

Agenda: FFMA approval working group meeting  
To be held at The British Institute of Embalmers, 21D Station  
Road, Knowle, Solihull, B93 0HL  
16th December 2016 at, working 12.30

Guest attending;

Henri (Intertek)

Rick Powell

Tim Morris

Richard Baradell

1. Coffin and casket Testing Protocol with a aim of approve the final three outstanding tests.
  - a. 6.0 - Ash test (suggestion of set size recommendation based on body size & coffin type)
  - b. 3.0 - Auto Charger test (recommendation of pusher plate size increase)
  - c. 5.0 - ignition test/radiant heat test
2. Pass/Fail Criteria, explanation how this will be concluded on receipt of test data.
3. Discussion about how FFMA recommendations will be delivered to the Cremation sector & funeral Directors (based on the test results)
4. Coffin certification test start date.
5. Site visits to Intertek test sites for cremation sector to view testing.
6. Private FFMA members meeting to discuss and decide the next action and if such a letter is necessary to Scottish Government.
9. Any other business.

**Transcript of FFMA Meeting  
16<sup>th</sup> December 2016**

**Present:**

David Crampton (Chairman) -DC  
Julian Atkinson - JA  
Will Hunneybel - WH  
Tim Morris -TM  
Rick Powell - RP  
Richard Barradel - RB  
Henri Bislick (Intertek) - HB  
Adam Masters -AM  
David Spittle -DS  
Bob Tombs - BT  
Dave Clark -DClark

**Apologies:**

Sue Bullock  
Louisa

DC- Henri Bislick has said she'd help me out my doing some minutes, so thank you for doing that Henri. I don't suppose anyone has any objections to that? Certainly better minutes than what I'd take. And we had an apology from Louisa who was coopted onto our working party at our general meeting but she can't make it today. Otherwise we're all here.

Bob's on his way.

Bob's delayed.

Bob Tombs.

OK, we've set an agenda for this meeting. I do hope and pray that we can get through the agenda.

Morning Bob.

BT- Morning. Sorry I'm late.

DC- No, we've only just started this minute. There's a tea on there if you need a drink.

BT- No, I'm fine thanks.

DC - We've all just sort of more or less introducevd ourselves. We've all got a copy of the agenda that we need to work through. There was a request to move item 6 earlier on but the consensus of opinion with the working party was to keep the agenda as it was, so we'll work through it in that order and see how we

finish up. So, once again, many thanks for everyone. I do hope that this can be a progressive and proactive meeting, conducted in a professional manner and that we can get the benefit of the expertise we have here and move this forward. So thank you very much indeed and thank you to Henri for making a few notes for us.

So, looking at our agenda - Item 1 – Coffin and casket testing protocol, with the aim of approving the final 3 outstanding tests.

So, thank you David.

[2.01 recording]

JA - turn to agenda Item 1, No 6 – Ash test. The FFMA's position is that we want to continue to cremate all the coffins that are currently established on the market and we do want to come to an agreement over ash tests where we feel it's not right to restrict the choice which we have. We would like to agree the volume to be 4.5 and for outsized bariatric cases and some types of eco coffins for 5.0 litre ash caskets to be considered. ??? Would that be acceptable?

TM - Could I read to you part of the transcript of the call for evidence that we gave at the Scottish Parliament last week?

JA - If it's relevant.

TM - It's totally appropriate. Do you mind?

AM - No, not at all.

TM - I'll read it verbatim. The convener, the NSP, we talked about the coffins coming in, the ashes at the end and the difference in between. I want to concentrate on the end of the process. The container that is used in the UK to contain ashes is almost standard at 3.2 litres. We've had a submission that suggests that this not large enough to deal with a large, larger person or a person who has been cremated in an eco coffin and that the containers should be increased to 5 litres, as is the case in America and most of Europe. Do you have a view on that?

Robert Swanson who is the Inspector of Crematoria Scotland replied "I have been told that there have been very occasions where the ashes have exceeded the quantity that can be held in the urn. (Standard urn he was talking of). In such cases the ashes have been put into a second container."

The convener – "So they used 2 urns instead of 1?"

Robert Swanson – "Yes, that is what I have been told. I have not witnessed it first hand. There are few occasions when it would appear to be the case. I accept the comments that more outsized coffins are coming in. It's my understanding that it is not the body that produces the extra ashes, but the vessel in which the body is contained. It has not come over as an issue on my travels."

Bear in mind that Robert Swanson has visited and inspected all 28 crematoria in Scotland and interviewed staff.

[4.45 recording]

“On the few occasions that it has been mentioned, they do not see anything wrong with putting the ashes into a second urn.”

The convener – “The Funeral Furnishing Manufacturers Association said: “If a cremation uses an alternative or eco coffin, the ashes increase by a factor. Following the research by Intertek, the FFMA has commissioned these factors can now be clearly understood. The effects and amount of ash vary by the height of the person, the weight of the person and the type of coffin.

He goes on to say” “The FFMA have supplied an excel file to illustrate that. Would it not be easier to move to a 5 litre urn than to continue to use a 3.2 litre urn? It would mean that all the ashes from a cremation could be kept in 1 container and that there would be no ??? about anything.”

[5.45 recording]

Robert Swanson replied: “I would agree with anything that is less disturbing to the family and I accept that it is probably not good to hand over 2 urns of ashes. Size and weight are sometimes an issue. There is an element of discomfort in handling an oversized coffin. The same applies on the health and safety side. It is about asking the funeral directors to give the weight of the coffin because of how we handle it, and at the other side.”

Bear in mind this is a draft transcript.

Yeah.

“That is in the case of cremation. I appreciate that burial is different. There is an element of embarrassment and people try to lessen the impact on the bereaved. In other words, rather than have 6 or 8 people struggle to bring in a big coffin during the service, it is recommended that the coffin be in place.....”

It’s going on to other things.

“We support anything that helps to reduce the problem. I accept that a lot of costs will be incurred if we change from 3.2 litre containers to 5 litre containers. Perhaps rather than change the system all-together, it would suffice for people to have a few 5 litre containers in store for the few occasions that they would be required.”

Rick was then questioned...

“The guidance is that 3.2 litres is the minimum size. It is not an absolute and it is not the case that no other container can be used. I think that the 2 main suppliers of the poly urns, the polythene plastic urns that are used for the delivery of ashes

to the funeral directors for families after cremation, currently supply 4.2 and 4.5 litre containers. It is very rare that more than 1 container is used. In a lot of cases in which remains or ashes are to be buried or whatever else, the funeral director will supply a casket directly to the crematorium rather than use the container that the crematorium supplied. Mr Morris' organisation and my organisation are working closely with the Funeral Furnishings Manufacturers Association to draw up guidelines, as test protocol and acceptable results so that we can move forward on suitability of coffins for cremation and ensure that coffins are fit for purpose.

My comments: "I echo what Rick ?? has said. There are instances, although they are very few, in which more than one container might be required. We have found that generally happens when an eco coffin has been used. For example, a cardboard coffin that contains a high china clay content, which gives it strength and rigidity, may produce more than 1 urn of ash, The FFMA research into ash residue into all types of coffin perhaps means that cremation authorities and funeral directors could be alerted about coffins that produce more than the normal amount of ash, so that on occasions when such coffins are used the funeral director or crematorium can supply a larger container."

Do I need to go on?

All - No.

All - No.

AM - Can I just ask the point of reading that out because obviously we've read that before?

TM - The point of it is, test results on ash residue will identify any coffins that are potentially going to produce more than 1 standard urn of ashes. On those occasions, our members and funeral directors would know, once the scheme's up and running, they'd know if one of those coffins is used, then a larger container is required and one can be brought in – simple as that.

AM - Can I make a sort of suggestion / observation that there seems to be a little bit of variance in figures. OK? And in interpretation of figures. i.e. 3.2 litres or higher, whether than be in a 4.5 litres or 5 litres. Surely the industry needs to know what the variances are. You know, if everyone, and we're the manufacturers of scatter tubes – we brought scatter tubes into the market place. If we were to set our scatter tubes at a volume of 3.2 litres, we would not be selling the hundreds of thousands that we do, because 3.2 litres for volume of ashes is too low for the majority of people that cremated and we done our research before we set the volume that we done. The volumes of our scatter tubes are pretty much identical and are at 3790 cm<sup>2</sup>, which is pretty much the same size as the poly urn. So, my point being is that surely the industry just needs a guidance with regards to the amount of ash that comes back from cremations. From a minimum, let's say 3.2, whatever that figures is to be, up to a maximum. Now, I find it quite hard to sort of get head around why there's so

much debate over setting a defined figure as to what a recommended volume of an ashes urn should be. That's my observation. I think to move forward, particularly with regards to coffin testing we need to understand the relationships between the type of coffin and the percentage of ash that's given back from the burning of a coffin when combined with the burning of a body, and look at those variances so that guidance given back to crematorium staff, to funeral directors and to also to us as manufacturers of ashes urns, is reasonable. That's my observation and I think that's what we should be focusing on trying to achieve.

RP - OK. If I could, Adam, the interesting thing is that the fact that the only issue we have ever raised with you, with the FFMA, around ash residue if you like that can't be dealt with in the normal way, was in respect of the compacted paper coffin that had a very high china clay content that was actually producing somewhere in the region of about 4 poly urns full. That's the only issue we have ever raised. I have suggested that there should be an ash residue test to basically make sure we avoided the replication of that situation.

AM - Yep.

RP - But no one has ever said that there is an existing problem with coffins that you are supplying. Other than that they are.....

DC - That's good - that's very interesting.

Thank you Rick.

RP - That's the only point we've ever raised with around this, was around that one specific coffin. As I say, the suggestion that there should be an ash residue test was to ensure that that didn't happen again if you like. We ended up with an embarrassing situation where when someone sends their loved one for cremation they getting back 4 poly urns full of remains, most of which aren't human remains, they're the remains of an indestructible material that has been put through cremation.

Yep.

RP - If you look at our guidelines to funeral directors, what it says is that coffins shall be made of a material, which is combustible. Clearly china clay wasn't combustible and that's the point we were trying to make. Nothing more, nothing less.

WH - And that product's been taken off the market anyway.

Yes.

AM - That's fair enough. Moving forward, we looking about pass / fail criteria as to what is acceptable in terms of the contributions where a coffin will create so much excessive ash in those types of circumstances that it is not deemed

acceptable to be handing over 4 poly containers of ashes to the bereaved family. So, the test if you like....

RP - Had you have talked to us about that point, we'd have explained exactly that. You know, I mean there seems to have been a breakdown in communications between us, which I think is extremely sad bearing in mind that, you know, the length of time this has gone of for, I'll remind you of the conversation that we had right at the very, very beginning, in the March I think it was when I first came to see you with Andrew Davis, and we sat at this table and I said that as long as you supply something that is fit for purpose, and we suggested a solid base, solid head, solid foot, I said you can wrap it what the hell you want, if you'll excuse the terminology, but that's exactly what we said. You know, but it was important that the structure was fit for purpose and allowed, you know, it to be safely handled and safely charged into a cremator at cremation temperatures. You get one opportunity to do that.

[14.13 recording]  
OK

RP - And you may well be charging at a temperature, you know, at about around 800 degrees and that is a matter of seconds before that coffin will actually ignite. If you put a coffin half in and half out of a cremator, for whatever reason, it hasn't charged properly, that is an unbelievably dangerous situation. What we're trying to avoid is precisely that and ensure that the product is fit for purpose. Nothing more, nothing less.

