, whereas façade
    contractors, they install this stuff pretty much on
    a daily basis.
            So it's recommended, it's probably best practice,
        but in terms of getting quality of installation, from my
    experience, I see not an awful lot of difference, better
    or worse, than what's done by standard façade
    contractors.
Q. Would you ordinarily pass on that recommendation to your

\section*{customers?}
A. It's something that's -- would appear within the contract for -- that's been issued by the main contractor, or if it's a project-specific requirement for the installation to carry third-party certification then that's a matter for whoever's tendering those works, ie the façade contractor, to ascertain whether or not they're a member - - they want to join the scheme themselves or look to further subcontract the installation to a third - party accredited installer. It's not something that we would generally get involved with.
Q. Yes, I see.

We spoke this morning about the inspection that you undertook on the Waylands House project, and you described the installation on your inspection as shocking. For our reference, that's the transcript at page 97 , line 17. That was after your inspection, which was in December 2014.

Did it occur to you, following that inspection, that you should take extra care to make sure that training or installation were offered to Harley in respect of the Grenfell Tower project, which was a few months later?
A. It's always offered. It's a reactive service. Had we been requested to attend site to carry out installation
A. -- which they were fully aware of and, had they taken us up on that, we would have certainly obliged and visited site accordingly.
Q. Yes.

Did Harley ever explain to you why they didn't take

\section*{107}
you up on your offer to inspect or provide installation training at Grenfell?
A. I cannot recall any conversation to that effect .
Q. I now want to move on to some questions relating to Siderise 's involvement with Grenfell Tower and its relationship with Harley.

At paragraph 10 of your statement, if we could have that up, it 's \(\{\) SIL0000304/3\}, you say there:
"Harley Curtain Wall ... were a local company to where I lived (in the South East) in 2011. They were, I believe, one of the first companies that I targeted as potential customers upon commencing my employment with Siderise."

Can I ask why you decided to target Harley as a potential customer?
A. As I said there, they were local. To my knowledge they were, you know, a reputable, market-leading façade contractor that did a lot of work in and around the area where I was living, which was a region which I was covering. You know, as a sales guy, why would I not be approaching them?
Q. How were you aware of Harley? Was it from the locality only, or were there other reasons why you were aware of them?
A. Just me prospecting and doing my job, you know, finding
Q. You go on to say that that meeting didn't produce any custom as Harley used the Tenmat cavity barrier, and Tenmat are a competitor of Siderise.

At paragraph 11, you go on to say that you tried to engage with Harley again in 2012 without success, and again in 2013 by sending tentative emails on 5 and 12 August 2013 to Tim Lovell, contracts manager, and Mark Harris, commercial manager of Harley on 19 August.

So I would just like to turn to one of those such attempts. This is \(\{\) SILO0000327/2\}. This is the email dated 5 August, and we can see it's from you to Tim Lovell at Harley, and you say there:
"Hi Tim,
"Hope you are well."

Looking at the second main paragraph, you say:
"I put some rates into you sometime last year but nothing really materialized so I am back with some more competitive ones!"

Would it be fair to say that Siderise were willing to offer Harley significant discounts to, as you put it there in the end of your first paragraph, "secure your complete fire barrier business on every Harley project going forward"?
A. It's certainly not a strategy of our business to be undercutting systems that we feel are not as -- or have a service offer like we do. The competitors named above, we feel we have a more premium service offer, coupled with fire test data. So we were certainly not looking to undercut. We're clear -- we're mindful, sorry, that we are not the cheapest system in the market, we're not to this day, and there's reasons for that, as I say, with the test certification that we carry and the level of service that we offer on site and technical that a lot of our competitors don't. However, I felt it was certainly business that, you know, we're looking to grow the business at Siderise we wanted to be taking market share, and I felt I had to be more competitive with our commercial approach. That's not to say we were undercutting or felt we were undercutting
competitors, it was just making sure that we were a more favourable, you know, offer from perhaps what my initial approach was.

I'm a salesman. I was a salesman back then,
you know. That was -- we were looking for business.
Q. If we turn to page 3 of this document \(\{\) SIL00000327/3\}, we can see the attachments to the email. One of the attachments in that box, the top one, can you see there it says " 2110 Lamatherm Rainscreen Fire Barrier 173.1.pdf". Can you see that there?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is it right that that is a datasheet 2110 ?
A. I believe that is our TDS that was valid at the time, the issue that was in the marketplace at the time, yeah.
Q. Yes, and if we turn to \(\{\) SIL000000226\}, we can see that datasheet. We can see at the top of the page it's identified on the right - hand side as datasheet 2110, and it's entitled "CW-RS".

Pausing there, does that stand for "curtain walling - rainscreen"?
A. It was the product coding at the time, so CW kind of encapsulate all of our façade fire product range, and then there would have been coding afterwards --

\section*{Q. I see.}
A. -- that denoted it was an RS (inaudible) cavity barrier.
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Q. We can see it's entitled "Cavity Barriers for Rainscreen Cladding".

Under the "Introduction" section, it states:
"Rainscreen cladding systems typically incorporate a minimum 25 mm continuous ventilated air space. The inclusion of this cavity ensures that any rain penetration can drain freely within the façade construction.
"To accommodate this design feature, together with the essential but conflicting requirement to install cavity fire barriers, Lamatherm have developed a purpose-made solution."

Just to be clear, the purpose-made solution that the datasheet is referring to, that is the open-state cavity barrier with its intumescent strip; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Turning now to the next section entitled "Advantages", there's a sequence of bullet points on the left - hand side.
A. Just scroll down -- yeah, there we go, yeah.
Q. Below that we see a heading that says, "Fire
performance". Do you see that there?
A. I do.
Q. The text under that reads:
Siderise cavity barriers between two concrete lintels?
A. Yes, because that is the applicable standards for cavity barrier product testing.
Q. Did you ever consider whether it was misleading for Siderise to market its product as for use in rainscreen cladding when the reports that Siderise relied upon hadn't tested the product in a rainscreen system?
A. I mean, its functional performance is to allow for drainage and ventilation in the cold state, so throughout the functionality of what a ventilated façade is trying to achieve, so it allows for that, and then under critical temperature in the event of a fire, the intumescent expands to seal to the back of the substrate that it's looking to seal against. So it is a system that is suitable for a ventilated type façade such as a rainscreen.
Q. Did you understand that the performance of the cavity barrier might change if it didn't have a fixed substance to expand against?
A. As with all passive fire protection -- I mean, BS 476-20 is a fire test standard used widely throughout the passive fire protection market. We are testing the maximum possible performance of our cavity barrier here, not the bounding structure, so for us to put data within a standard technical datasheet that could not be read
"Lamatherm CW-RSH has been successfully tested and
assessed for up to 60 minutes (fire integrity and
insulation) using the general principles of BS 476, Part 20:1987 and BS EN 1366-4:2006.
"When adopting the fire resistance testing procedure of BS 476 Part 20, technical failure of integrity \& insulation would deemed [sic] to have occurred at the start of the test due to flame passage through the open void. However, following the rapid expansion of the intumescent layer, the gap becomes fully sealed and the product achieved the integrity \& insulation criteria ."

It then refers to two test reports, reference 157714 and 194496/B. Do you see that there?
A. Yeah.
Q. So it's right to say that the datasheet relied on two test reports, and those were undertaken by Exova Warringtonfire, weren't they?
A. I believe so.
Q. Had you read those reports?
A. I'm aware of the content of the report that we then subsequently obviously produced our technical datasheet based on. In terms of reading them word for word, no, that's not sort of in my remit to do that, authoring or reviewing the test reports.
Q. Were you aware that those tests had only tested the
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and interpreted by specifiers and end users, and then looking to then apply that to the specific system that they're looking to use them in, which there is an infinite combination of cladding and internal wall build-up types in the construction sector, our technical datasheet wouldn't be too much use.

So, you know, by advising here that we are clearly tested to the principles of BS 476-20, anyone that knows passive fire protection will know that's a concrete to concrete test, and we are here testing the performance of the cavity barrier, and we need to demonstrate to an end user, to a specifier, within our technical datasheet what the maximum possible performance is of that barrier if used then within a wall construction, an external panel construction with a subframe supporting it, that's either going to equal it or better it .
Q. Yes, I see.

