

COMMENTS HANDLING DOCUMENT

Comments received up to September 25, 2023

In the following table you can write your comments or questions. Please send the filled to johan.anderson@ri.se. An explanation to the columns used are as follows:

Column 1 – N°: Numbering of comments

Column 2 – Body Reference: The body who have given the comment

Column 3 – Comment on document: A reference to which document the comment belongs

Column 4 – Paragraph/Figure/Table: A reference to which part of the document the comment belongs

Column 5 – Comment: The comment received

Column 6 – Proposed change by the consortium: A short description on how the comment has been handled

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/Figure/Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
789	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Could you give an overview which labs already performed calibration tests and with which exposure level? When can we await the presentation of the complete results of the calibration tests?		Calibration until now in large scale was done at BRE, UK. In medium scale, two tests at RISE Sweden.
790	Steering Group 2023 04 12			It was mentioned that a scale (for measuring falling parts) can be expensive. What is the price range? Can a scale be used for other purposes as well?		a. If a single purpose weighing platform is ordered it may cost €10 000. However, it may be multipurpose construction with available

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
						equipment from the laboratories where the cost could be around €1000 instead.
791	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Can you reexplain slide 9 as you said there was an error and the red line was not in the right place. Please correct the slide when you issue it. Thank you.		Yes, the level one was misplaced indicating level 2 in BS 8414 method. We amend this and publish the amended version on the webpage. (See presentation from SG meeting 2023 04 13)
792	Steering Group 2023 04 12			I would be interested to hear if there is any experience or reflection on how the temperature measurement will be reduced when a test specimen of 100 mm - 150 mm -200 mm will be installed. I am thinking about there will be a deflection of the flame from the Combustion Chamber?		This is a quite well understood phenomenon where the fire plume reaches a lower height due to the thickness of the façade. To have good comparability, tests with inert facades of the same material of different thicknesses should be tested. However, it is indicated in the test with wooden façade at BRE where the total thickness of the façade is approximately 100 mm and the temperatures are reduced compared to the inert wall tests.

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
793	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Otherwise, the temperature measurements shown in the calibration tests look quite reasonable based on what I have seen before?		We agree with this assessment.
794	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Will the videos of the publicly shown tests be made available on an internet platform?		We will put most of the inert wall tests on the open YouTube channel. However, the agreement with the sponsors have been that the videos of tests with specimen are available only for sponsor, steering group members, European Commission representatives and consortium members
795	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Are the data from the smoke extraction available?		Yes, this is monitored and will be published in the reports.
796	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Thanks for the presentation. However, it is difficult to assess the findings ad hoc as not all calibration tests have been performed yet, and no data (temperatures, crib data, etc.) and reports have been published so far. This is needed to check in detail. Stakeholders should be given sufficient time to		Yes, we agree. We will communicate findings as soon as we have them and there is always the possibility of comment or send questions to either the project leader or the Commission representative.

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
				comment once all information has been made available.		
797	Steering Group 2023 04 12			After the first calibration test at BRE it was promised to measure the mass of that amount of wood fallen from the crib onto the floor in front of the crib (and extinguished by sprayed water as seen in the video. Are you able to give a result of this measurement?		It was about 5kg. However, more details will be given in the report.
798	Steering Group 2023 04 12			What means other system instead of solid aluminium?		The other system in medium scale is Fibre cement.
799	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Is there a change in the type of facades to be tested in large-scale configuration? In the previous meetings it was presented that ETICS would have been tested. If I am not mistaken there was no communication about this change?		Yes, a modification in the testing program was necessary due to difficulties in timing with the laboratories and availability of contractors.
800	Steering Group 2023 04 12			What was the Euroclass of the timber cladding?		Not tested, but estimated to D.

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
801	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Are you sure that the timber was untreated? As I remember correctly Johan wrote to me that the timber cladding was treated with an intumescent coating. Please clarify this contradictory information?		It is untreated, but there is intumescent lining in the vertical joints between panels.
802	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Interesting - please give a very detailed description about this assembly, because it seems to be a very untypical construction.		We will present full details in the coming reports.
803	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Please, give all the cladding details (wood species, thickness, profile, joints/treatments)?		We will present full details in the coming reports.
804	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Has the same wooden facade with the same details been tested before in BS 8414 or SP 105 and what were the results?		There are two different wooden façades. One is tested in large scale and was previously tested in SP Fire 105 with an extended fire of approximately 30 minutes (usually around 15-20 minutes fire). This system passed the ad hoc SP Fire test barely. The second wooden façade again tested with SP Fire 105 and barely passed the test.