JA - So, moving to the point of this actual agenda and the ash test, would the 5 litre be acceptable to you?

RB - That is a question of transition. I mean interestingly I did a straw pole with some funeral director clients and the sort of line was that it's probably 1 in 50 funerals where 2 containers ??? The other thing I learnt, which I think is down to us, is that the crematoria don't always use the full capacity of the container. That's the other thing that came out of it.

Yep

RB - And therefore, surely, isn't this guideline, I don't personally have any problem with going for 5 litre and if you remember when we went to FFMA in summer there was a whole range of new products coming along and I actually asked the capacities and they went literally from about 3.2 to about 4.9, that's literally how they went.

AM - So, without going over old ground and bringing up breakdowns in communication or whatever it is, let's just say that we are where we are because ultimately we're all sitting in this room now wanting to move forward and push forward in terms of the coffin certification scheme. Have you had a chance to review the testing protocol that is particularly around the 6.0 ash test, with regards to the protocol for that and the recommendations at this stage of the

recommended volumes of the ash containers? Because I think if we could just sort of move on and get agreement to it if that is the case and move on to the next test.

DClark - Could I just say that if the general consensus, which seems to be ??? with the point you've made here, is that the residue fits into a ...

[16.23 recording]

JA - No, we're talking about the ash test.

DClark - Ash test, into 5 litres, yep, whether it be 3.2 to 5.0, that's the range, then that's the criteria of the testing then that should be an agreeable point that we move on and test to that level.

RB - And we explain it to funeral directors and we explain it to crematoria, so we get hopefully a transition and greater understanding of it.

WH - Yeah, with the data we could plot out.....

DClark - I'd like to read you an email from one of the, from a crematorium.

"We have only ever experience a problem, re too large a quantity of ashes to fit in a bio box on two occasions. One was made from a banana leaf and the second one was test cremations, which were part of our sanctioned test cremations on barley board that wouldn't fit into one container, went black and as part of central England Cooperative we said we're not prepared to make these products fit for cremation because they aren't fit for cremation. The majority of the ashes go into a bio box...."

And I won't read the size out but basically it equals 5 litres.

"We also have poly containers which contain 4 litres. If we have ever had too larger a quantity of ash for the container provided we would liaise with the FD to sort out a larger urn casket that are available."

Now that's a guy who's doing 1700, you know...

How can you respond?

DC - Tim, Tim please.

TM - Apart from residue that could cause certain damage or certain residues that could block filters.

Like bark and stuff like that yeah?

Yeah. For ash residue potentially there isn't a fail. Potentially. Now if you're testing all of your products, those that produce a lot of ash will be identified and recorded and when one of those comes in then a cremation authority or funeral



director can look at your website and think right oh, this coffin produces a lot of ash, we'll supply a larger container. It's as simple as that.

[18.38 recording]

AM - Although, just to highlight that we are, the tipping test is the ash test in terms of volume and then 8.0, that test is the residue test.

TM - I've left that aside.

AM - OK. But just in terms of terminology because obviously the residue won't leave that as a substance that is left over that is not desirable for, or made for the handing over...

TM - Or the type of ash that finds its way through the flue system into the filters and block them.

Really.

RP - If I can just sort of finish off. I totally agree with what Tim has just said that the only caveat that I would put on that is that the material is combustible.

TM - Combustible. Yep.

RP - So that we're not dealing with something that's an indestructible matter. The other point if I can just clarify is the fact that within our guidance, the 3.2 litre is shown as a minimum, not as the accepted size, only as a minimum, and I draw you attention to the bit that Tim didn't get to in your evidence submission which was from Andrew Brown, where Andrew quite clearly stated that one size does not necessarily fit all in exactly the same way as the supplier of coffins for the deceased, you wouldn't use a 7ft long coffin or a 41" wide coffin for a little old lady that was sort of 7.5 stone.

No.

RP - What you were saying was that coffins are supplied in various different sizes to suit the situation and there should be no difference in the relation to the size of urns. And we wholly support that, you know, and what we're saying is that under normal circumstances the urns that are in use at this point are fit for purpose.

AM - Can I just pick up on that point because I brought to task both Julian and Will on this whole point of minimum 3.2 minimum because it does come down to interpretation of the guidance that's given to your members, because if you were to take it by the letter of the law and a funeral director was to turn up with the minimum, i.e. an urn of 3.2 litres and the volume of ash is more than 3.2 litres there's a problem because ultimately it would then have to be put in to a secondary vessel for the family to take. So I think a lot of what this has come down to potentially is the breakdown in communication as well, and it comes down to how everybody interprets the terminology differently and I .....

RB - But ???? discussing that.

Yeah, well...

JA - Moving forward, sticking to that ash test which Andy did say what is a pass and fail criteria and was saying would 5 litres work for you, so you don't end up in the same scenario of a coffin being cremated and in your words, or your words spoken, 4 poly container fulls of ash, which I don't think that anyone disagrees is unacceptable. If we cap it at 5 litres then that scenario won't happen again and it will get tested and it then it won't pass and then you won't cremate.

RP - If you do that there are, I think there need to be alternatives because if you're right there are common variables that won't accept 2 x 5 litre containers, you know, and so the need, sorry just excuse me for a second Tim, so you need to be able to have alternatives where is a 5 litre container isn't needed then it isn't necessarily used. All I'm saying is, that you know.....

JA - Yes, it's a pass and fail criteria for testing. What you keep on your shelf in your crematorium is you own business.

RP - That's fine.

RB - I think, this is what I think, that the guidance behind it ????

JA -Yeah. Absolutely.

RB - So the right product gets used for the right ??? It's as simple as that and I'm going to say it, take it from us I think we should come up with some draft guidelines that we then put out to both funeral directors and to crematoriums, I think we should come up with that and let you see it and....

Richard.

Sorry?

The guidelines – I mean I don't have a problem with the pass and fail criteria, you know, to 5 litre. Rick's point is quite right, so you may have to, through the families needs, have to reflect some. You know, you may have to if there's a common variant and they won't take 2 x 5 litres you might have to use 2 smaller containers. That's what you might have to do.

JA - But that's not the ash test is it.

RB - No, no, nothing to do with the ash test, but I think very importantly is the understanding behind it.

JA - Well, it's not necessary for this discussion. We want to move and agree the testing protocol.

RB - Well, hang on – sorry, hang on a minute. We've got at the moment crematoria Julian, using 2 containers and we want to try and get away from that. If we issue some guidelines and made this clear, then hopefully we shall bring that about.

DC - Is that a fact Richard, I don't know...

Sorry?

DC - Is that a fact?

RB - They do occasionally.

DC - Right, OK.

RB -And certainly my straw pole, which is a very straw pole, finger in the air job revealed, and that is not necessarily restricted to either eco coffins or solid coffins. It could be either. But yes, and you know, three of four times a year if you're doing 250 funerals a year you might need it, that's what I've been told.

JA -But in the past, we've spoken about constraints on that ash, which would limit the use of all the ash being contained within the vessel, in the case of large bariatric cases and certain eco coffins. And what we're saying is that we'd be comfortable to pass a coffin if it produced ash, by calculation, which would fit into a 5 litre vessel. Is that acceptable for a pass / fail between you all?

TM - Can I just... you're mentioning bariatric cases, now that's a red herring. Someone who's 14 stone, 6 foot tall, that body won't produce anymore ash than someone who's 40 stone and 6 foot tall. It's the bone structure. Just because someone's large, doesn't mean to say that... It's proven that their bone structure isn't larger than an average weight person.

WH - Can I just say, Richard, you know you were saying you were going to write some guidance, maybe if we get through the test protocol with the calculator we've got we can assist you with that guidance based on scientific facts, because we could tell you, ring fence the size of a person, the types of products that sit in it and we could give you the 3 measurements. So you know that if you've got a wicker coffin turning up with a 6 foot 2" person in it, you know that your safety net is here, here or here. And it's very easy to give guidance given on scientific facts. Yeah?

RB - I don't have a problem with that.

RP - If I can just come in for a second, I think the other thing is what needs to be thought about is the fact that, and Henri may be able to sort of fill the gap in here, that the tests that may be carried out by Intertek may not be equivalent to the cremation process. I mean what you've got to understand is the coffin can be inserted into a cremator at probably 800 degrees and then subjected to a

temperature between 800 degrees and 1000 degrees for probably up to 90 minutes. And then at the end of that process actually, the remains being raked out down into the cooling area within the cremator where air is actually injected through those remains, will actually create like another mini-furnace just burning off, not what's left of human remains, but what's actually left of carbon residue from the coffin. Now, the end result of that may not tie up with.... Unless you've managed to replicate that sort of process.

WH - I think, I'm pretty sure they've managed to replicate the process. There are going to be, by actually doing the tests and getting this live, we can get accurate data on that chart. I think, Henri's pretty and the lab that I spoke to are pretty confident that they've managed to simulate the process even to the point of taking the remains and sieving them to the same particle size that you cremate to. Yeah, so we have simulated that whole process.

JA - We're moving off the subject of testing.

WH - Yeah.

JA - We want to arrive at a volume that you think...

[26.50 recording]

RP - We're not Julian. We're talking about what's actually produced as ash.

WH - Can we leave it that we'll plot it out and feed it back to you to write your guidance? Yeah? Based on Intertek's scientific research.

RP - Well, yeah, I think we need to understand what that process is that's being used to give an equivalent.

WH - They can show you that.

RP - Yeah. Yeah.

JA - Where we were before, I think where we were before is the vessel size that we found by calculation and by research which was given to us by Intertek that those barriers were broken. And as Adam says, the minimum was specified in your guidance, which is not helpful in the situation. The standard is used in a poly container, which is larger than that. And the there is, we can show cases where ash goes beyond what your standard poly container is. We know different coffins give different amounts of ash. We don't want an unacceptable position and we're looking to agree a new maximum size of 5 litres as a pass / fail criteria. What you decide to do within your own organisations and crematoria, we're not involved with. We just want to agree this test at 5 litres.

RP - Can I just come back to you there Julian. You've talked about a new maximum - there is no maximum. There is a minimum. Now, if you're talking about the cremation of a 14 year old child and putting those remains into a 5 litre casket, that would be absolutely ludicrous.

JA - I'm talking about the test. I'm talking about the test.

That is a minimum.

WH - Julian's talking about the test.

DClark - I get that Rick, but we're a bit, I wouldn't say smoke and mirrors, but we're drifting all over the place. There's a minimum of 3.2 and you're making a fantastic example, but on the flip side of the coin we've also got another example where we don't want 4 containers as well, so it's got to be a happy medium reached that suits every coffin within reason.