Moving on now, you say at paragraph 12 of your statement, if we can have that up, \(\{\) SIL00000304/3\}, that:
"In January 2014, I was discussing Harley with Martin Sexton of Technical Fixings Solutions Limited. Siderise had a commercial relationship with Mr Sexton and the company he worked for (Technical Fixings

\section*{115}

Solutions Limited), in providing introductions to new customers."

In what context did those discussions with Mr Sexton arise?
A. We have general catch-ups, Martin and I. We worked very closely together. At the time, he was working as kind of an agent for Siderise. He was a facilitator of relationships, providing instructions. He holds a lot of relationships with key players in the industry under the banner than of TFS, Technical Fixing Solutions, and he felt he was able to facilitate an introduction to Harley due to his existing relationships, because he was predominantly their go-to fixing supplier.
Q. You say there in the second sentence of the page that we're looking at \(\{\) SIL00000304/4\}:
"Technical Fixing Solutions Limited effectively acted as a sales agent for Siderise."

What did Mr Sexton or TFS receive in exchange for acting as a sales agent for Siderise?
A. They would obviously receive a level of discounts from the product rates, so obviously there will be some margin in there for them if the orders went via them.
Q. Finally in that paragraph, you say:
"Siderise via Mr Sexton received its first enquiry from Harley to supply cavity barriers on 24th January

2014 for a Project at Merit House. Siderise proceeded

\section*{to supply cavity barriers to Technical Fixing Solutions} Limited for onward supply to Harley to the Merit House project in 2014. It also supplied curtain wall product to Technical Fixing Solutions Limited for onward supply to Harley for a second project in 2014 at Wayland House in Brixton."

So you list here two Harley projects, the
Merit House project and the Waylands House project.
Were there any others that you were aware of?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Mr Swales mentions four projects in 2014 and 2015. Now, we don't need to turn to it, but for our reference that's at his witness statement \(\{\) SILO0000306/17\} at paragraph 66.

We have identified two here, Waylands and Merit; you're not aware of what the other two were?
A. Not off the top of my head. Obviously this was seven-odd years ago. So, no, off the top of my head, no.
Q. Turning to paragraph 15 of your witness statement on page 5 \{SIL00000304/5\}, you say here:
"In March 2015, Harley were not a direct customer.
However, Siderise were receiving direct requests for
quotes from Harley, as well as via distributors. Back 117
in 2015, distributors of our materials were generally
reactive rather than proactive with regards to generating orders for our products."

Is it right that Siderise had supplied
cavity barriers or other products to Harley on previous projects but via an intermediary and not as a direct customer?
A. Potentially, but not to my knowledge, because quite a lot - often distributors won't disclose who their end user is or the projects that they're working on.
They can be quite -- hold that information quite close to their chest for obvious reasons, you know, they feel that we may then obviously cut them out of the picture when they realise that they're not offering too much contribution to the sales process and they're just taking a margin. So, yeah, not to my knowledge via any other distributors were we supplying.
Q. You describe the distributors as reactive rather than proactive. Can you just very briefly describe what you mean by that distinction?
A. Well, obviously we're offering them a level of discount to allow them to make margin on the on-sale of our products, and if they're just literally waiting for enquiries to come in from specifications that Siderise representatives have generated at spec level with

\section*{A. Yeah.}
Q. So far as you're aware, was this the first contact from Harley regarding the Grenfell project?

\section*{119}
A. Yeah, I'm not cc'd in, but my understanding is that was the first approach from Harley to -- directly to us, yeah.
Q. Now, Mr Lamb writes there -- and I appreciate you're not copied:
"Barnaby,
"Further to our discussions, please find attached details for rainscreen cladding using your RH25G-90/30 \& RVG-90/30."

When he refers to, "Further to our discussions", are you aware of what discussions he's talking about?

\section*{A. I'm not, no.}
Q. Do you know if Siderise advised Mr Lamb about the appropriateness for use on Grenfell Tower of the two products set out there, RH25G-90/30 and RVG-90/30?
A. What do you mean by appropriateness?
Q. So did Siderise propose those products to Harley, or to your knowledge was Mr Lamb asking after those products having independently discovered them?
A. I wasn't privy to any telephone conversation that happened or however the line of communication between Barnaby and Kevin happened, so I couldn't tell you whether or not that was them, from a datasheet that they previously received from us or accessed via the website, proposing those products or whether or not that was
something that came from Barnaby.
Q. Yes, I see, thank you.

I'm sorry, I cut you off there. Do you want to finish your answer?
A. I'm not aware of any discussion that took place, so I'm unsure as to how or who is naming those product codes. Q. Yes, thank you.

Mr Lamb was an independent subcontractor who had been commissioned by Harley to work on the drawings for Grenfell. Are you aware of how he came to be aware of Siderise?
A. Maybe -- again, I may have had some communications with him many years ago on other products, he could have been engaged with Chris or other members -- Chris Mort within our team, other members of the Siderise team. I'm unsure what would have made him reach out to us on this particular one. Perhaps he was aware that we supplied Waylands and Merit and, looking for consistency of manufacturer, looking to progress with us on this one as well. So I'm unsure as to what his reasoning to approach us was.
Q. Yes.

Now, Mr Lamb requests there in that email, if we could return to it, Mr Carrick's comment in particular to:
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"1. The horizontal break in a void of 316 mm
(exceeding your max tabulated size of 300 mm ) ...
"2. Not having any product details for the RVG, we have assumed the fixing detail as the horizontal.
Please clarify."
So would you agree that Mr Carrick was being asked to provide advice as to the suitability of Siderise's products, (1) in respect of the void size, and (2) in respect of the fixing method?
A. Yeah.
Q. Was it normal for these issues to be addressed once construction work had started on site, in your experience?
A. We get asked all sorts of questions at design, at start - up, when things have started up. It's not uncommon.
Q. Now, attached to that email were a number of documents. We can see the first of those at \{HAR00009735\}. These are Harley specification notes identifying, in the bottom left-hand corner under the heading "Fire breaks", Siderise Lamatherm RH25G and Siderise Lamatherm RVG.

Just to clarify, in the product code, the RH, that stands for rainscreen horizontal; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And similarly, RV is rainscreen vertical ?

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. Then if we look at the top of that page, on the left -hand side, we can see under "System" that it describes the system as "Reynobond composite rainscreen cassettes"; do you see that there?
A. I do.
Q. So that would suggest that these were metal composite rainscreen panels; yes?
A. I assume so, yeah.
Q. Did the inclusion of the brand name "Reynobond" signify anything to you in particular?
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I think, Mr Laking, the first question is: did he see this?
MR LAKING: Yes, you're quite right, sir.
A. No. I haven't seen this document, no.

MR LAKING: Thank you, that's helpful. I can take this more briefly, then.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I'm not sure he's going to be able to comment on it if he hasn't seen it.
MR LAKING: Were you made aware, Mr Kay, of what panels were being proposed for use at Grenfell Tower?
A. No.
Q. The email also contained section drawings. Now, I appreciate that you may not have seen these, so please do let us know. Can we turn to the first one. It's at

\section*{123}
\{HAR00009727\}. Do you recognise that drawing?
A. Only from the previous witness, when it was brought up, but prior to that, and at the project design stage,
I don't recall seeing this drawing, no.
Q. That's helpful, thank you.

Just dealing with it very briefly, then, we can see in the top left -hand corner that's a -- was it your understanding that that was a cavity barrier in the honeycomb hatchings in the top left-hand corner of the drawing?
A. That looks to be a cavity barrier, yeah.
Q. Just using this as an example, because I appreciate you have not seen this drawing in particular, is it right that there is a gap then between the outside of the façade and the edge of the cavity barrier?
A. Correct, that's the gap for drainage and ventilation, yeah.
Q. And that gap would be filled in the event of a fire by an intumescent strip; is that right?
(Pause)
l'm sorry, I'm not quite sure we picked up your answer to that question.
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you.

That's what's commonly called an open-state
cavity barrier; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Could we turn now to the second drawing that was attached, and again, I appreciate you haven't seen the drawing, but using it as an example. It's at
\{HAR00009737\}. This is a section showing in the bottom left - hand corner a cavity barrier. Is that how you would have interpreted that drawing at the time?
A. Yeah, again, that appears to be a plan detail of a vertical cavity barrier, yeah.
Q. We can see that this cavity barrier extends to the edge of the façade. So would it be right to say that this is a vertical cavity barrier which is full fill?
A. Correct.
Q. le, to put it another way, it doesn't have an intumescent strip to expand?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you.