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
805	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Can you say something to the Medium Exposure test rig at RISE Sweden. It looks on the picture like a frame construction planked with (non-combustible?) boards as substrate for the wooden cladding system tested?		The blocks visible is of light weight concrete attached to a metal frame at the positions of the black screws.
806	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Can you give more info about the "replacement" facade system for large test configuration? Who would sponsor it and what kind of features would characterize this facade (cladding, insulation, etc...)?		More information of the system will be available soon.
807	Steering Group 2023 04 12			Which facade systems are tested in both scales?		This was indeed the initial idea that the same system should in one case be tested in both medium and large scale to have this correlation between the scales however this was not possible thus there will be different systems.
808	Steering Group 2023 04 12			ETICS is now only foreseen to test at MFPA Leipzig with the Medium Exposure Level?		ETICS is still included in medium scale and tested at MFPA Leipzig, RISE Sweden and Efectis France, three tests in total.
809	Steering group 2023 09 25			EAE decided to contribute to the project and want to		A glazed curtain walling should also be supplied and tested

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
				confirm that they will be included in the final report. Confirmed by the consortium.		beginning 2024 (EU Aluminium information).
810	Steering group 2023 09 25			Clarification on the “comparison documents”?		Comparison documents will be issued for each façade specimen type, e.g. ETICS, Timber etc and each fire intensity e.g. medium and large.
811	Steering group 2023 09 25			Are there any changes to the rig or crib based on initial results?		No, none that are identified as of now.
812	Steering group 2023 09 25			Requests for a meeting after the “comparison documents”.		There will be a validation workshop once a draft of the final report is written.
813	Steering group 2023 09 25			Question on how large the wind was on the inert outdoor test.		It was below 2 m/s during 15 minutes before the test and the first few minutes. Thereafter it was above 2 m/s but most often below 3 m/s.
814	Steering group 2023 09 25			For calibration, not only an interval of 750-950 °C should be defined for calibration but also how fast that interval is reached.		Yes, introducing a “starting time” based on temperature increase may be used.

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
815	Steering group 2023 09 25			Comments from some stakeholders that outdoor testing will be impossible.		It will come with significant variations. The test data will be fully assessed before final recommendations can be given.
816	Steering group 2023 09 25			Flame heights look lower than those of DIN4102-20.		Hard to tell from snapshots but we have performed tests at MFPA where this comparison can be done.
817	Steering group 2023 09 25			Total details on the laboratories dimensions, exhausts etc should be given in the reports.		We will provide some details of the labs but perhaps not full drawings.
818	Steering group 2023 09 25			Did the timber façade previously pass the BS test?		No, it has not been tested according to BS8414. It has passed an extended duration (ca 30 minutes fire) SP Fire 105 test.
819	Steering group 2023 09 25			How compare timber façade systems that are not exactly the same?		The system provider built the systems and decided this. It was out of the control of the consortium.
820	Steering group 2023 09 25			Was the timber façade treated with fire retardants?		It was heat treated.
821	Steering group 2023 09 25			Did the timber façade system pass (even though criteria are not fixed)?		The fast fire spread during the test is not appropriate for the

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
						method and this will probably not have passed any of the tests.
822	Steering group 2023 09 25			Weighing could be affected by thermal gradients.		Agreed, there are other sources of uncertainties as well.
823	Steering group 2023 09 25			What about the ETICS test at MFPA?		We have not received data from MFPA at this point, therefore comparison documents are not finished.
824	Steering group 2023 09 25			The RR does not fulfil ISO 5725-2. It should be called a demonstration test.		But this is what we have to work with. The commission did not provide funds for a broader study. We still think it can be called a round robin since it is a comparison among different independent tests.
825	Steering group 2023 09 25			The providers really want the raw data asap!		The project consortium agrees that data should be provided very soon.
826	Steering group 2023 09 25			A discussion on if the secondary opening is needed.		Ok.
827	Steering group 2023 09 25			Postpone workshop and end of project.		Ok.

N°	Body Reference	Comment on document	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table	Comment	Proposed change	Answer by the consortium
828	Steering group 2023 09 25			How far away is common acceptance criteria?		Far!