DClark – AM - I take you back to my suggestion 20 minutes ago, but essentially what the industry is looking for is guidance as to what is the minimum and what is the potential maximum. When we're talking about the potential maximum that's what we're looking at making sure that a potential coffin doesn't contribute to above and beyond what we're saying in the maximum acceptable limit that would impact on a family receiving their loved one's ashes back in a vessel size that they would deem to be too big. And so I think that we are sort of going around the houses a little bit because I think there has been reading between the lines, you know, frustrations in terms of communications in the past, I think we have to move on and focus on the testing criteria for FFMA certification testing programme so we can get this approved, because ultimately we want this to be endorsed. You guys are here to, as I see it, to endorse this programme and give us advice from your expertise as well as whether you believe the testing protocol that we're putting together is suitable from your knowledge of the industry and how it works. I believe that if we can just agree, whether it be via giving out guidance to members, in terms of what a funeral director would expect, whether that be based on scientific data that can be challenged at future points, because at the end of the day, the scientific data that we got from Intertek is a starting point. You know, we have no other really analysed, in any depth or detail, data based on ashes from, combined ashes of humans and coffin types and how that impacts on ??? volumes in terms of families. This is a starting point, so the theoretical mathematics that have been employed in relation to this that have been backed up by simulation of cremating bodies and coffins. That's given a chance to check the validity of this theoretical data, and Intertek stand by it that it is accurate data. So I think that, bearing in mind this is the starting point for us, we by now are starting to contest coffins, we will be able to verify data and hopefully if we can agree now as to what a maximum pass / fail criteria will be for a coffins contribute to ash then I think we can move on from this. Everyone agree and accept that there are always going to be variances and a minimum is very, very important in terms of what guidance we give to funeral directors.

RP - I'll just finish off if I can Adam by saying I've been involved with, directly involved with the operation of the crematorium and cremators for the last 38 years. And the only problem that we've experienced is where the material of the

coffin has been not combustible. And that's the key to this, is that the material, which is used, is combustible.

RB - Can I just come back on one other thing? In your 6 test, I think one of the things is, we've got a quote here of 800 degrees C, in actual fact we're operating at anything on a daily cremator from 800 degrees C, and I went to a crematorium the other day and it had gone up to 1100 and I think perhaps it would be good to....

WH -Richard, it's because it's....

JA - But it's to do with ash on the basis that it's the combustion that goes on in the....

RB - It says it's going to be combusted to ash. It's irrelevant because it's going to be combusted to ash by the lab. They're not going to half, sort of combust it. i.e. 800 degrees, you're going to burn it until it's gone, you know, until it's ash and then you're going to sieve it to give us a volume, so it's...

RB - I just want make a point...

WH - Yeah, OK, OK.

RB - That they operate within a range...

WH - Yeah, I know they do, we know that. Yeah, we understand that.

RB - I personally think it would be better if it does say that, I'm not going to make a big fuss about it, but I think it would be better if it represented that.

WH - OK.

RB - You asked to comment, ??? comment.

TM - Can I come back? I really don't think you need fail criteria. I think the chart that you're talking about where you're going to put lines, will have lines where certain coffins will exceed the minimum size urn.

WH - I would agree with that. I think it's sensible guidance based on the research there. Yeah, OK.

TM - So the crematoria know those types of coffin, you're going to need a larger urn. I think it's as simple as that.

??- Tim, can I say no maximum.

WH - Of course you can, sorry.

DC - Can I just ask, Rick, what do you think of Steve's comment there please?

RP - As I said the only caveat, that I called an hour ago, is that as long as the material is combustible.

JA - I think that will come out in the ash residue test, ash volume was to remove this issue which you had with the cardboard coffins with a high amount of china clay in, where you were left in a very unsatisfactory position of bucket loads of ashes. You wanted a maximum so we had ash that represented what people would expect and we had a bit of decorum.

Sorry, can I just ask on a technical perspective, going back to the china clay because this is what we were talking about if Tim is saying that there can't be a pass / fail criteria because you give back what you give back. If the china clay was combustible, a combustible material then can I just ask you whether you believe that was a combustible material?

RP - It's an incombustible material.

Incombustible.

RP - As is the material that was, I suppose that left a residue that welds itself to the hearth. That was an incombustible material as well.....

So the issue...

If you're going to subject something to temperatures of 800 – 1100 degrees for 90 minutes, and for whatever reason is hasn't gone at the end of that period, then it's incombustible, because, you know, you're giving it every ruddy chance aren't you.

[34.44 recording]

AM - So pass / fail criteria is more based on the fact of the point that you keep making, as to whether it's a combustible material or not?

RP - Yeah.

RP -It has nothing to do with the ash, more the residue.

DC - Do you accept that Adam?

AM - Yeah, I, you know, at the end of the day, of course it's got to be of a combustible material. I think make, just moving forward in terms of, you know, the whole the volume thing, taking on board Tim's point, is that ultimately, we've got to look at, once they've analysed the data, once they've burnt all the materials and potential future materials that could be subjected to this testing regime as wanting to be acceptable for use, we've ultimately got to ensure that the test is adequate enough to give us a pass test, pass / fail result as to whether it's combustible as opposed to the volume of that it returns. Is that what we're saying?

?? -It seems to be.

JA - You're talking about 2 tests.

WH - I think you're talking about 2 tests.

WH -You're talking about 2 tests.

JA - Everything is combustible. Everything will oxidize, it depends at what temperature, it depends at what temperature and what pressure.

RP - Well, we know the realms that we've got there.

JA - Yes, correct. So, in the range, that's a separate issue to the amount of ash and what you want is a dignified volume of ash. You don't want 4 bucket fulls.

RP - ?? - Correct.

JA - And what we've done is say right let's set the barrier at 5 litres and if we use simulation with Intertek's testing, and if it produces 10 litres it's a fail, if it produces 7 litres it's a fail, if it produces 4 litres – that's great, you go ahead. It's all we're wanting. For all the science and you know...

RP- With china clay Julian, it was exactly the same as if you put a china mug in....

WH - That's part of the ash residue test.

JA - This conversation is about ash testing.

WH - That's part of the... We've covered that.

JA - Can we leave it at that then? Can I propose, is that level acceptable at what I've said, 5 litres for the pass / fail criteria?

RP - As a maximum? We're not worried about that. We're not particularly keen to put a maximum on it.

WH - Then we'll leave it at that then. We'll leave it at that. OK, so we've agreed that there's no maximum and we'll come back to with the data. We'll come back to you with the data.

RP - But you've got to understand that bearing in mind, whatever that maximum may be it may dictate what can and can't be done with the remains afterwards.

WH - That's what we were trying to do by producing the chart.

Yes.



TM - As the funeral director in this, then if the funeral director knows that there's going to be 5 litres plus ash from the type of coffin that a family has chosen then in guidance he would have been alerted to warn that family.

Yeah.

AM - Of the arrangement options of what they do with ashes following the cremation. That's ultimately what we're trying to do here.

WH - Give guidance.

TM - Take it all the way back to the bereaved person as Robert Swanson did in his evidence last week.

WH - We'll be able to do that with the plotted data. That's the whole point of the chart.

DC - Want to comment on that?

RB - No, I'm fine with that.

????

WH - I think we can move to the next test.

If we can move it forward and move it on...

Can't we move to the next test?

WH - It's down to the chart.

DClark - If 5 litres is a guideline, I take Rick's point on board. We're not asking for a maximum.

WH - Just some guidance.

RB - I think guidance in terms of practices.

WH - Yeah, OK.

AM - For absolute clarity then on the minutes, are we all happy to move forward, but as a guidance note we are suggesting 5 litres.

DC - Can I just qualify one thing then we'll move on, that Will and Tim talked about this chart... Will that still go forward?

WH - Yeah, what we're going to do with the data is plot some practical levels, so you know the size of the person and the coffin and what litreage it would produce, with a little bit of a caveat for safety and try and feed that data back, so

it helps plot that chart, so we never end up in a position where it could be questioned and with their research I think that will be really achievable and then when you offer that guidelines out, you know you're safe. Yeah? Is all that challengeable? I think we can move to the next thing.

TM - You're giving two parameters then aren't you.

WH - Yeah.

[39.02 recording]

TM - Personally I'm not particularly bothered if a coffin causes 6 litres, because the funeral director will be alerted because the results for that coffin will be on your website. He can look at that and he can warn the bereaved family, because they're the ones that really matter.

RB - That's a good point. So it goes through the chain, ??? That's what we need.

WH - Brilliant. Brilliant.

AM - Then aren't those cases going to be very rare? That's based on the testing and the guidance we give the association members.

WH - Can we move to the next point? Move to the next point.

TM - Can I just ask a question? The high china clay content coffin, was that withdrawn because of that high content?

JA - Yes.

TM - Was there a reason? Was it because funeral directors didn't want that much ash for their clients?

JA - I think it was death by 1000 cuts. The guy tried very hard to market it and everyone knew there was a problem. And this is exactly the thing, funeral directors are in the middle of this and just as much as you don't want a problem, they don't want an issue. They are very, very skeptical about the types of coffins they buy and if there's a bad word going around they're not going to expose their families to that by offering that choice.

TM - So it's in the manufacturers interest to modify the product.

RB - So in the end that was the commercial pressure?

WH - Yeah. The protocol will do that in itself now as well now.

[40.30 recording]

DClark - As I say, we tested two alternative materials - barley board and maize and on both occasions the feedback from the crematoriums was the cremation time would take nearly double and the residue was black in colour and we

advocated, or essentially ?? advocated that they wouldn't support it and say it's a crematable product. Probably fine for burial but not for cremation.

RP - That's coming back to exactly what I said just now. The product has got to be robust and combustible.

WH - Yeah. The ash residue test does cover that doesn't it.

AM - Are we all in agreement?

WH - Yep.

I think so.

AM - Can we all move on?

?? - Yeah.

JA - Test number 3, the auto-charger test. What it's suggesting is that the auto-charger is fitted with a 300 x 300 plate as standard and that the coffins are tested to a point of destruction and also to simulate the loading and unloading to and from the hearth. And one set of measurements has been assessed that we added a 25% capacity and we used that as a standard pass / fail.

WH - Yeah. To push to see any default formation of the product.

AM - Do we have any sticking points on this?

[41.57 recording]

RB - I'm just trying to desperately remember in my head what the standard plate is at the moment.

WH - There's a lot of mixed stuff on the market we discussed during the process and some of them were pins, some of them were.... Some of them are big and fit for purpose but what we're saying for testing is that everyone should really go for a 300 x 300 minimum. If you go bigger than that, it's up to you. It's a great idea. Do you want me to show you pictures?

RB - No, no, no, no. Hold on. I think one of the points is here is what's out there at the moment.

WH - Yeah.

RB - You know, what are you facing? What's the current state of play?

WH - Do you remember you described the push runner as about that big yeah?

RB - Yeah, I do remember. ??? I've had this discussion. Yeah. And I think the point is, I don't think we have any trouble, as I understand it, that the larger head

would come out including VAT at somewhere between £320 and £350, it would come out at about that level. My understanding of it is. I think though, you know, you've got to get that across to primary local authorities, who have then got to spend it. But I think ???, I don't want to speak for them, they'll speak up, but I think we don't see a problem recommending that that's what we do. But again, there'll be a transition period. You know, from what they've got at the moment. It's not going to happen overnight.

JA - As is with every guidance, when there's, you know, when some new guidance comes out people are given a probation period to ??? But the point of the plate is, you know, it spreads the load and it diminishes the danger that you had where, you know, if it's on a small point it can pierce the end of the coffin and then if it retracts it can retract the coffin with it giving an unsatisfactory ??.

RB - But as a second point I think ??? where as OK, let's be honest, something like FD equipment would be fairly easy to achieve, somebody at the moment, if you took DFW, or somebody like that, would be more difficult. So I think, you know, there's a job to do, but as soon as you say that that's going to be the guidance and the size we need to talk to the other manufacturers. We need to go and say what is the feasibility of adapting? Because if you ask me what the feasibility of adapting the current sort of pin on DFW, I can't tell you. If I go and talk to them I can find out.