Is it right that a vertical cavity barrier should be installed under compression to ensure a tight fit between the barrier and the material against which it is abutting?
A. With our system there is a requirement to install under an element of compression, yes.
Q. How would that compression be achieved?
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A. So the product is supplied oversized, and we're sent the overall cavity dimensions between face of inner leaf and rear of panel. We take those measurements and then we add on an element of compression depending on what the overall cavity width is.
Q. You say at paragraph 7 of your statement, that's at \{SIL00000304/2\}:
"As a general rule, we always request as much information as possible from the customer, in particular the Fire Strategy, though this is rarely provided, in order to advise the customer, on the appropriate cavity barriers to use."

So we've seen the documents that were attached to the email to Mr Carrick. Did you ever take any steps to obtain further information from Harley such as, for example, the fire strategy?
A. When I say "we", that's generally down to our technical team to assess the information currently provided, and if they require more information to allow them to issue a formal response and offer any guidance in terms of design and the application of our cavity barriers, then, yeah, that was generally down to our technical team, not myself.
Q. Did you ever take any further steps to identify the other materials used in the façade, so for example the
insulation product that was being used?
A. I did not, no.
Q. When you refer to requesting the fire strategy here, in that part of your statement, do you mean a narrative fire strategy or fire strategy drawings, or both?
A. Both. Generally we'd like to see fire strategy drawings and the narrative, yeah.
Q. What information would you be looking for in the fire strategy?
A. Mapping out locations of cavity barriers in accordance with regs; whether or not, you know -- if it's required to conform to minimum requirements of ADB or NHBC, you know, the locations of cavity barriers vary between both; required fire ratings. That sort of thing is what we'd be looking for.
Q. Can we turn now to an email \{HAR00019012\}.

My apologies, just before I leave that, there is one more question I want to pick up on.

In your experience, would the location and performance of cavity barriers be specified within the fire strategy?
A. Certainly. Certainly.
Q. So now moving to the email which is at \{HAR00019012\}.

This is an email from Chris Mort to you, copying in Ben Bailey, dated 22 June 2015. We can see then from
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the text of the email itself that it appears to in fact be addressed to Ben Bailey, despite him being copied in that. Do you see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. We can see that Mr Mort requests certain information from Mr Bailey, including elevations, fire strategy report, and NHBC or not. Do you see that there?
A. I do indeed.
Q. The date of this email is 22 June 2015; do you know why Mr Mort was only requesting this information in June rather than in March, when the initial enquiry about cavity barriers came to Siderise?
A. I believe more focused questions were being asked at this point in relation to design that we hadn't been queried on previously, and obviously to be able to respond to those specific enquiries, Chris required that additional information to allow him to formalise an official Siderise response.
Q. To your knowledge, was the fire strategy ever received?
A. I'm unaware. That would have been a question for Chris.
Q. Did you or anyone else at Siderise -- my apologies,

I spoke over you. Please finish your answer.
A. My understanding is no, but I couldn't be sure.
Q. Did you or anyone else at Siderise ever consider whether it might be inappropriate to provide advice without
```

having sight of the fire strategy?
A. What sort of advice are you referring to?
Q. Well, we've seen from the emails that advice was being
requested as to the fixing methods, as to the
appropriateness of the 90/30 product, and we'll come to
some --
A. Fixing methods are just in accordance with our standard
installation instructions, so that wouldn't change from
project to project, so that's pretty standard
information. So in terms of offering guidance on how
our product is fixed, same from project to project,
there is no deviations there.
Q. What about in terms of the appropriate insulation and
integrity requirements of a specific barrier?
A. Well, looking at that spec document that you brought up
that I hadn't seen before, it clearly outlines the
specific product codes and fire ratings that were
required in accordance with the spec, so I believe that
was what was originally put forward.
Q. Now, returning to the 3 March }2015\mathrm{ email, this is at
{SIL00000069}, we can see that Mr Carrick responded to
Mr Lamb on the same day.
Now, I appreciate you're not copied in to this
email. I'll read it to you. It says here:
"Hi Kevin,
A. Fixing methods are just in accordance with our standard installation instructions, so that wouldn't change from project to project, so that's pretty standard information. So in terms of offering guidance on how there is no deviations there.
Q. What about in terms of the appropriate insulation and integrity requirements of a specific barrier?
A. Well, looking at that spec document that you brought up that I hadn't seen before, it clearly outlines the specific product codes and fire ratings that were required in accordance with the spec, so I believe that was what was originally put forward.
Q. Now, returning to the 3 March 2015 email, this is at \{SIL00000069\}, we can see that Mr Carrick responded to Mr Lamb on the same day.
Now, I appreciate you're not copied in to this email. I'll read it to you. It says here:
"Hi Kevin,
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            "We have reviewed the details you have kindly
    supplied and can confirm they follow our
    recommendations. As the void is less than 325 mm and
    a 25 mm air gap is present, the cavity barrier size falls
    within our standard test data. Regarding the RVG-30/30,
    as shown in detail C1059-305, also follows our
    recommendations. The brackets for the vertical barrier
    only need to penetrate two thirds to three quarters of
    the cavity barrier."
            Were you aware of this email at the time?
A. If I wasn't copied in, then no, I wouldn't have been
    aware at that specific time.
Q. Do you know what test data Mr Carrick is referring to
    when he says there, "the cavity barrier size falls
    within our standard test data"?
A. If it 's standard test data then that perhaps would have
    been in our technical datasheet, but yeah, I mean, if
    it 's anything outside of the technical datasheet then
    it 's probably something I wouldn't have been acutely
    aware of.
Q. Now, following Mr Lamb's request of 3 March, Siderise
    sent Harley a quote for vertical and horizontal
    cavity barriers. Can we turn to that, it's at
    \{HAR00000842\}. We can the quotation there. It's
    addressed to Mr Mark Stapley, design team manager at
"We have reviewed the details you have kindly

Harley, and it's dated 12 March 2015.
To your knowledge, what was Mr Stapley's involvement in the Grenfell Tower project?
A. He is listed there as design team manager, so I can only assume that was his role on this project.
Q. You say at paragraph 15 of your statement \(\{\) SIL00000304/5\}, but no need to turn to it, that you were "generally copied in to emails to ensure pricing was correct, as we were trying to get Harley on board with a better pricing strategy". What was the nature of that better pricing strategy?
A. I just wanted to ensure that the pricing level that I had proposed to them as like a blanket agreement was also being reflected on this project, so there was some harmony between what I had agreed with the commercial teams there or what I'd sent or put forward to the commercial teams there, that what they were reading from that particular price list was then reflected in the rates for that particular size on these projects.
Q. Yes, I - -
A. I wanted to ensure that they were corresponding and there wasn't going to be any --
Q. Yes. So your general comments to Harley about price were being reflected in the specific quotes that were being sent out?
A. Yeah. I just wanted to ensure that there was continuity between the pricing strategy that I'd presented to them and then what we were pricing on this job, so I just wanted to confirm that, because obviously being one of the first projects that we were engaging with them on, I didn't want there to be any -- you know, it not be carried through, so any inaccuracies from what we were quoting here to what I delivered as what was their pricing strategy.
Q. Yes, I see, and if we move down the page, we can see the prices that Siderise quoted. So we can in respect of the horizontal open-state cavity barrier they were being charged at \(£ 22\) per unit, and the vertical cavity barrier was being charged at \(£ 13.55\) per unit.

Could you just explain what is a unit in this case?
A. A 1.2-metre length, and then obviously by the width and depth of the material. Depth of material, as in thickness of the material, is determined by the fire rating that it was required to achieve, and then obviously the width would be whatever the void size is that it 's being used in, minus the 25-mil for an RH25 or plus compression fit for the RV. But all of our materials are supplied pre-cut in 1.2-metre lengths. Q. Yes.

Keeping that document on the screen, can I also have

\section*{\{SIL00000082\}.}

Now, just waiting for it to come up, this is an email of a few days earlier, 4 March, and that's from Sue Sheppard to Gill Walker. Just to confirm,
Gill Walker was an employee of SIG; is that right?
A. I believe so, yeah.
Q. And SIG, was that a third-party distributor of Siderise products?
A. They were.
Q. We can see that you're copied in to that email. Had you discussed the provision of a quotation with Ms Sheppard before it was sent to SIG?
A. I cannot recall, sorry.
Q. The contents of the quotation that she attaches can be seen at \(\{\) SIL00000028/3\}. We can see here that the price - if we can have on the left - hand side of the screen the quote to Harley directly, that's at \{HAR00000842\}, so we can compare them side by side. Thank you.

So we can see there, it 's the same product that's being quoted with the same quantities in both cases; correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. And we can see that the price charged to Harley on the left - hand side, \(£ 22\) per unit in respect of the
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horizontal cavity, but being charged to SIG at \(£ 24.62\).
Can you see that there?
Similarly, the vertical cavity barrier, the price to Harley was \(£ 13.55\) and the price to SIG for onward supply was \(£ 14.50\).

Could you explain the reason for the increased prices to the distributor?
A. As I said, the strategy for the business was to be establishing better lines of communication and relationships with end users, and it was a strategy for the business to identify the market-leading façade contractors and be looking to offer our best commercial offer which is -- which was reflected on this particular project.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Kay, can you just help me, it looks to me as though the quotation to SIG was a figure less \(12 \%\); is that a discount that had come off the figure mentioned there?
A. That's the standard discount issued to our -- you know, any distributor of our product.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: But the unit price to the distributor would be \(£ 24.62\) less \(12 \%\); is that right?

\section*{A. Correct.}

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So it would bring it down somewhere nearer the \(£ 22\) you're quoting to Harley; is that right?
A. Correct. So we'd be selling to both businesses at pretty much the same rates, yeah.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Okay, thank you very much.
MR LAKING: At the bottom of those pages we see there is a part number and description for each product, and in those descriptions the products are being described as for use in building envelopes and rainscreens. Can you see that there?
A. Yeah.
Q. Would you agree with me that including the phrase "for use in rainscreens" in your quotation of the products might suggest to the reader that testing of cavity barriers as part of a rainscreen system had been undertaken?
A. Again, they're suitable to function in a ventilated rainscreen, that's how the system is designed, to allow for the air flow and ventilation which are the functionality requirements of a ventilated cavity behind a rainscreen, so they allow for that, and then they react at critical temperature to seal to the back of the panel in the event of a fire. So the way that they are designed is specifically for that type of application.
Q. Now, we can see here that the insulation and integrity requirements of the horizontal barrier are listed at 90 minutes and 30 minutes; is that right?
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\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. Can I briefly take you to Approved Document B. That's at \(\{\) CLG00000224/125\}.

Now, this is a table, and we can see at the top it's table A1, and it's giving the "Minimum provisions when tested to the relevant part of BS 476", and it's then giving figures for loadbearing capacity, integrity and insulation.

Are you familiar with this table?
A. I'm familiar with the extract that specifically relates to cavity barriers, yes.
Q. Yes, and if we could pan down the page to number 15 , that shows there cavity barriers, not applicable because it 's not a loadbearing element, and 30 minutes' integrity and 15 minutes' insulation; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you explain why the product supplied for the horizontal barriers in Grenfell were 90/30, which is in excess of the \(30 / 15\) set out in Approved Document B?
A. We generally test to failure, so we want to see what the maximum possible performance of our product is, so we test to failure. We don't just stop the test at 30/15. We leave the furnace running to see how the El rating achieved, and the El rating achieved on our, let's say, lowest performing barrier was at 90/30.
```

