



Q&A

Question	Answer
<p><i>Anonymous Attendee 01:31 PM</i> How does the fire testing proposal from OFR detailed in this report differ from the STA working group fire testing they are leading?</p>	<p><i>Joe Giddings (ASBP) 01:41 PM</i> Hello, as we understand it builds upon that, goes into more detail, proposing more tests for situations like junctions between steel/timber & concrete/timber - and looks at things like penetrations through timber components, and how these affect fire performance.</p>
<p><i>sarah.newinemoore 01:38 PM</i> How can we get the cost of insuring engineered timber buildings down if the insurers profiteer from perceived higher risk structures?</p>	<p>This question has been answered live</p>
<p><i>sarah.newinemoore 01:40 PM</i> is also difficult to get mortgages - any suggestions for the residential sector?</p>	<p>This question has been answered live</p>
<p><i>Anonymous Attendee 01:48 PM</i> It's great that the report deals with fire and insurance as these are the biggest concerns, but will the TAH be moving on to deal with other fears that are often raised with timber in residential buildings e.g. vibration, supply chain shortages?</p>	<p><i>Joe Giddings (ASBP) 02:00 PM</i> Hello, the focus until now has been on tackling those primary barriers, but as you mention there are other challenges... there are no plans from our side to look at vibration & supply chain shortages at the moment. We're focused on demand side stimulation. If you have an interest in taking this up I would encourage you to consider looking at Built By Nature's accelerator fund...</p>

Unanswered Q&A

Question	Answer
<p><i>sarah.newinemoore 01:39 PM</i> IN the residential sector, mortgage companies are also influenced by insurance and it is d</p>	
<p><i>Anonymous Attendee 01:44 PM</i> The lack of fire testing appears to be a big hurdle - do you agree? Who is responsible for driving this forward?</p>	<p>Joe Giddings: There has been a lot of fire testing, it's not that there is a lack. I think it is more that in the current context, following a tragedy at the scale of Grenfell, there can be no such thing as too much. Mass Timber products and their connections to other building elements should be tested in as many configurations as possible, and I believe the responsibility is shared between the Timber Industry (who wants to sell it's products), Developers (who want to use timber in innovative ways) and the Government (who want to reduce the carbon footprint of construction and ensure safety).</p> <p>In the meantime there is an existing body of evidence and this should be communicated to Government as clearly as possible.</p>
<p><i>Anonymous Attendee 01:54 PM</i> The slide earlier mentioned we understand a lot about the charring of timber and rate of the char, in turn offering the 'insulation' effect. In fact, we have notional charring rates based on Eurocode 5 – 1-2 table 3.1. However, one of the bigger issues is that the charred pieces of wood have a tendency to flake off, and under varying conditions, these are then unpredictable – is there any research happening on the flake rate and has this been considered so far? i.e. has the effect of delamination on the rate of charring been addressed? is this information available?</p>	<p>Joe Giddings: Look to the research being carried out by the Structural Timber Association through their Special Interest Group on CLT. They have been carrying out tests to understand delamination rates. RISE have also carried out tests on glue line integrity (delamination).</p> <p>STA CLT Special Interest Group - Information zone: https://www.structuraltimber.co.uk/sectors/clt-special-interest-group/information-zone/</p>
<p><i>Corker, Nicholas 01:54 PM</i> Curious that design standards was not higher rated.</p>	
<p><i>Corker, Nicholas 01:56 PM</i> Does the issue of standards get more complex when timber is used in combination with other materials ? Surely design standards are important here ?</p>	<p>Joe Giddings: Agreeing on design standards is definitely very important. I think that best practice standards for mass timber combined with steel & concrete are fairly well known and understood by leading designers and consultants. It is now about sharing and agreeing that knowledge across industry.</p>

<p><i>Will Hurst 01:58 PM</i></p> <p>Ministers like talking about new tech in relation to net zero i.e. hydrogen and 'green' steel. How do you get them to talk about natural materials like timber?</p>	<p>Joe Giddings: Mass timber is in fact a highly advanced technical achievement that we should be proud of! I think if it can be communicated as such to Ministers, you're totally right that they might pick it up more.</p>
<p><i>Luka 01:59 PM</i></p> <p>Congratulations on the launched report and this has been an excellent talk. Simon, when will the development of entities standing for timber will turn to top down rather than sideways, so that a clear RACI matrix will be set, a regulator defined and industry be clearer, effective and more efficient? Thank you.</p>	
<p><i>Peter Wilson 02:00 PM</i></p> <p>There are huge amounts of fire testing results from around the world available - most of which show much the same results. Why do we need to endlessly replicate this rather than interpret the available results? We don't have adequate testing facilities in this country and so developers are being forced abroad - at vast expense - if they are to keep projects on programme. Who's going to fund proper testing facilities in the UK?</p>	<p>Joe Giddings: In the UK, most of our prohibitive regulations relate to the external wall. I'm not a fire engineer, but I am unaware of a large body of testing that has been carried out on full scale mass timber external wall systems in different configurations? I think if we want to overcome prohibitive regulations in favour of mass timber use in external walls, which I believe we should – we should then build up a compelling body of evidence of fire tests of different external wall build ups. Government could provide funding for research facilities.</p>