JA - For the purposes of this test though if we use that plate to test the coffins and that's a really good start isn't it.

WH - And that's the recommendation.

JA - We know where we stand on that and we've got the test data for once the tests have been conducted. What you do in your background, you know, I quite agree, you've got to do due diligence on the equipment that's out there, it impacts the technology and I'm sure they know what they have and whoever else may know that they have.

WH - You could run a recommendation on size.

RB - The thing is Julian, in practice, we can only recommend they do and it will take some time before it gets accepted as common practice.

WH - With the problematic cremators could you, sorry, sorry, go on.

WH - Go on.

WH - Sorry, I was interrupting – go on.

[45.01 recording]

Carry on.

DC - Rick, you were going to ask?

RP - All I was going to say is, and I suppose it's very repetitive but what we were saying just now around ash residue, it's a case of being fit for purpose. What we've got is a chamber that's sitting there at about 800 degrees plus, we've got one opportunity to get the coffin in and that machine has got to be able to push at a, with whatever pressure is necessary to ensure that that coffin goes in come what may. And that is come what may. And, you know, if there's a snag for whatever reason, and you know. I know we've talked about, and we've heard the conversations about what point the coffin charger comes to a point and goes, well you know, that's maximum – anymore pressure will destroy the coffin and it stops pressing or pushing. If that's a situation where we've got 2 foot of the coffin into a cremation chamber at 800 degrees and it stops pushing, we've got a disaster on our hands. You know, that charger...

DC - You mean it stops pushing because it's snagged? Is that what you mean?

RP - Well, what I'm saying is if the decider is the fact that the pusher has got to stop pushing because any further pressure will destroy the coffin, that isn't the deciding point. The deciding point is getting it into that chamber.

AM - Can I just... my views on this point... What we're doing here, is we're giving guidance for our testing protocol, so we're offering guidance in terms of providing consistency of how we're testing the strength of a coffin, as close to real simulation as possible to ensure that there wouldn't be any issues in practice when either auto-charging or manually charging a coffin. In terms of the size of the plate, you know, this is guidance that we are offering for consistency of testing so that all the coffins are tested the same way, so that we give and have data back that's valid in terms of offering consistency of testing to the coffins. The testing in itself is testing the strength of the coffin, but what we're not saying is, we're not simulating the differences in equipment. From the back of the testing data, of course there's going to be potential guidance that needs to be given to the practical implementations of auto-charging or charging a coffin. We know that there are different size headsets out there and of course we have to consider that in the market place, but the issue of whether a coffin snakes, whether it digs into the ball bearings or doesn't roll properly is also, you know, incorporated into the sort of slip or the ?? test, the issue being that if a coffin did snake and hit the wall prior to going into the doors, you know, no matter how much that coffin is continued to be pushed, there's a problem. If you are pushing it with force and you continue to push it with force but it's hit the side because it's snaked off, then you know, just by the fact that you're going to continue to apply the force, common sense is that that's not going to push a coffin in if it's already bared off. So I think we just need to try and focus on what we're ultimately trying to achieve here, is consistency in the testing programme, to give guidance as to the coffin in correlation, not correlation, but in conjunction with other tests would not cause a problem when being charged. I think that ultimately what we're trying to do.

RP -What I was going to say and I didn't quite get to the end of what I was going to say.

[48.50 recording]

Sorry.

RP - No, it's totally all right... was don't be under any illusions that cremator manufacturers have dreamt up the pressure that these machines actually exert. That's been done for a very good reason. And they will have done their own testing, under various different conditions to ensure that coffins, from the point of view of either charging a 4 or 5 year old baby into a cremator up to a 41" wide coffin, which is the maximum they will accept. You know, that it will charge into that cremator chamber at whatever, whatever conditions basically. And that's been arrived at after significant testing at their end. All I'm saying is that, you know, if we're going to do a pressure test then it's got to be realistic against what those machines have actually been designed to do.

AM - Do you also accept though that force alone is not solely responsible for getting a coffin into a cremator?

RP - If it's up against that wall then it isn't going to go anywhere is it? You know, and that's common sense, you know, but we've got experienced operators who make sure that the coffin is central on the charging barer and everything else that goes with it, but that isn't the only reason why you'll get a possible snag, you know, all I'm saying is that that has been arrived at, not by pure chance, you know, and basically sort of I suppose, coming from the direction of somebody else needs to change their equipment to suit our product is not necessarily the answer. You know, that has been done for a very specific reason.

[50.20 recording]

JA - If we're testing captured data, and part of the problem with this test is that, what you stipulate for it to kilonewtons, you know, we haven't been able to get our head around that. It's 300 kilograms in weight, and you know, when the testing programme is underway then we'll have that data, but all I'm saying is as a minimum requirement it has to overcome the resistance of the hearth and all the extents that Intertek can measure and either safety factor in.

RB - Could we come back to the plate size? Yeah? My concern is that at the moment the majority of plates are something like 150 x 200 - about that measurement as I recall. Yeah? My concern is that there will be a considerable amount of time lapse over. I don't know how practical this is, yeah? My view is, we should be testing initially what's out there in terms of equipment and what is out there is 150 - 200, and then testing at 300.

WH -Richard...

Can we do that?

WH - I visited a crematorium which I think you had attended and advised them to increase the plate size.

RB - I certainly have done that. And I keep on doing that.

WH - Yeah, a nice big, wide one like that and she said it took about 2 weeks to fit, so I don't think, you know, at £600, I don't think that we should hold up anything. If we're testing 300 x 300, that's fair. If you're recommendation was bigger and they had it delivered and fitted in two weeks I think the timeline of that isn't really relevant to update the equipment.

RB - Well, you ask these guys because I suspect I ain't got a problem with it – ask these guys.

WH - No what I am saying is the practicality of it, of fitting a plate on a charged wouldn't....

RB - I wouldn't disagree.

WH - From what she told me, the cremator manager, she said "oh we did it quickly because we had worries about snaking."

RB - Is how quickly we could get them all to do it and these guys have got more experience, as they're face to face with the local authority finance than I am.

HB - OK, why don't I suggest we set it up so we have interchangeable plates on the test equipment? One at 150 x 200 and one at 300 x 300.

TM - No harm in that.

RB - No harm in that.

I think that's the point....

HB - And then both are covered. We can do that.

RB - And then if people don't comply, you know, you know, and if the thing, I mean, some of these new material coffins may be quite happy with a 150 x 200, may not be a problem.

WH - I think that's a good idea.

RB - That's exactly where I was coming to, then if you do that then you've covered it off both ways.

HB - We've covered all bases and then you've got the data to say that may be fails at this and passes at that, or passes at both.

AM - It does mean manufacturers have to select two coffins though for the test.

JA - No.

HB - Well, yeah. No, well, we might... It's tested as ??? Let me see, at the moment, yes on the surface, maybe no because you've got, no, we always go in the right head first.

JA - You'd put the bigger plate on first.

HB - In that case you've got two ends to a coffin, we could actually push in...

AM - Yeah but...

But if you break one end to destruction, that could have an impact on the structural integrity of the whole thing.

HB - OK, fair enough. Cause what we could actually do is push ??? in. It's up to you. We're willing to work around that.

DC - David did you want to say something?

DClark - I wasn't actually going to say anything David, but...

?? - It's just the way he shifts.

DClark - I'm just trying to get my head, an understanding around the issues bearing, that probably 90, well 97% of what we supply is traditional style coffins. I know we were referring to this as a puncture test that punctures into it and then it pulls it back out on its way out. Is that what we're referring to?

WH - The problems, that's where the problems arise.

That is where it started.

DClark - So therefore, I can exactly understand Julian and Will's, or the FFMA's recommendation because the recommendation is we recommend you use a plate this size whether it be 150 x 200 or 300 square or whatever. We recommend you use it. You can't make them use it. It's a bit like the old story going back into the 1970's, you'll remember Steve, don't fit a cross ???? on the rear of your car.

DC - No.

DClark - They recommend you don't do it, or you'll end up losing control and smashing your car up. It's the same thing.

Yeah.

All we're saying is that it will be tested at a plate size to this and tested plate size to this amount of kilonewtons, in it will go. If you choose to take that plate off and use a spike, if you choose to push it in by hand, well you're going against the recommendation. That's not a structural fault of the coffin. What it is is an



operational misuse surely? And we can't verify everyone's operations, and we're not suggesting....

RP - There are a number of sites out there that don't have power chargers, that are still charging by hand.

JA - can I say for the purpose of this, I completely agree with what Dave says, this goes back to the test protocol and what we write in our guidance. Out of it we're going to test many hundreds of coffins and many different types and there is a great opportunity to collect data and there is a great opportunity to share that research and development with you. And, if it helps, we can duplicate with a smaller plate. I don't think we need to do every manufacturers, we just take a selection of say 12 types, and do that from a random sample and we could present you with evidence and say well actually, there you are. That will provide, you know, for the next sort of version of this and so on and so on.

DC - Well, can I just say that Henri had made that suggestion for the two size plates and no one has said yes or no.

RB - How quickly do you think we could get people to adapt to a standard 300 x 300? And can we achieve it?

DClark - But Richard, that's, sorry, that's not the point of the test is it? I understand that's your dilemma, and if you agree that today that we are going to use this as a recommendation, then you're going to have some feedback that says hold on a minute, I've got to change this and I've got to change that, but the point is, it's a recommendation from both parties to say for health and safety grounds we recommend this is the best way, the best way of charging.

RB - But you've also got to take into account what's actually happening out the now.

RP - But in reality Richard, what you're saying is that you set that standard that you go ahead with 300 x 300. If you get a crematorium that chooses not to go down that road and uses a pin charger or whatever else, and it fails, then they come back to you and say that your coffin wasn't fit for purpose, it failed and you find it uses a pin process rather than a 300 x 300, then it's not your fault, or the fault of the coffin, because it's achieved the standard of testing that Intertek....

RB - But I think Julian's suggestion is good because it gives us the background generically on the coffin.

DClark- Rick, can I go back to you please?...

RB - But our guidance would be that to avoid problems, we suggest you fit...

RB - You fit the larger head. That's what we're going to have to say. Yeah? But I think Julian's idea is good because it's a good compromise.

Right. OK.

Sorry, I'm lost now.

AM - So, once again we're sort of in agreement.

?? - So, sorry, what have we agreed?

Am - the original plate size. Are we all agreed with the original plate size because it's a guidance in terms of consistency in how we're testing our coffins.

All -Yep, yep.

RP - Yeah, I mean this is all about making sure the coffin, if you like, is fit for purpose under certain circumstances. You know, if you use a wheel barrow to try and get it in there, you're going to have a problem.

DClark - Exactly.

RP - If you're using proper equipment then it fails, then you know, you've ticked all the boxes and for whatever reason it may be the fault of the coffin. All I'm saying here is, that if our guidance is that, to our members, that we would suggest that the minimum size of the power charger head is 300 x 300, you get a situation where an authority for whatever reason chooses not to go down that road, if it's like a DFW machine where it's got a pin, or a very small area that it puts pressure on. That fails and they come back to you say it's failed, well no it hasn't, because you know, they weren't using the suggested, the recommended head size and in the method that's been recommended by the association, if you like, to achieve the safe charge of that coffin.