Q. Yes, I see. So that would be the barrier that Siderise
would ordinarily supply to meet a 30/15 requirement; is
that right?
A. Lowest performing RH barrier for -- with a 25-millimetre
(inaudible).
Q. Can we turn now to {SIL00009344/4}. We can see here at
the bottom email this is from Andrew Kay to Gary Hall at
Focchi Ltd. Do you see that there?
A. I do.
Q. It's on 15 January at 17.28.
He says in that email there:
"Hi Gary,
"Further to our conversation I attach a copy of the
guide on rainscreen fire barriers that might be useful
for Claudio when designing in the future.
"With regards to our product data sheet we have just
updated it and it is awaiting final draft approval.
This should be available Monday and I'll get it over to
you straight away."
If we go down to the final sentence, it says:
"If you need any of the guys trained on the curtain
wall firestops let me know. We will want to train on
the rainscreen ones as these are often installed
incorrectly."
Do you see that there?
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A. Yes, yes, I do, sorry, yeah, final sentence, yeah.
Q. Then if we go to page 3 \{SIL00009344/3\}, this is
    an email dated 21 January 2015 at 11.32 , we can see then
    that you are then copied in to the response to that. Do
    you see that there?
A. I do.
Q. Did you share Andrew Kay's view that there was
    a training need for rainscreen firestops?
A. Focchi being predominantly a curtain wall unitised
        installer, they don't often install this type of
        cavity barrier. They're Italian-based. I believe the
        requirements for cavity barriers and ventilated façades
        differ in their home market. So in terms -- where a lot
        of their design is dealt with overseas, it was just
        ensuring that they were fully versed on what the
        requirements were for cavity barriers here in the UK,
        because it was not a system that they were installing on
        a frequent basis.
Q. Now, when Andrew Kay says that the rainscreen ones are
        often installed incorrectly, how did Siderise know that
        that was the case?
A. When we say incorrectly, like I said earlier, the
        non-conformances that we generally find are with
        interfaces with subframes, so it's not a case of
        installing our barrier incorrectly in accordance with
our basic installation instructions, it's really down to workmanship and understanding that where there are interfaces with the cladding subframe, which is on \(95 \%\) of projects that ventilated cavity barriers are supplied into, it's ensuring that the right steps are made to make good any penetrations or interfaces with the subframe where they pass through our fire compartment walling, so that would have been the angle of that comment.
Q. To your knowledge, what would the impact of those workmanship deficiencies that you have just identified in that last answer be on the fire performance of the firestopping or cavity barriers?
A. If you can imagine, cladding rail supports can be every \(300,400,600\). If you're not making good the penetration to ensure then it's fully sealed, so there is no route for passage of smoke or flame, then if that's apparent on every floor, at every 400, 600, then that can be quite a significant effect on the overall performance of the fire compartment line even after it's sealed to the back of the panel.

So, yeah, it's critical to ensure that these installers are taking care of the 1 -millimetre,
2 -millimetre, 3 -millimetre gaps, and they are predominantly the areas of non-conformance that we see
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from job to job, not necessarily the fact that our -because a curtain wall product doesn't have too many penetrations, CW passing through it, if you get a nice clean slab edge line, it's quite a clean install. Rainscreen differs, and it's generally down to the cladding subframe and the penetrations, not the basic installation principles of the system itself.
Q. When you say rainscreen differs in that answer, do you mean that rainscreen differs insofar as there is the potential for different sized gaps in the rainscreen in a way there isn't in curtain wall?
A. Curtain wall cavities can span between 50 all the way up to 250 . We frequently see it's the -- that the support frame for the various types of cladding, which is -there's infinite cladding systems out there with different subframes and how they will potentially interface with our barriers. They're the areas that need attention and extra focus on workmanship from project to project.
Q. Yes, I see, thank you.