[59.27 recording]

That's what we're saying.

Yes.

AM - The ??? acknowledges the fact that in testing protocol we cannot take into account every different type of push head, so we've had to agree to a standard in which the coffins are tested. That's what you're saying.

RB - As long as we've got Julian's data with the other behind us.

JA - I think that's a given.

That's a given.

RB - ??? because that's a) what's there and you've got to accept that people won't convert that quickly and it is important.

AM - Are we agreed?

HB - Just one moment.

Henri.

HB - Nealy there, nearly there.

DC - Henri.

HB - Yes.

What do you think about that?

What?

The head pusher test.

So, we're actually going to go with the two? Oh, we're going to go with the 300.

You were thinking of testing with two.

Well no, that's if everybody wanted to.

But it sounds like we only need to do one.

RB - Julian is going to use generic types in terms of ....

HB - Ok, so what we will do then is we will have an interchangeable head. For the testing programme we'll go 300 x 300, however we will have the option for some sampling testing at 150 x 200.

Yes.

Correct.

Fantastic.

AM - Sampling testing is not part of the testing protocol.

Yeah.

RB - So you establish the new standard for people going forward.

Right, let's move on.

OK.

RP - Just quickly, if I could just say....

JA - It's important so...

RP - I'm not going off on a tangent, but if you wind back to your own general meeting that was at the hotel down the road here, not the last one but the one before that that I came to, and Julian expressed some concern about whether or not the cremation authorities would pick this up and run with it. And I said at that time, and I think Tim agreed with me, that following the advice and guidance from ourselves and from the institute, it would be very unlikely that those authorities would choose to ignore that guidance. And I still stand with that, that you know, if both organisations give the same guidance that we recommend a head of 300 x 300 then ?????????? (*Can't make this bit out as you're speaking to someone quietly at the same time.*)

AM - Because let's face it, that's exactly what this whole testing regime was put in place to try and achieve was that some of the issues we're currently coming up against as manufacturers whereby crematoria were banning the use of certain coffins, thereby taking away choice from families because of instances that have occurred that may or may not have been an issue with the coffin.

JA - Adam, can we stick to the agenda?...

RB - Can we just come back to the 3K enforcement here please?

JA - Well, I prefer to come back to the ignition test if we've finished with the auto-charger test.

[1.02.21 recording]

RB - Well no, because we've got these ??? 3K that you're actually quoting here in test 3 Richard.

WH - Oh, you know what it is, he's got the old test. He hasn't got the one with three amendments that I sent to you last week. One minute, let me just check. One minute. I think... 300 x 300.....

RB - The only reason I'm raising it is that I've done a little research on what the fault is on automatic chargers.

WH - Yeah, the testing house were going to do that as a ??? charge. Yeah. Sorry.

RB - That's OK. We'll pass to Tim in a minute.

WH - Yeah, he's got the old one. It's where we've agreed what we're doing with the test that's simulating the hasp.

RB - The reason we were going to work on this was because historically you've raised the point that, you know, you can't just have 3K smashing against the end of a coffin.

Yeah.

Yeah.

RB - So, what I then did was tried to sort of put out and see, because there must be, yeah, the drive's motor and you can set these to have a cut off, yeah? If it exceeds a pre-set value of a pre-set time. You can actually set them.

WH - I don't remember you talking about that.

RB - Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. And what was interesting was in the, what's the ????, that's the most important thing applied. And the answer was about 2 - 3 seconds. Yeah?

WH - Right.

RB - So, you know, but how do you feel about that?

Tim hasn't seen it yet.

RB - Yep, hang on.

JA - But Tim, we seem to be talking about the past and we're trying to move forwards and we're trying to stick to the tests.

RB - I hadn't had that document until this morning.

JA - I know, but it doesn't relate... If that's not in, we talking about the tests and pass and fails.

WH - Yeah, but hang on a minute you've got here that this has to be 3KN and that's why we're asking the question.

[1.04.26 recording]

WH - Yeah, look we had a meeting about these last 3 tests as a working group last week and we went through how we're getting there.

Yeah well fine, but if it hasn't been communicated then...

OK, OK. Yeah.

Then my information is....

OK, it's there, have a minute on it.

DClark - I think the general consensus of opinion, and Rick and Tim feel comfortable with, then the recommendation of a plate size of, and then an alternative over sample coffins with suffice on that test. As long as it doesn't come to a snag or a dart, 3KN, as you've rightly said there, 2 - 3 seconds has got to push 3KN for 2 - 3 seconds and we almost went back to the start and said if

it's up against a solid wall then somebody should be watching what..... that's the reality that. It only got the last 2 - 3 seconds and I think it basically closes it off, what we agreed and we should move on. If everyone's comfortable.

RB - As I say, until this point, I didn't know that.

OK.

RP - I think we need to focus on whether or not....

RB - Yeah I'm OK with it.

RB - Are you all right? Are you all right with that?

Yeah.

RB - We have majority, we have total ??? that's fine.

[1.05.35 recording]

RP - All I'm encouraging you to do, is not to create a new set of problems that nobody is worried about. Let's deal with the problems that we know.

Yeah.

JA - Are we going to move on then to ignition test and heat test?

DC - Can I just say we'll discuss this. Item and then we'll have a break for lunch or what else. Toilet break or smoking break, so we'll go through this...

HB - I need to get feeling back in my hand.

OK. All right.

RP - I'll send you a copy of the CD.

HB - Could you? I'm sure I've got 10 pages so far of notes. Yeah just the 10, I'm writing in???? Seriously. You guys talk more than we do.

DClark - Ok. Julian.

JA - Moving forward, we felt what would be suitable was a test that was around 600 degrees C. It's lower than what was previously stated and communicated, but again as we were doing a test we thought we could exaggerate that from 400 to 500 to 600. We don't have the data as we haven't started the testing so we don't quite know what happens, but given the research we've done I think we'd be, all the coffins that are currently out there will be OK at 600. Looking at the temperatures, at actual at ?? basis, close to the door we seem to be achieving at around 200 degrees because of the flow of air which is a pull through open door

into the combustion chamber. And inside the chamber we know that it's around 600 when the door is open.

WH - At the door point sorry Rick...

AM - Not inside the chamber?

WH - Not inside the chamber, at the door point what we did....

RP - Sorry to interrupt, but is that under normal operational conditions?

WH - It was a Monday, and we did the same Friday and Friday end of day.

RP - Yep. Because, you know, actual chamber temperatures then you're more likely to be 700 – 750 degrees and thereabouts and a bit more than that and if you're looking to drop that.... Our guidance if you like has been, if you're talking about wood coffins and other coffins that have got a fairly low ignition point, our guidance has been to treat it as a large coffin. And the reason for that is that normally we would recommend that the chamber temperatures were dropped to somewhere in the region of 550 or 600 degrees, the actual chamber temperature, before you charge. Now to do that, that would probably take an hour or an hour and half under full operational Friday afternoon circumstances, to drop that temperature.

[1.08.32 recording]

WH- OK. So, when I was there.....

AM - Can I just say....

WH - Yeah. Of course, of course.

AM - Just again to reiterate the objectives of this test is to simulate, obviously operational conditions across all sorts of crematoriums and cremators. So, and simulating when the door's at that point open and at that, the time that it takes the coffin the to be charged and what we're looking at is to whether the coffin is going to combust, essentially prior to entering the chamber. So therefore the temperature at the door is the most important factor. Not the temperature inside the chamber, could be 700 could be 500 could be 850, but it's the temperature at the door and the temperature at which the coffin materials can be subjected to, to see if it's going to start smoldering or igniting causing health and safety issues to crematorium operatives. So therefore, in my mind the critical nature of this test is to ascertain for a period of time at certain temperatures, as we all know that, you know, when you open the door of a cremator there's going to be variances in temperature of what the coffin's subjected to. But again we need consistency in how we test coffin materials as to what temperatures they will potentially start igniting and therefore cause problems, so I'm not making a point other than just stating the objectives of this test.

WH - Yep.

RP - I'm aware, and I'm sure Tim may or may not confirm what I'm saying here, but a number of operators have already gone down the road of dampening the coffin, putting a damp sheet over the top of certain coffins, trying to avoid that ???

TM - It's in your guidance. Yeah.

RP - But, you know, to try and avoid that initial flash and it's the rate at which the combustion will actually move along the coffin.

TM - Yeah.

RP - Whether that matches or exceeds the rate the coffin's being charged at. Because, what you end up then is an emission out into the area where the operative is actually working, rather than actually in the chamber itself.

AM - You've got the issues of radiation heat transfer and conduction now, obviously there's not too much metal, therefore high conducting properties, but obviously wood and those sorts of materials have low conducting properties, but ultimately it's that radiant heat that is going to cause the issues with regard to, you know, the premature flash or igniting the coffin.

RP - Absolutely.

AM - So, therefore we need to be able to simulate, via the testing protocol, tests at different temperatures so that we believe we get a representative data on the coffins in terms of what they're subjected to at heat, at set defined distances at a period of time so that we can start collecting that data to look at pass / fail criteria. Because at this point we don't have any data at all on flash or ignitions tests on coffins. We have the problems that have been experienced with crematorium staff and ultimately it's down to us as part of this testing programme to give data on whether coffins are fit for purpose and not going to endanger, from a health and safety perspective, crematorium operative.

RP - Yeah, sure.

Am - We have to have a starting point. We believe this is a fair starting point in terms of temperatures at the door and the time the coffins are exposed to those temperatures. That's why I believe we can move forward on this one.

RP - There's a period of time when obviously that coffin is sitting on the charger being offered up outside the door and the door is opened and it will take a certain amount of time for the door to raise, it will take a certain amount of time for the operator to press the button to go and a certain amount of time for that coffin to be charged in, so it's being exposed to that radiant temperature during that period and I think that's got to be calculated, as to what effect that has and whether or not.... You know, OK, it may not ignite on there, but you may well have moved the coffin into a different zone because of the....



RP - Because it's been subjected to it for a period of time.

Yes, subjected for a period of time.

AM - What would you say would be a sensible time frame of subjecting a sample of coffin to that temperature for that would be representative of essentially how long it takes for the doors to open, start to finish, and for the operator to hit go to start charging?

RP - I've got to be honest Adam, I've never really stood there with a stop watch and actually timed that, but I mean that is something that....

AM - There's going to be variance...

WH -It was...

WH - Yeah, there will be, but in reality, that's something that going to be relatively easy to establish.

Will, you've done...

Yeah, we took..... While we were doing the temperature checks, we videoed it, so the eight charges that day, we videoed him opening the door... I must say, the door doesn't open until the chamber is 800 degrees, it won't open because a green light comes on, so that was straight away....

RP - That's the secondary zone, not the main chamber.

RP - That's the secondary zone, not the primary chamber.

WH - Oh, he seemed to say that is was the.... OK, OK. That's interesting because.... That's OK.

[1.13.53 recording]

AM - Primary temperatures, just making sure everyone understands, so the primary chamber is the chamber that the....

WH - Main one, the secondary one burns the gas ???? and all that. So yeah, the door wouldn't open until 800, but I didn't realise it was that. So we opened that... I filmed him charging the coffin so, and we took the temperature probe throughout the day outside the chamber, we took it inside on the hearth's bricks and the metal up the top we were taking, so I was there sometimes for about 4 or 5 minutes with the probe with the heat ??? on because it could smoke after 4 or 5 minutes. But the other thing we did simultaneously is we printed out from the machine which shows the temperature probe in the middle of the chamber and that sees basically, as soon as you open the door, down to charging point. So while take a temperature outside the oven and printing out simultaneously the sheet for the faculty machine - it demonstrates we were about 480 degrees worst case and I was getting about 200 degrees with the radiant heat thing

outside and I was there for quite a while, but that's how... I mean Steve went and done it as well... I think Steve went didn't he? A couple of weeks after our last meeting?

JA - Yeah.

[1.15.03 recording]

WH - But we've done it a few times because we were worried we were getting a low reading. But that's what we kind of found and that's why we thought....

??- How do you explain that?

JA - On two separate sets of equipment.

WH - It's to do with the air rushing in isn't it.

Tm - Cremators work under negative pressure.

WH - Yeah, he did say...

TM - When the door opens the thermo couples sampling the air temperature, the brickwork temperature won't drop.

WH - Yeah.

JA - But in fairness, the coffin's not in contact with the brick, it's in contact with air.

WH -Yeah.

JA - As a very good insulator, as a good insulator it's the radiation that's absorbed by the surface.

TM - So you open the charged door, the temperature might appear to drop, but as soon as that door comes down, it goes back quite quickly.

WH - Oh yeah, I saw that, that was demonstrated on the chart. It was demonstrated on the chart.

AM - As you want it to because you want it to because you want it to start ???

WH - Yeah, yeah, yeah.

RP - But I mean, if I can just add to that as well, the machine is designed to work under pressure and that's with all the doors and orifices closed.

Yeah, yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

RP - If you were standing around the other side of the machine and actually witnessed the actual amount of suction that you've got at the bottom when the door's open it would be practically zero, because you're taking so much air out....

DClark - Sorry, I missed that... Basically....

Zero.

Sorry I missed that.

But it was taking air in.

RP - Yeah, it will be taking air in.

Yeah.

RP - The actual suction throughout the machine will be running at virtually zero because...

When the door's open sorry?

RP -Yeah. Because it's not designed to operate with the door open so it will drop the level of suction.

WH - Yeah I suppose I did check it....

RP - What you need to bare in mind is the great, great variation between a brand new installation and machine just having been commissioned, to a machine that's ready for a revive. You know, the amount of suction that you've got on the operational efficiency of that machine depending on at what point during its life it is, will vary quite significantly.

WH - This is to do with when you're replacing the heath's brick's?

RP - Well not just that...

WH - The whole lining?

RP - You're talking about flu ways in general.

Oh.

RP - The actual size and condition of the flu ways is critical to the performance of the equipment. You know, if somebody were to ??? a cremator and change that flu way dimension by half an inch, you would totally change the way that that

machine performs. So, you know, its actual condition and where it is in the range of its life....

WH - Right.

RP - Will impact upon its performance or the amount of suction that's available to you. I'm not saying it's not operationally sound...

WH - OK.

WH - The sample I took, or the sample we went to, because we talked about the hearths while we were there and that, and he was having it done in about 4 weeks, and it was £17,000 to rebuild the whole thing, he was saying. That they....

RP - More than that...

RB - Well, yeah... It was due to be done is what I'm trying to say.

WH - But you won't want to, the hearth is different to replacing the total ?? as you fully realise.

WH - Yeah.

RB - So the hearth is done about half way through the life....

WH - I'm pretty sure he was doing all of it from what he was saying.

WH - I think he was due all of it from what he was saying because he was saying that they cut all the bricks out the back and it's quite an art.

JA - But the figure we're talking about is 600 though. Can we not test to that and use that as pass / fail for now? In seriousness, because I understand...

RB - I struggled... Go on.

JA - No, I understood that was an acceptable figure from your point of view anyway which was fed back to me from John ???

RB - Well I think, I mean the question is, you've written here, has this been changed again since you met, or?

JA - Not really. It's just for ???

WH - Is that the copy?...

JA - It's 850, which was, written before, it's been lowered to 600.

DClark - Does that seem acceptable?

WH - Yeah, I just, yeah...

RB - Well, what I've got down here is starting at 200 degrees C's and rising to 800. That's what I've got in front of me.

WH - Sorry, have you got the copy I just gave you?

RB - No, Tim had it last.

WH - Grab that copy.

It went back.

Oh did it. Oh sorry.

What we're saying is that....

RB - We just need to make sure...

There it is...

AM - The temperatures of this test will be at 400, 500 and 600 and again that's giving indications of the variables that we've been talking about in terms of times of the day, in terms of makes of machinery, in terms of the age of the machinery, so essentially what we're doing with this test is we're building in a lot of variables that the coffins will experience, or be subjected to, when the cremator doors are open for the period of time in which they are then subjected to being charged into the coffin. That's all we want to try and achieve with this test, is to find whether there any materials in the coffin, where even at the lowest point can combust and flash over prior to what we agree to be an acceptable time.

RP - It's difficult for us Adam, so sit here and say yes we fully agree with that one. A) we've not been privy to the tests or even involved with the practicalities as to how it was carried out ??? *(Too much background noise to hear what's being said at this point...)*

Have you...

RP - You're asking us to actually rubber stamp it if that's what, you know, and saying that the trade associations agree with that. We've had no involvement whatsoever in.....

But at the moment.

JA - What we worry about is the lack of test data, getting to 850 and funding a whole set of coffins that will experience problems and be essence being failed and that will mean that they'll be worthless in the market place.

WH - And I also struggle....

JA - And that's not an acceptable position really.

With the help of ...

RP - I'm not saying it is Julian. All I'm saying is, you know, arriving at that figure and not having been, if you like, privy to how you've done that, or witnessing how you've done that it's very difficult for us to say yes we completely agree with....

RP - Have you got some back data from what you tried to do? Have you got some back data?

WH - Yeah, we've got videos and....

One second...

AM ??? It's quite boring but what we are doing is writing a test profile. So at the moment this whole test profile is theoretical until we start testing, our knowledge is based on coffin manufacturers ??? (Too much background noise here to hear what is being said...) This is just a test protocol being written based on nothing other than our experience and I think it's...

JA - From nothing as well. From nothing to a starting point I imagine ??? (Too much background noise again – someone shuffling papers I think...)

JA - None of us other than... You know, we have all had the opportunity to sit and go over test, to back up ??? But ultimately we're looking at using a common sense approach to try to write test protocols to simulate what a coffin would be subjected to. So, ??? I have right now is, you know, I haven't sat down and physically gone over the tests, so see whether I believe this to be suitable. I believe what is appropriate based on a common sense approach to how the test programme can be written.

[1.22.32 recording]

DClark - And is it fair, so back on what Adam was saying there, to move us forward and get this ?? right, I fully accept that at this moment in time you give a ??? until you know obviously what the outcomes are. So is it worth, and for the protocol to move forward to say subject to test data, coming back from Henri.

Yeah.

RP - After the tests have been done we can say these style of coffins will withstand this kind of heat for this length of time.

WH - And maybe they can go and show us an example of where we're getting 850 degrees outside the door.

Yeah.

RP - They're not saying we do we do get 850....

WH - Oh sorry, on the approach or here?

RP - I've never stood outside the door with a thermometer.

WH - OK, yeah.

RP - The temperature we're telling you is what the temperature of the chamber is.

WH - Yeah.

RP - You know, how you've arrived at the evidence here, is all I'm saying is. It's very difficult for us to understand that.

RP - We're not here trying to put obstacles in your way. It's a bit like the advert on the telly that says, you know we're not here to sell you a car we're here to help you but one. And that's what we're trying to do now is ???, you know, try....

JA - If the barriers for the test are fair that can't happen though. If the barriers are set too high then you will ban coffins, which have been established on the market for... Through this protocol.

RP - Let us work with you to let us help you achieve what you need to achieve.

JA - Yeah, but you're asking us to set a bar of a pass and fail, which your members will recognise and say yep that's OK to cremate or that's not, so, if the test criteria aren't correct and fair by that initiation then you will stop those coffins being sold to market for cremation, which is 75% of the market place which renders them basically useless. So, it's very important we get this test criteria right. I don't want to talk about what's gone on in the past but where we are today, we're sort of saying...

RP- don't see how we can avoid that Julian.

JA - Well, what we're saying is 600 degrees.

RP - Don't go away into a corner and do this on your own because it will get you nowhere.

JA - Well, coming back to this though, do you think that's an acceptable start point, which you can see as a start point?

WH - I don't understand how we arrived at the 850 but you're talking at the door of the bricks, sorry, sorry, OK.

DClark - What we're trying to get at is ??? there's a proposal been put forward because we don't know it as well. Will's done some great work in his own time to try and find some details out, stood there with his ?? on looking like ??? But at the end of the day, it's one man taking time to do ??? But what the proposal I think is more is, that's a start point, let's do the testing from that start point and then feed back the data that says for example a traditional chipboard coffin veneered with this will withstand 600 degrees and it might withstand it for 2 hours, you know what I mean? But a ??? one at 400 degrees will withstand 90 seconds. I don't know.

[1.25.39 recording]  
Let's find out.

JA - Until the testing starts we won't know that level of data will we?

Am - The point being the test profile was written prior to any testing that we've done based on what we believe to be a common sense approach and will simulate real conditions, regardless of what we've then gone out and done ....

RB - And then the test can be adjusted one we've got that.

Absolutely.

HB - So why don't we suggest that we start on 400, 500, 600 bearing in mind that every test is being videoed as well, so there's going to be video evidence of... What we can do actually, is say, instead of exposing it for like a minute or two minutes because, I mean, who knows, you might decide to sort of stand there and, I don't know, take a phone call or whatever, it might not go in. We'll actually expose everything for 10 minutes, which is never going to happen, ever gonna happen, but let's expose it and everything and let's video it and then we'll record if it does ignite or do anything within that 10 minutes you'll have the exact time it actually happened at and then you judge for yourselves what's reasonable and what isn't reasonable. That's actually taking everything to the extreme and then you go back from that and actually set the pass / fail criteria, but everything's tested. You've got data at different temperatures, different times on different materials, then you set more parameters outside of that and we do that. And then you start clawing it back, it's sort of going to the extreme to claw back again rather than saying are we doing a minimum...

WH - And then we can do the approach test as written. I've got that here.

RB - Are we going to that on Julian's previous principle of generic types?

JA - Yeah, I think that's sensible. There's no point doing it on hundreds of coffins.

RB - No, no we'll do it on sampling. Let's do it on sampling and then decide.

[1.27.15 recording]  
Yeah. Sampling. Get it from there and then....



Yeah. Yeah.

JA - A veneer coffin ???

DClark - Can you come in on that point, on what we're talking about, you went a bit quiet on that.

No, no.

You ??? with that Rick?

HB - OK, so we'll run each test for 10 minutes, video each, sampling method at the three stated temperatures and then submit data and then you've got something tangible to agree or disagree.

RB - Can we just have a list of the generic materials you're going to test? Just so we know. That's all.

DClark - Well I think that's quite reasonable here.

HB - Yeah, yeah.

We'd like a list too please.

A list of generic materials.

Just so we know...

Am - Right, one's going to be china clay....

JA - I think by inference, what you're trying to say is that that list will be comprehensive.

Yeah.

Yeah.

RB - We want to make sure we cover it off, because then when you come down to the guidelines and the advice you can be very specific. And that's what we want to try and do.