Now, was training offered in respect of the Grenfell Tower refurbishment project in particular? I understand what you've said in terms of you would always make offers as part of your sales pitch to Harley, but was a specific offer made of either
inspection or installation services by Siderise on the Grenfell Tower project itself ?
A. Not to my knowledge, because as it was then, as it is now, it's a reactive service. So, you know, we present that level of service and what's available to our customer base as a complimentary level of service, and if they take us up on it, they take us up on it. We always recommend it, but in terms of proactively offering, I cannot recall, but I'm pretty sure that the answer is no.
Q. We saw in that previous email we looked at that Mr Kay said, "If you need any of the guys trained then let us know". Can you explain why we don't see in the emails around Grenfell a similar comment from you or from someone else in Siderise along the lines of, "If you need any of the guys trained on the rainscreen cavity barriers, just let us know"?
A. As I said, they installed the system at Merit House to our belief with no issues. We weren't asked to come to site. There was no areas of non-conformance that we were made aware of. Really that system is bread and butter for the likes of Harley Façades. For that company in particular that you've drawn up there, Focchi, I think that was probably the first time they've ever had elements of ventilated cladding within their
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scope of works on a project. Predominantly they are, as I said, unitised curtain wall installers, and then you may well end with small elevations or areas such as shear walls where they had a rainscreen type façade application which they would have needed cavity barriers for. So in that instance we were offering that because we were mindful that's probably a system and product that they'd never installed before.
Q. Did it not occur to you, having seen the quality of the installation at Waylands House just a few months earlier, that there was a real need to restate the offer, to make sure that Harley were very much aware that that was something that Siderise were offering on Grenfell?
A. I go back to Merit House being a project that was recently completed around the time of Waylands House with no issues with the same system that was then installed at Grenfell. You know, the Waylands House system installed there was a completely different system, so there was nothing -- whilst obviously the installation there was non-conformant and was supported by the report that I issued highlighting the areas of non-conformances, completely different system to then what was installed to my knowledge without any issues at Merit House, so why would I then assume that there would
Q. Would it be fair to say that there would be a range of reasons why someone might not request an inspection
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which would go beyond simply there are no problems with the installation? There might be a whole host of reasons why a customer wouldn't want or request an inspection on a particular project.
A. Yeah, I mean, ultimately the sign-off of the installation is the requirement of the project supervising authority. I mean, they'll be going round and doing their own QA procedures, and if there was something that they saw that was of any concern, quite often that then gets escalated to us when it's a project supervising authority or a fire engineer that's doing their own inspection, and that's when we get asked to come to site.

You'll always, I'm sure, get elements of contractors not wanting manufacturers to attend site and offer - you know, if they thought, "Well, last time I got Siderise out, they identified loads of areas of non-conformance, maybe we won't reach out to them again", but more often than not, when you've got the likes of local authorities who are going to be signing off the installation themselves, if they identify areas of concern, then that's when they engage us and we're always there on hand to offer support and any inspections needed.
Q. Yes, I see, thank you.

12 Q. Did Harley explain why there had been such a change?

> A. They didn't, no.
Q. If we turn to \(\{\) SILO00000051\}, we can see here on the same day, this is an email on the same day of 25 March 2015, you instructed Sue Sheppard -- just to confirm,
Sue Sheppard was an employee of Siderise; is that right?
A. Our customer services representative at the time, yeah, who would have dealt with the issuing quotes -- putting quotes together and issuing them.
Q. Yes, I see. We can see here that you propose the pricing for revised quote: horizontal 120 minutes at \(£ 26.40\) per piece, vertical at \(£ 16.26\) per piece. Do you see that there?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can we turn now, before I ask you a question, to

Ms Sheppard's response, which is at \{SIL00000053\}. This
is her response to you on the same day, and she says:

\section*{"Hi Ricky}
"I have started the new quotation for HCW [Harley Curtain Wall], but a little problem, we have a product code for the void of \(120 / 120\) to suit 316 mm void, but it is in development.
"Ricky this cannot be taken out unless we have an approval from Technical/Barnaby to say that this has been approved for the 120 mins .
"Please can I ask, did Barnaby e-mail you so that I can continue with the quote."

What was the significance of the product still being in development at that time?
A. I can't recall. It would have been a question for our technical representative. I can't recall, I don't get involved with that sort of thing.
Q. Is it right that Siderise were still offering a product to market despite the fact that it might be a development product?
A. Again, if there's a request that comes in for that void size, then it's deferred to our technical team for review and just to see if we've got any applicable data that we can fall back on or any planned fire testing

Now, moving to paragraph 16 of your witness
statement, \(\{\) SIL00000304/5\}, in the second sentence, you
refer there to a request:
"... on or about 25th March 2015, we received
a request from Harley to change the quote for an increased fire rating of RH25-120/60 and RV120-120 ..."

To be clear, that was an increase to 120 minutes' integrity and 60 minutes' insulation for the horizontal barriers, and 120 minutes' insulation and integrity for the vertical barriers; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes, I see, thank you.

Can we turn to \(\{\) SIL00000056\}. This is Mr Carrick's reply to Sue Sheppard on the same date. We can see here that he writes, and I appreciate you're not copied in to this:
"Hi Sue,
"Yes please proceed. If the only change is upgrading to a higher fire rating there should be no problem."

So was it your understanding that Mr Carrick had approved Sue Sheppard to continue with providing a quote to Harley?
A. I guess so, yeah. I mean, I haven't been copied in on any of this, so yeah, I assume we progressed the quote, so the correct process had been followed, which was consult our technical team, which is what it looks like has happened, and we have been comfortable quoting for that price in that fire rating.
Q. Did Mr Carrick discuss his conclusion with you that if the only change is upgrading to a higher fire rating, there should be no problem?
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A. He didn't, no. He wouldn't look to consult me because I'm not part of the technical team, so ...
Q. Do you consider you ought to have made clear that this was a product that was in development to Harley so it could ensure it remained suitable for Harley's purposes?
A. At this stage, I mean, I can't recall definitively, but from the email chains it doesn't look like I'm made aware that this is a product that's in development, so that was something that technical determined and gave the green light to Sue, who then issued the quote.
Q. Were you aware of whether technical carried out an EXAP, an extended application assessment, before providing that advice?
A. My understanding is that's our standard procedure.
Q. Returning to paragraph 16 of your witness statement on page 5 \{SIL00000304/5\}, at the last four lines there, you say:
"Ben Bailey of Harley contacted me by telephone to discuss the higher price ..."

So you're discussing here the revised quotation to the increased integrity and insulation requirements.
A. Yeah.
Q. "... as he indicated that it was now over their budget.

If I recall correctly, I asked Mr Bailey to clarify why two hours of fire resistance was now required.

I advised him to make sure that the specification was
correct, as the two hours of fire resistance was above the requirements of Approved Document B for an open state cavity barrier."

\section*{Do you see that there?}
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you recall the reason why two hours of resistance was now required at that stage?
A. I believe it was down to, as we see later in the correspondence, the local authority interpreting it as a firestop not a cavity barrier, and therefore needing to meet the ratings of the internal walls and floors, rather than being determined as a cavity barrier and therefore, in accordance with ADB, only being a 30/15 requirement.
Q. Were you aware of any other project that had required two hours' fire resistance for cavity barriers?
A. We test to that level at the product level because we're frequently asked to supply cavity barriers at that level so ... yeah.
Q. Did you advise Mr Bailey to push back against building control's recommendations?
A. I was advised that the uplift in costs meant that they hadn't budgeted for it, at which point I then queried: well, why has there been an increase up to two hours?
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And only at a later date did I -- obviously, with all the email exchanges that then spiralled from this -- was I then understanding the reasons why is because the local authority was of the opinion that it was a 120-minute requirement, and Ben said, "Can you do me a favour, then, please, and offer me -- point me in the direction of where it says in ADB that the minimum requirements are 30/15 and that your barrier that you're proposing is offering \(90 / 30\), therefore it exceeds the minimum requirements".
Q. Do you --
A. I mean, you know, I'm a salesman, you know, to bump the order value up by \(6 / 7\) grand, happy days. So, you know, there was commercial pressure, and I was advised they were then overbudget and, you know, we were going to show an additional level of discount against the two-hour products, my query was simply: why has it been escalated to two hours from originally what we deemed to be accepted as a \(90 / 30\) ? And he said, "Is there anything you can provide me with to support the change back to a \(90 / 30^{\prime \prime}\), at which point I pointed him in the direction of the regulatory document.
Q. We have had a conversation about the fire strategy and the fact that Siderise would ordinarily request one. Had you considered whether it might be appropriate to
A. No. I mean, it's common, cavity breaks, firebreaks, cavity barriers, they're all referred to in the same cavity barriers, they're all referred to in the same
way. Generally when I see a firestop or smoke stop, that would normally be associated with curtain walling, continuation of internal compartment ratings, so matching the ratings in the internal walls or floors,
ask for the fire strategy at this stage rather than simply referring Mr Bailey back to the insulation and integrity requirements as set out in ADB?
A. It's not something for Ben and I to have come to a conclusion in between ourselves. I mean, I was just giving him something to go back to the other stakeholders involved, the other project supervising authorities, the fire engineers, to re-open the discussion as to whether or not \(90 / 30\) would be accepted, and that there was -- you know, the definition of the barrier in that application was a cavity barrier rather than a firestop. So it was me, in good faith, offering some potential advice to try and assist with going back to what was originally -- what we felt was accepted as a 90/30.
Q. Would it have been more prudent to request relevant documents from Harley, such as the fire strategy, and then refer the query to the technical team at Siderise?
A. The specification document that you brought up earlier clearly stated RH25-90/30, RVG-30/30 or 90/30 or whatever it was at the time. So within the original spec document that you presented to me earlier, which I hadn't actually seen before, it clearly stated that that was what the specification was, which is what I believe our technical team then confirmed, which is
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what then I reconfirmed again. So we were querying why
there has been an escalation into a 120 rating when the original spec was outlined at 90/30.
Q. Can we turn now to \(\{\) SIL00000064 \}. This is an email from Ben Bailey to you copying others from Harley and Siderise, and it's dated 26 March 2015, so one day later than the emails we were discussing before.