Yeah.

HB - Well, the thing is then everything is set up, the equipment is set up, so once you all have the data and you actually agree then that's the tweak that would be the standard for everybody and then...

Yeah.

Yeah.

DClark - I think that's reasonable. Both parties agree on that and then we'll share the data...

All - Yeah, yeah.

AM - I'd just like to pick up on one point and that's about how we work together and just to reiterate, you know, there's been two people in particular who've put a lot of time and effort in this, because of how passionate they are in terms of pushing this forward, but particularly talking about Will taking his own time to go to a crematorium to back up the data that Intertek had done. Just please accept from this point, it wasn't done in terms to deliberately exclude you and it think moving forward, I think we welcome your input and your time and presence at anything future that we do, in terms of being able to, you know, verify the test data or verify other particular things if we want to do in ???

RB - I would entirely agree with that, because you know, we've got to be in volition when we go for legal opinion. The thing I also, in my head, throughout of all of this is, if something goes wrong and you're being attacked by the barrister on the other side, you know, start from that point. Did you do this? Did you do that? Didn't you? You've got to be able to answer those questions.

AM - Everything that we want to do moving forward is, you know, has to be very transparent and has to be very open.

RB - I'm sure we can come to ...

JA - Can I just apologise, we've just got to cover off a couple more points.

Yeah.

JA - One's particularly pertinent to Rick - the residue test. The sample must not leave a residue that has a detrimental effect on hearth surface or quality of ashes being retained by the family. Would you agree with that being added into the test protocol?

RP - Just say that again Julian.

[1.30.20 recording]

JA - It's actually on page 10, statement 8. Ceramic surfaces used for test 6 have been inspected for incombustible residue and photographed. The sample residue will be bagged and returned to the manufacture for further investigation. The sample must not leave a residue that has a detrimental effect to the hearth surface of quality of ashes returned to the family.

RB - I think if you took out had a detrimental effect, then that's fine because really what it shouldn't be doing is leaving a residue.

JA - One of the things we've talked about is that, you know, all alternative coffins are fitted with a wooden charger board and there is some confusion at the moment about certain types of weave coffin and I know they're not made by banana by the way, so I haven't got a vested interest in this, they're leaving a sugar type molasses type incombustible material.

RP - I think what you've got to understand is that any residue that actually welds itself to the hearth, then you actually then go and ??? not only that cremation but the following cremations. You'll collide with a metal rake against that residue that's fixed itself to the brickwork. And what then tends to happen is that that residue releases but brings some of the brickwork with it. You know, you'll actually damage the surface of the hearth, by raking.

JA - First of all, that's a detrimental effect so that would be ?? wouldn't it?

RP - Yeah. But I mean, you know, I suppose what I'm saying by you putting has a detrimental effect, you know, it's a case of how you judge that, but I mean, what we're saying is it shouldn't leave a residue on the hearth.

DClark - Would, I mean, ??? consultation I suppose in a way, but would you think, are you thinking that if a product leaves a residue on the hearth then it would be a failure?

Yeah? So we're not talking about if it's a little bit it's OK. We're talking about if there's a residue.

Tm - It effects charging as well, as residue on the hearth.

Yeah.

JA - It can damage hearth It's down to the operator.

DClark - Just so as we're clear that we know that's what we're...

I personally don't have a problem with taking out detrimental effect - anybody else?

RB - What we're saying is, if there's a residue it's detrimental, that's what we're actually saying.

Yeah.

Residue means...

WH - An uncrematable residue, isn't it.

By definition it's what...

If something that doesn't burn completely.

HB - Basically the test is just to highlight anything that isn't combustible, which is what you want to know. And the photos will be taken so non-combustible materials...

HB - It comes into that category doesn't it. It's a non-combustible material.

Exactly.

We've had discussions that if you use.....

So do you want to ??? non-combustible.

Non-combustible residue.

DC - Can we just have one discussion.

Julian - first.

JA - Well, take out detrimental effect and put non-combustible.

Adam.

AM - Nope, that's fine.

Rick.

RP - Yeah, that's fine.

RB - So are you putting in the words non-combustible Julian?

JA - Sorry?

RB - Are you putting in the words non-combustible?

JA - Yes. Yes. I don't know why you didn't get these before - I'll amend them again.

WH - Yeah, apologies.

RP - Is that going in as a non-combustible residue?

AM - So just to be clear, the sample must not leave a non-combustible residue that has an effect or just get rid of detrimental effect, the sample must not have a non-combustible residue. Pretty much full stop.

RP - Full stop. That's got to be the way to go because in itself it will leave a residue that will be an ash residue, this is a non-combustible residue.

Yeah.

And....

JA - OK. Lastly, because it's the right place to do it, now you have the correct documents, there's a couple of recommendations on the back and I think we should just go through these because it's the right time to do it.

RB - What page are we on?

JA - Page 21. This is how this document will work, so any amendments and recommendations can be set out here and there's an order trail which is in the ???

WH - See the system of control? Have you got the system of control Adam?

WH - Page 20, document status, no?

AM - Page 21 on mine.

Oh it's probably...

RB - We've got document status on 20 and we've got reference zero six ??? 2015 and a couple of dates on the other side.

JA - That's the one.

JA - So, reading through those for the benefit of people who haven't got it, first recommends coffins and caskets only will be tested when the following recommendations are adhered to by manufacturers or vendor. When an alternative coffin requires a charging board, the board must be firmly fixed to cover the entire base of the coffin or casket. It should have a chamfered, smooth radius to its edge. Number three, be perfectly smooth and free from defect, with exception, if fitted of hand groves cut into the head and foot areas. Number four, be made of a suitable material no less than 12mm in thickness, for example chipboard, ply board, MDF or solid wood.

TM - I've got a comment on four. Suitable combustible material.

Yeah.

Happy with that.

DC - Yeah. Good point Tim.

JA - Is everyone OK with that?

Now that would cover ???

Other boards, solid board....

AM - So again it would be, it does apply for ??

Yeah.

Well that gets it at.

DC - Can anyone think of any other coffins that might not be covered? Can anyone think of anything?

No.

OK.

Henri, what do you think about that?

HB - Love it. See, I'm easier to please than you lot. Yeah, that's, it should be specified.

Anything else?

JA - Number 2 - a recommendation of the same date. Polished coffins / caskets coated using varnish relying on the solvent to dry should be allowed to, for at least 24 hours and should not be tended to the customer before the period has elapsed. Are you happy? Yep?

RB - My only question is, do you think, we'll take you lead here because you're the experts. My only concern is funeral directors, yeah? Do you think it should be slightly higher because they'll say, oh 24 hours, oh right, you know, it will be all right, we'll have a ?? There's a built in safety margin.

No, this is us, if someone rings up today, we won't give them a coffin until tomorrow at the same time.

So this is you being told and not a caveat of theirs?

Oh no.

OK fine.

JA - OK, if we stick it on a wagon, you know, in our case at one in the morning ...

RB - So this is a manufacturer recommendation?

JA - Yeah. You know, notwithstanding that the coffin and casket should be placed, in other words if you don't leave it 24 hours, in a drying ??, so tunnel room, exposed

to ventilated warm air of around 35 degrees C for around 30 minutes. That will in essence dry off any residual solvent, which I know causes you the problem.

?????

RB - You talked us through that.

JA - Steve, is that OK?

SS - Yeah, yeah.

JA - So you either keep the coffin for 24 hours, it doesn't matter if it's in the back of a van or in your premises, or you force dry it.

Yeah.

David?

DS - Yeah, it's fine with us.

DClark - Yep. Well, probably like yourself, we're using ?? so it's not an issue to us. But, back on what you're saying, health and safety, you shouldn't have a driver transporting a coffin giving fumes off and him breathing it in, so I think we've all got a duty of care anyway.

DC - We use a different finish if it's going to an under 24 hour. If somebody rings up this morning and says I want to a coffin this afternoon, we put a different finish on it.

JA - Well, do you want that bit put in there?

DC - No, not necessarily....

JA - Actually, it's covered because that's not solvent based, it's water based isn't it. OK.

JA - Number three, recommendation of the same date, the FFMA recommends a plate size for all pusher chargers of 300 x 300 and that relates as a recommendation, as I say, to what we'd already discussed. Is that given the context of what we said, before I move on?

Yeah.

Yep.

JA - This is just what we're saying, we know it doesn't change what we've discussed before we quickly go back to ground zero.

RB - But in four, are you now going to replace that with your maximum of 5 litres or are you going to leave it as is?

JA - No, I'll change to 5 litres.

JA - I am very pleased to move to point four. So, three, you're happy, number four I'll take care about the 5 litres.

???

DC - Rick. You're looking pensive.

RP - No, I'm just cleaning my specs.

He's looking blind because he took his glasses off.

RB - We have got a slight problem here because you're saying the standard size and I think it should be the maximum size. Or maximum recommended size.

But....

JA - I'm all right with that. Are you all right?

???

TM - That's the thing we discussed wasn't it?

RB - But what I'm saying is, you don't want to give people, you don't want funeral directors believing that on every occasion they've got to turn up with 5 litres...

JA - No, no, no...

WH - We're going to plot that graph aren't we and give you that data.

Yeah that's fine.

WH - That's a recommendation then.

RB -And we will try and educate them.

TM - Correct me if I'm wrong, but my note says 3.5 minimum, 5 max.

Yeah.

Is that what we said earlier?

WH - For outsized bariatric cases, larger volume ash caskets should be considered.



AM - That's just the terminology but ...

Yeah.

WH - But we'll see that on the graph.

RP - Yeah, as Tim says, bariatric is misleading because that has no relevance at all.

D Clark - I think it goes back to what Rick said earlier. The minimum says 3.2 am I correct?

RB - But you were saying 3.5.

RB - Oh sorry. 3.2....

RB - 3.2 - 5 litres.

OK.

RB - And when we have Will's graph we can have guidance, which gives you an approximation of you use for what. Yeah?

JA - It's Intertek's graph.

TM - So if I change that to between 3.2 and 5.

That ties in with what... with earlier.

Yeah.

Yeah.

OK.

AM - In terms of terminology, that's a valid point, if you know, try not to use bariatric all the time, again it's .... Because we're talking about again coffin size....

JA - I'm happy to adopt a different ??? it just seemed to be better, I don't know, would it be politically incorrect if I say fat people?

AM - Oversized. I don't know.

A fat person.

WH - I think it can produce bigger bone structures from what... If you're big from a little child... Yeah, OK, OK. But I believe it can.

Excellent.

OK.

DC - Time for tea?

Quarter to three, that gives us 25, 30 minutes.

***Adjourned for lunch – recording continues.... Transcript not detailed during lunch break.***

***Meeting reconvened at 2.43pm [2.10 recording]***

Dc - We hope you enjoyed lunch thanks to Julie downstairs. Please take any sandwiches with you Steve.

Thank you for this morning we've done extremely well and some good stuff come out and we can now move on.

JA - We are now on agenda number 2.

I think [agenda] number 2 really is really covered off in number 1, full and frank discussions- the discussions from all the tests from the pass fail. Can I ask if everyone is happy with that? Henri are you happy?

HB - We're not as stated throughout this, we are not issuing pass or fails on the test reports we are just reporting as found. Reporting on results, so all fine.

RB - Just one point, I assume as we have made one or two alterations to this so you will circulate this round?

Is everyone happy?