We can see that Mr Bailey writes there:
"Hi Ricky
"As discussed yesterday could you forward the relevant building regs to support the advice that 30/15 firebreaks are what is required. I've got to have this approved by the client before I can order anything so time is of the essence!"

Do you know who he was referring to as the client in this email?
A. I don't, no.
Q. Were you concerned at all about Mr Bailey's use of the word "firebreaks"?
but a 30 -rated firebreak, you very rarely get \(30-\) minute what cavity barriers are, but to me that didn't send any alarm bells, no.
Q. Did it cause any alarm bells that Mr Bailey was not able to identify the relevant building regs himself and seemed to be reliant on your advice?
A. I think just from the nature of the conversation that we had, it was: I've got this to hand, it's part of our CPD delivery, I' II ping you over -- just for ease and speediness of filtering the information through to his client, I just said, oh, I' II give him a brief overview and a snapshot from the regs, and he was grateful for that, so ...
Q. In your experience, would it be common for specialist cladding subcontractors not to know about integrity and insulation requirements of cavity barriers?
A. You think it mad now, obviously, given all the focus around fire safety in façades, but back then, I mean, if you consider the overall value of cavity barriers to the overall façade building envelope package, you know, we were anything between 1 and \(5 \%\) of the overall package, so it was no surprise that, considering we're such a small portion of the overall value of the building
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envelope package for this type of contractor that
they're not completely versed on all the regulatory requirements, and that's where we're there to try and assist to -- it's our expertise.
Q. You replied to Mr Bailey the same day, and we can see that email at \{HAR00004005\}. We can see here, when it comes up, that you attach the requested extract from Approved Document B, and this is from table A1, and I think you said earlier that this is the extract that you were familiar with; is that right?
(Pause)
Are you able to see that email there?
A. I am, yeah.
Q. There is a cut and pasted table which is a section of table A1 from Approved Document B; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You say below that pasted table:
"Here you can see that it clearly states that 30 minutes fire integrity and 15 minutes insulation is all that is required from a cavity fire barrier. This is reference to rainscreen cladding applications where the cavity barrier is deemed to be on the outside of the building. Our RH25-90/30 will offer 90 minutes fire integrity and 30 minutes fire insulation, therefore exceeds minimum requirements."

Did you feel comfortable providing that specific
technical advice without having received relevant documents from Harley, such as the fire strategy to be adopted at Grenfell?
A. As I said, we've -- there was a recommendation that came out from our technical team at an earlier stage between Barnaby and Chris Mort that specified the RH25-90/30 as being suitable. I was literally echoing what I had already seen at an early stage where we recommended those products for use, so I'm echoing our technical department there.
Q. I see.

Can we turn now to \(\{\) HAR00003949 \}. We can see that this is an email from John Hoban, the building control officer at RBKC, and we can see that you're copied in to that email, along with a number of other recipients.
That's on 30 March 2015. Do you see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. To your knowledge, had you or Siderise more generally ever provided cavity barriers on projects where John Hoban of RBKC building control was the relevant building control officer?
A. I can't recall. The name doesn't ring a bell prior to this project, but to be definitive, I couldn't advise.
Q. Mr Hoban writes there:
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"Please find detailed below a copy of an email sent to various persons on the 20th of March 2015, concerning the topic relating fire stopping of the compartment floors to the building. I would advise you that it is my interpretation of diagram 33 of Approved Document B is that the detail between compartment floors and external cladding is not a cavity barrier, therefore it must be fire stopped to at least the standard of the existing compartment floor ( 120 minutes)."

So, essentially, is it right to say that he was setting out his view that there needed to be firestopping at 120 minutes fire resistance; is that right?
A. By the looks of this email, yeah.
Q. If we look at the beginning of that email chain at the bottom of the document, so this is the bottom of page 2 and on to page 3, but starting with the bottom of page 2 \{HAR00003949/2\}, there is an email here of 27 March 2015 at 10.53 . This chain appears to have begun with Neil Crawford at Studio E forwarding your email of 26 March. So if we go over to page 3 \{HAR00003949/3\} we will see that there. So there we can see your email to Ben Bailey of 26 March that we've already considered.

Have you ever come across an interpretation of diagram 33 which was the same as Mr Hoban's on previous
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A. We see even to this day a lot of confusion between the requirements for cavity barriers and firestops. Just because the cavity barrier's being taken back and affixed to the actual slab edge, when you look at the line of the internal wall, you're still isolating that cavity barrier from the inside of the building and therefore being an external cavity. So it was our collective review at -- view at Siderise that this was a cavity barrier requirement and not a firestop.
Q. You say at paragraph 21 of your statement
\{SIL00000304/7\} -- we don't need to turn to it -- that you think you must have discussed this email with Chris Mort. Can you recall that discussion?
A. Not word for word, but I'm sure there would have been discussions that were had, yeah.
Q. Do you have any sense of the content of those discussions?
A. It would have been along the lines of, "What's your view on the email from Mr Hoban? Can we look to formulate a -- perhaps a further response?"
MR LAKING: Mr Chairman, I'm about to move on to a different set of emails, so this might be an appropriate time to take the afternoon break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. How are you getting on with
this witness, Mr Laking?
MR LAKING: I'm doing well, thank you, sir.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, how well?
MR LAKING: I suspect I will need approximately 45 minutes this afternoon to finish off.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, he has to finish today, hasn't he?
MR LAKING: Yes.
THE WITNESS: I'm happy to proceed if you want to crack on. I don't need a break.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We all need a break, I think, at this point, including you.

Okay. Well, I just think we need to bear that in mind, Mr Laking.
MR LAKING: Yes, sir, noted. We will certainly finish today.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, very well.
Well, we shall take a break now, Mr Kay. Will come back at 3.30, and please don't talk to anyone about your evidence or anything to do with it while we're having the break. All right?
THE WITNESS: Of course, yes.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. See you in a moment.
(3.15 pm)
( 3.30 pm )
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going
    to continue hearing from Mr Richard Kay.
        Mr Kay, are you there?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm here, yeah.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: You can see me and hear me all
    right, I gather?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Happy to carry on?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, let's proceed.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
        Then, Mr Laking, when you're ready. Thank you.
MR LAKING: Yes, thank you, sir.
        Mr Kay, can we now turn to \(\{\) SIL00000068\}. We can
    see here this is an email from you to Mr Mort of
    30 March 2015, and you forward the email that we were
    looking at before the break from John Hoban. Can you
    see that there?
A. I can indeed, yeah.
Q. Now, we don't need to turn to it, but at paragraph 19 of
    your statement \(\{\) SIL00000304/6\} you say that you
    forwarded it over because he was the technical officer
    for fire and best placed to respond.
        So what had prompted you to send the email to
            159
    Mr Mort at this stage?
A. Because of the stakeholders involved, the fact it had
    been escalated to the building control officer,
    I thought it best it come from an official Siderise
    technical personnel.
Q. We can see there that you don't send any covering text
    with your email, you simply forward Mr Hoban's email.
    Do you think that you discussed it in the office with
    Mr Mort?
A. It would have been remotely, I'm not office-based, but
    yeah, it -- certainly we would have held some form of
    discussion. The content I couldn't tell you
    definitively, but it would have been along the lines of,
    "This is coming over, could you please, when I forward
    it over to you, review and author a response".
Q. Did you propose any suggested comment or response?
A. Not at all. It's not within my remit to do so.
Q. Could we now turn to \(\{\) SIL00000070 . This is an email of
    the same date, and we can see it's from you to
    Ben Bailey and John Hoban, and you write there:
        "All,
            "Please can somebody forward over a drawing of the
    build-up of the cladding so that my Technical Officer
    can evaluate and forward an official response with
    a SIDERISE product specification."
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So essentially Mr Lawrence was requesting that any debate around the cavity barrier requirements was done without John Hoban's knowledge; is that right?
A. That's what it looks like from Simon's email, yeah.
Q. Now, turning to your statement at paragraph 22, that's on page 7 \{SIL00000304/7\}, I would just like to pick up the story as you deal with it here:
"On the same date (30th March), I received an email from Simon Lawrence of Rydon, who had copied in Ben Bailey, Chris Mort and individuals from Rydon, Studio E, Martin Sexton and Sue Sheppard (Siderise), asking that we dealt with the query privately ..."

So that's the email that we were just looking at.
"Mr Mort replied to the email confirming that we would only liaise with Harley as they were our client ... Mr Lawrence replied confirming that he was happy for the project team to discuss but did not want to upset Mr Hoban, which could have subsequent implications for him at a later stage ... Following this email, I had no further involvement with any other party/contractor involved in the refurbishment."

Then moving down to paragraph 23:
"Mr Mort following his review of the drawing provided by Mr Bailey on 30th March, provided me with

Had Mr Mort told you why he needed a drawing of the
A. It's just standard procedure. We'd look to request further information when further requests come in for technical assistance, you know, we needed as much information as possible to respond to the enquiries being put to us.
Q. Is it right, then, that you passed the drawing requested back to Mr Mort when you received it?
A. Yeah, I was playing a bit of middleman here, so yeah, I was just bouncing emails between the two people who were requesting and supplying information.
Q. Yes, I see.

Can we now turn to \(\{\) SIL00000072 \}. This is an email from Simon Lawrence of Rydon to Ben Bailey, Ray Bailey, Ricky Kay, copied to a number of other recipients, and he says:
"Ricky/Ben,
"I appreciate that there is a discussion and different points of view regarding the cladding firestopping/cavity barrier regs which we can make. However we need to do this constructively and I'd rather not question the BC Officer (John Hoban) in front of everyone on email. Can you please sort this out in private and respond to myself and Neil if you have
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a marked up version, requesting drawings of 3 sections; namely \(A-A\) through the cladding, \(B-B\) through the cill and CC Total, which I sent to Mr Bailey on 30 March 2015 ... Mr Bailey replied on the same date and refers to a discussion, which I cannot now recall. However, he confirms that the two drawings that he has attached represent section \(A-A\) (window head) and \(B-B\) (window cill ), which can be combined to create \(C-C\), as he did not have a drawn detail to cover what Mr Mort was requesting."

So, to put it simply, Mr Mort requested three section drawings from Harley and you obtained two of those, window head and cill level, and passed those from Mr Bailey back to Mr Mort; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you.

Can we now turn to Mr Mort's response, \{HAR00018971\}. At the bottom of page 1 of that email, we can see Mr Bailey's email to you copying in Chris Mort, subject "RE: Grenfell Tower Fire Stopping", and if we go over the page \(\{\) HAR00018971/2\}:
"Ricky as discussed the two drawings attached represent section \(A-A\)..."

So he is providing the drawings.
If we go back now to page 1 \{HAR00018971/1\}, can we
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have a look at Mr Mort's email in response at the top of the page. He says here:
"Hi Ben,
"I have reviewed the drawings sent over and sketch a proposal to alleviate the issues raised by the BCO ..."

That was sent to Ben Bailey and also to you.
In the second paragraph, he explains:
"The proposal requires the installation ..."
So he is talking about the proposal to alleviate the issues raised by the BCO :
" ... of RH25g 90/60 product in two layers one at the head of the window aligning with the compartment floor and the other at the top of the existing up stand, therefore two layers of 60 minutes protection that overall would provide if tested over 120: minutes protection, at the window locations."

> Do you see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. Now, that differed from your previous advice to Mr Bailey that only 30 minutes' integrity and 15 minutes' insulation were required.

What was it that had led to Siderise's change of approach from pushing back against the building control officer to acquiescing and formulating a proposal to
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A. What I informed was that minimum requirements of the cavity barrier were \(30 / 15\) and then advised that they should perhaps discuss this further with the BCO to see if that would be acceptable.
Q. What was it that led then to that advice changing to, "Here is a proposal to alleviate the building control officer 's concerns"?
A. As and when we received more information, which is what we requested to allow us to make further reviews and comments, then this is what materialised from that.
Q. Now, in the first paragraph he goes on to say, at the end of that first line:
"... also on the second page of the attachment I have highlighted the weak link so to speak in terms of fire and \(I\) think the BCO would have also noticed this."

Had you discussed the weak link with Mr Mort?
A. No, I hadn't discussed it with Chris Mort, no.
Q. Could we turn to his annotated drawing, \(\{\) HAR00003948/2 \(\}\), please. This is an annotated Harley drawing, annotated by Mr Mort, and he has put a bubble around the top of the window head and highlighted that weak link for fire.

Did you review these drawings produced by Mr Mort at the time?
A. I didn't, no. I was, like I said, acting as a bit of 165
a middleman, just merely clicking forward and just a brief summary of what was required from either side, so I wasn't actually opening the documents myself and reviewing them. I was of the full belief that Chris was obviously doing his side of things from a technical perspective, and that those technical -- any guidance being offered by Chris was being picked up by the guys at Harley.
Q. Can we turn now to page \(1\{\) HAR00003948/1\}. We can see here that Mr Mort has sketched a proposal which includes two cavity barriers above the window head and two below the cill on the right-hand side. Do you see that there?
A. I do, yeah.
Q. Do you recall whether you reviewed this drawing at the time that it was sent out?
A. Again, I wouldn't have done, no.
Q. We can see here that there are no cavity barriers at the immediate jambs of the window. That's right, isn't it?
A. One to the left there of the elevation, that's in pretty close proximity, but the one to the right's slightly further out.
Q. Was that something that, had you reviewed this drawing, you would have picked up at the time?
A. There can be all sorts of reasons why verticals are not in too close proximity to window jamb locations, because
of the subframe supporting the cladding, because of the window(?) details and the various bits of bracketry at window jamb locations on -- more often than not it's almost impossible to get a thickness of cavity barrier into these areas, so quite often they need to be moved away.

But, I mean, from looking at this, it appears that that's still within the same compartment, so had I reviewed it, it wouldn't have sent me any -- set off any immediate alarms because, I mean, we're not in -you know, we're not able to see sections here to show the interfaces, you know, the bracket supporting system around the window details. But, no, had I reviewed this, it wouldn't have raised any particular alarms.
Q. Are you aware of the guidance in ADB setting out that cavity barriers are required to close around openings?
A. I am.
Q. Just so I can check I understand your evidence correctly, are you saying that, with that awareness, had you reviewed a drawing such as this, it wouldn't have caused you any concern that it did not appear that there were cavity barriers to close around openings?
A. They are in quite close proximity already to the openings, and for other fire engineered reasons that may well have been mapped out within the fire strategy, if
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they were the detailed locations of cavity barriers authored by the project fire engineer who writes the fire strategy or equivalent supervising authority, that's not for us as a manufacturer to then go ahead and override their proposed locations.

So, no, it wouldn't have informed alarm bells because they're clearly set out here and they are set out for reasons that we may well not have been privy to.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Laking, this witness didn't see this drawing and I wonder whether he is the right person to be pursuing questions of that kind with.
MR LAKING: Sir, I take the point and I'm moving on.
Mr Kay, did you ever have any separate discussions with Harley as to this weak link and Mr Mort's proposal to alleviate it beyond what we see in the documents?
A. Nothing at all, no.
Q. We see that Harley then placed their order for Grenfell Tower on 2 April 2015. Can we turn to that, it 's at \{SIL00000172\}. If we look at the bottom of page 1 we can see Mr Bailey's email of 2 April to you: "Hi Ricky,
"Please see order and relevant information attached. If possible can you arrange to have the fixing spikes sent to site ASAP so we can get on with fixing them please."
20
21

Above that, we can see that you forward that to "Purchasing" and "Siderise Sales Distribution Group". Were they internal Siderise mail lists?
A. The Siderise sales distribution group would have been. Purchasing, that may well have been an old one, we're forever changing our emails, so without seeing this specific email address there, I can't be \(100 \%\) sure, but yes, I would have thought so. It was an internal email.
Q. Can we turn to the purchase order itself, which is on page 5 \{SIL00000172/5\}. We can see there, if we zoom in on the middle of the page, RVG-30/30, can you see that there, vertical cavity barrier?
A. Yeah, I can see that, yeah.
Q. It's right to say that the \(30 / 30\) product, that didn't exist, did it?
A. I believe it would have been \(90 / 30\) at that time.
Q. So would it be right to say that that should have referred to \(90 / 30\) vertical cavity barrier?
A. I'd have to check in the technical datasheet that it was a 90/30 rated barrier at the time. I'm aware that historically we did \(30 / 30,60 / 60,120 / 120\), but then with more recent fire testing, we were testing to failure rather than stopping at the levels that we were looking to achieve. So I'd have to double check that. I can't give a definitive answer on that at this stage.
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Q. Can I ask you now to look at Barbara Lane's report \{BLAS0000008/46\}. We can see there at paragraph 8.9.53 she says:
"The vertical cavity barriers observed on site were not the Siderise Lamatherm RVG-120/60 Full Fill
(non-ventilated) breaks as prescribed in the Harley specifications ... but appeared to be the same RH25G-120/60 product (intended for horizontal installation ) rotated and installed in the vertical position ... The leading edge (with the intumescent strip behind the polymeric seal) was located flush to the column surface, with the rough cut edge facing the rainscreen cladding panel."

If we then turn to page 48 \{BLAS0000008/48\} and look at figure 8.52, we can see a picture there, if we zoom on in it, in the middle of page.

Can you confirm that in the blown-up part of the box we see a green strip and it says "Siderise RH25"? Do you see that there?
A. I do, yes.
Q. So looking at that photo, would it appear that that is a horizontal cavity barrier that has been installed in the vertical position?
A. It would appear so.
Q. Are you sure that Harley did in fact order vertical
cavity barriers?
A. If we can check a proof of delivery, I'm sure we'll be able to see that.
Q. Do you have a specific recollection of them ordering vertical cavity barriers?
A. They've sent it over on their purchase orders, an incredibly slim chance we would have deviated from somebody's purchase order, so I'm pretty sure verticals would have been supplied and I'm sure we can support that with a POD.
Q. Do you have any explanation as to why Dr Lane discovered horizontal barriers installed in the vertical position?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Were you ever aware of horizontal barriers being installed in the vertical position by customers in previous projects?
A. No.
Q. Can we turn now to \(\{\) HAR00004238 \}. This is an email at the top of page 1 from Ben Bailey to you on 6 May 2015, and he says there:
"Hi Ricky,
"At the risk of covering old ground.... Are we ok to use the \(30 / 30\) product (according to BR) for vertical cavity fire stopping at Grenfell tower? Just want to make sure before we start putting anything on the wall,
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as I think we focused on the Horizontal intumescent cavity barriers last time..
"Best Regards,
"Ben."
Was it your understanding that there was a 30/30 product at this stage?
A. Again, I can't recall whether or not it was rated at \(30 / 30\) or \(90 / 30\) when it was supplied.
Q. We are unable to find a response to that email. Do you know if you corrected Mr Bailey?
A. I can't recall, sorry.
Q. Do you know how you responded to him if at all?
A. Yeah, no, I cannot respond -- cannot recall, sorry.
Q. You continued to correspond with Harley after the weak link email that we were looking at. Did you ever take an opportunity to check with Harley whether they had taken on board the advice in the weak link email and actioned it or relied upon it?
A. I mean, my understanding was that that weak link didn't ultimately concern the application of our product, so the advice by us was just offered in good faith and it was something that the project design team should have been looking to consider as a possible route for fire to spread from, I believe, inside to outside through the window detail. So it wasn't specifically an application
for our product or the products that we'd supplied on to this project.

So, no, it wasn't something that I proactively
followed up on. It was just advice offered in good
faith by our technical team.
MR LAKING: Mr Kay, that reaches the end of the questions that I have for you.

Mr Chairman, that was a very short 45 minutes,
I appreciate.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Don't worry, you won't be criticised for that. Right, thank you very much, Mr Laking.

Well, as you heard, Mr Kay, counsel has asked all
the questions that he thinks he needed to ask you, but we always have a break at this stage just to give him
a chance to review things, and also to give other people who are following the Inquiry from elsewhere the chance to suggest further questions.

So we will have a break now until 4.05, I'm going to say, and then at that stage we will whether there are any more questions anyone wants to put to you. All right?

Please, again, don't talk to anyone about your evidence or anything relating to it while we're on the break.
THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
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SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: So we will see you a bit later, then.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. (3.50 pm)
(A short break)
(4.05 pm)
(Proceedings delayed)
( 4.35 pm )
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Welcome back, everyone. I'm sorry
that there has been quite a significant delay, because
we've had problems with the live stream. The live
stream failed about half an hour ago and, despite the
best efforts of our technicians and their support, we
haven't been able to resume the connection.
I understand from counsel that he has only one
further question for this witness, and because of that,
we've taken the view that the right course is to record
the rest of this afternoon's proceedings, which ought to
be very short, and add it to the recording of the day's hearing.

So, we're now going to go back to Mr Kay and put the
final questions to him now.
So are you there, Mr Kay? Can you see me and hear me?
```

THE WITNESS: I am, yes
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very good.
Well, I'm very sorry to have kept you waiting for so
long. As you have probably heard, we've had some
technical problems which we haven't been able to iron
out fully, but we have at least reached the point at
which we can finish your evidence without any further
delay. So I'm going to invite Mr Laking to put
a further question to you, if he has one.
Mr Laking, are you there?
MR LAKING: Yes, thank you, sir.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Very well. Would you like to go
ahead.
MR LAKING: Thank you.
Mr Kay, just one question: did you ever inspect any
other Harley projects beyond Waylands House?
A. No.
MR LAKING: Mr Chairman, Mr Kay, thank you very much. That
concludes the questions that we have for you.
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, thank you very much,
Mr Laking.
Well, again, I'm sorry we kept you so long just to
ask you that one question, but we are very grateful to
you, Mr Kay, for coming to give us your evidence. It's
been helpful to hear what you have to tell us, and

```
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    that's all we have for you. You're now free to go, and
    thank you very much. So, goodbye.
THE WITNESS: Bye.
            (The witness withdrew)
SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, that completes the proceedings
    for today. We will resume tomorrow morning at
    10 o'clock.
(4.40 pm)
            (The hearing adjourned until 10 am
                on Wednesday, 10 March 2021)
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[^0]:    A. No.
    Q. No.

    We can see that at this time you were made aware
    from Mr Lamb that Grenfell was going to be overclad in
    ACM rainscreen cladding. Do you remember noting that at the time?
    A. No.
    Q. Yesterday in your evidence you said -- and for the transcript this is at $\{$ Day102/73\} -- that you weren't aware of what panels were used on the Grenfell project. Having seen this email exchange, can we agree that in fact you were made aware that this was ACM rainscreen cladding at the time?
    A. In the context of that email, I may have read it, but I was more reading the response from Barnaby.
    Q. Yes, but in checking Mr Carrick's response, presumably you would have read the request in the first place, otherwise you wouldn't have been able to help --
    A. But the ACM isn't clarified as to what it is, as in what performance standard it is --
    Q. No, I understand --
    A. -- what grade it is or anything. Yes, I acknowledge it 's an ACM, but there is no grade against that ACM.
    Q. Yes, but you knew at the time that it was an aluminium composite material rainscreen cladding panel; yes?

[^1]:    barriers aren't going to be effective if used in combination with that product?
    A. Again, I' ll come back to the same point: Siderise are not responsible for the design of the project. We have to assume that others at a higher level within the project, so the fire engineers, the approving authorities, have done their due diligence and proven that the panels going to be used on the project are suitable for use on the project. That is not Siderise's responsibility. We're not contracted to do that. We give advice on a free basis. We're not contracted to give advice, we give advice on a free basis.
    Q. Yes, okay.

    To your knowledge, can you help us, was this the first time that Siderise had been contacted about a project involving ACM cladding, or had Siderise supplied open-state cavity barriers on projects where ACM cladding was being used before this?
    A. Our emails have been scrutinised and passed over to the Inquiry. We cannot find another enquiry that contains the words "ACM". However, we were supplying material at the time through third-party distributors as well. We could have been supplying materials to projects that had ACM on.
    Q. Right.