Agenda Item 3

JA - Discussion about how an FMA decision would be delivered to the cremation sector and funeral directors based on the test results. The way that we feel through the website, it's been up there for a number of months now and there is some discussion about where we can find this document. It is live and published on the website. Each manufacture has its own portal which will advertise their result - I think you're the main one.

Who - Once the testing has been done and it has been uploaded for the manufacturer to see the results, once they get to a pass stage or not, they then decide to say to the FFMA look the documents in a pass stage and the official secretary has the ability to turn on the official passcode that they stamp on the bottom of the coffin, then at that point the member can order the stamps via the website which is the stamp with their code on.

RP - have you got any objection to us actually publishing this on our website?

WH - No

RP - Once we have the amendments then we will put it on the website.

Yes then we will put it on our website.

RB - If you let us have what is the final version then we can post that very quickly.

JA - Really point of agreement is before your members, we won't be sending out directories, it will be up to your members to go to the portal and have a look.

RB - Something will need to be said to the funeral association.

JA - Absolutely.

RB - Can I just flip back on one – sorry to go backwards. Henri is going to do her test data. That will be circulated and then your final pass and fail criteria will be determined.

Henri will do the tests working with the manufacturer.

There's a difference between the generic tests we are doing, we ought to test certain proposition and the whole programme.

HB - Won't you need them all to set proper pass fail criteria? Or are you only going to base part of our criteria on the sampling?

No no, it's all of them.

RB - What I would normally expect..... you would do a ? test programme which I completely accepted after which you would set the standards that people need to meet having evaluated your criteria, that's what I would expect you to do.

We've agreed pretty much everything.

If someone is submitting volume coffins for test, we will know what the pass and fail criteria is by the time that they do it? Yes.

JA - By the point of making application for test they are obliged to publish yes?

WH - By the point, that's a relationship between the testing house and the supplier at that point. Until it has achieved all the tests and the supplier is happy for that to be published on the FFMA website and speak to the FFMA.

RB - Before the Volume test take out the supplier will know what the criteria pass fail criteria are before they send it.

[2.15.46 recording]

HB – Sorry how can you have pass fail criteria without any data and you won't get data without doing the testing.

RB - Hold on the data comes in your initial pre test programme.

JA - I think if I have this right, there are a couple of tests that in principle we are agreeing to, yes. But if for instance we test all the coffins at 600 and they fail it's just ridiculous. It's ridiculous to say that we've got no coffins which have passed.

RB - Oh I don't have a problem with that. That's the whole reason for doing the pre-test.

Yes but we've got this 90% agreed, there's one or two areas we've highlighted in principle like the auto charge test that we've just got to look at the data. We are both in the dark about this, there is just that slight reservation.

JA - On the last 3 tests that we've discussed today, we haven't set a fixed pass fail criteria. As the testing goes underway we will find the data and then look at odd things that step outside of it.

JA - At a minimum if we publish what the test result is, would that satisfy you?

RB -when I'm submitting components to medical manufacturers I would know what the criteria of the start or fail of that was before the product was submitted.

We'd have to meet their criteria their specification, it would go for an independent testing house. But I'd know what I was aiming for before I started.

What is slightly concerning me is will the people submitting coffins, let's just take the other tests for a minute, perhaps the simpler ones, will they know before they submit their coffins what that pass and fail, what they're aiming for.

WH - Yes

On the simpler ones yes, all the way up to these last 3.

RB - So the only ones in doubt of being confirmed are the 3 we've discussed?

WH - Yes.

DClark - To be fair to support, I see where you're coming from, the last 3, 2 out of the last 3 until we have some quantity data it's hard to say. But on the other ones we've got the BMI weight test for the strength. Along with the size and weight of the average person, plus a percentage uplift of 1.25. If you look down each one, there's an actual .....coffin lining.

As long as that is going to happen and you know what you are aiming for that's all I'd hope for.

AM - You've introduced the terminology pre testing and we haven't agreed pretesting it's testing to sit along side the testing of the data on the 3 areas that we ..... to enable us. Not pre testing prior to the....

HB - It is not to replace the main programme it's aside the main programme as a sampling method in the background.

To give us a good area to identify what passes or fails on proper....

I don't have a problem with that.

[2.19.31 recording]

TM - Just to clarify, so you are going to do X number of tests. A number of manufacturers are going to arrange for the tests. They'll have those last 3 carried out without knowing the criteria.

TM - Once you've had a certain number of tests completed. Then pass and fail on those can be. Some of your..... are going to have to wait.

AM - Bearing in mind that one of them was ..... and we've already agreed that we are not setting pass or fail criteria we are giving guidance.

So they might have to wait.

DClark - It depends on the level of tested and the time it's going to take there's probably a couple of these points might take 3 to 6 months before you start to see any quality data that you can start ring fencing and saying what it is, but at least we're in a programme of testing to a agreed protocol.

AM - We're in a situation now where we've submitted coffins waiting for the testing programme to start not knowing the pass test, pass fail criteria on a number of the tests and observing the fact that we know that this is starting off and we will be able in time to have pass test pass fail criteria for the coffins that we have all submitted.

TM - I'm just concerned that your organisation, does that mean that potentially someone could have their, a coffin tested today and it might be June before you send them their stamp?

JA - I think from our point of view we are starting the testing as of end of this week.

TM - Whenever you start it might be 6 months before you have quantitative data on some of the information. So you can't actually approve or whatever you call a coffin.

HB - But there again on the 2 that are under question we are doing sampling at the same time as the main programme which we can push through really quickly which means it won't be 6 months. You can put a deadline to us on that and maybe come up with a deadline that is more acceptable to everyone - say end of February or something. And then we'll say that we'll get all sampling testing

done by then so a decision on pass fail criteria will be made at the end of February.

WH - While the testing is underway isn't it.

HB - The testing is underway then anyway. The thing is the pass fail won't change the results it will only change the outcome, those results mean that we can still carry on with the generic programme and we'll do the sampling, how about we agree that we'll do the sampling during January, we'll submit by mid February and a decision will be made on pass fail by the end of February. And then there is a deadline and everyone is very clear. That's like the schedule we've asked for anyway.

DC - Rick can I ask you a question on this, do you have any sort of date in your mind or will you come up with or are you open to when this will kick in to action.

RP - Well really David as soon as possible I'm getting fairly regular calls from all angles about where are we with it. They've obviously waited for a long time. There are cremation authorities out there that have put restrictions in place and when we are meeting regularly with the funeral directors the funeral directors are saying where are we with the testing. We need to resolve it as quickly as we can. We sat down probably just over 12 months ago and we thought it would be in place by June or July this year.

[2.23.00 recording]

RP - You know we are sort of 12 months behind that really because what we did discuss was when it was implemented and then we talked about a 6 month clearance period because of coffins that were already in stock and so on and so forth. So depending on what your timescales are with this we are still a fair way away from actually full implementation aren't we.

AM - After today I think without going back over the timeframes I think we've all be trying to push this forward as quickly as possible. We are where we are today in terms of agreeing to the final test specification. Lets then make an accurate assumption from this point forward that we've moved a long way in terms of agreeing this test protocol to hopefully be fully agreed by all parties we can start the testing. We can very quickly collate the data in terms of some of the test data sitting a long side some of the coffin testing that's occurring. There should be no reason and I'm just going to pluck a figure out of the air here, why by the end of February 2 months fully inclusive of the end of this month to actually fully up and running with the scheme that we are meeting and looking at the test data that we have got and we are fully marketing and publicising this to all our members and the industry as a whole to get this up and running and ready for all manufacturers to see.

RB - I think the only problem we have with that is that the sooner we do, because there is quite a lot of parallel work to do with ..... in particular. And in terms of guidance and everything else, we've talked to them about....., I see no reason that once we agree this that we shouldn't be actually drafting you

know their procedures and process and getting them familiar with it. I see absolutely no reason why we shouldn't start that at all. I think it needs to happen in parallel because otherwise it will be ..... on the line.

AM - But surely shouldn't that have been occurring already.

RB - Well it has been occurring. We couldn't talk to them about the actual specifics.

JA - They are well aware of the programme. .... and I have been and had several conversations with Alan Slater before he retired and had several conversations with Alan Tucker in particular wants me to pick it up and I can do that. I think we need to get that on to the pitch as soon as we can.

HB - Can I minute then that we hand over all data both on sampling and testing so far by the 26<sup>th</sup> February.

RB - Do you think that is achievable?

RB - Well it's only achievable if you send your coffins in. That would be helpful.  
WH - Yeah, yeah.

DClark - To be fair for myself today was the crux of the whole process. If we come out of today with a positive which it looks like we have then coffins will be sent in for testing and I think that Steve's in the same mind, we're all the same. So the ball can get rolling from ..... side of it. Once you've received the protocol you can put that on the website and say right, over the next 3 month period to the end of February all coffin manufacture will be subject in their profits to testing. And you've told them then that you are in process. There's not finite detail, because it could take 3 months it could take 6 months it could take a month, you just don't know at what speed you are going to get through them. Well actually we do, well we have to don't we as that's what we do. We do know how long it will take to pass per coffin.

[2.27.18 recording]

AM - So we'll ..... the FFMA the system is up and running we will request for as many members as possible ..... who want to be part of the scheme.

JA - All this work has been done in the background hoping that we would come to an agreement and now we can push a button we have to rely on Intertek to do their job and that is great reassurance to know that you've got all this ready to go.

HB - It's not all fluffy and roses and unicorns, basically they are told how long they've got to do each coffin, we have worked it out literally to the minute. We know how long each test, it's how we do. It's how we process. We know how long each coffin takes worst case scenario to the minute. Therefore we say how many you can get through in a week, therefore we would expect this output and that's

that. And if there are any issues we will obviously, that is why we know we have identified, I think we are bringing 2 people in.

WH- There are currently over a hundred coffins uploaded.

DC - Rick wants to ask something.

RP -No I'm fine, if you finish that conversation first. I'm just saying as and when you get to finishing that.

DClark- David all I would say from our perspective as the working party committee, it's the emphasis is on us now, basically to spread the word. Everybody in this room could subject their coffins to testing straight away.

HB - Well bearing mind we can only report on the 26<sup>th</sup> on the data we have got so far, there might be banana ones missing or I don't know or whatever ones missing or something like that. If they've not been submitted then that's that, maybe you could look at the data and if there is there is something missing. But you've also got to all be in agreement that you will whether you make decisions on the data in front of you, which could only be a snapshot of the whole - that is what you have got to bear in mind.

Henri are you suggesting then or saying you would like to have at least one of each type of coffin?

I don't know whether that is achievable is it. I don't suggest for a second that next week you dump a hundred coffins on us because .....

WH - There is over a hundred uploaded already.

JA - I think ours are there already.

There are a hundred uploaded which will give you .....

HB -I know I know we discussed as a sort of practically. You know we don't have a warehouse for this we have assigned a whole lab you know – with all due respect.

WH - If we give you the list of the next test ones, you could fit.

HB - We can try and do it and also don't forget we might be picking up some of the odd ones in sampling because what we'll do is come up with a list in sampling and say these are the variances, send us a bit of each and so we should be able to capture all of it is whether you need to be aware though that you are making pass fail on the data in front of you which could just be a snapshot.

AM - Can I just make a suggestion for those manufacturers in the working party that we all chip in and provide the coffins for the test data that.

HB - But not a hundred, thank you.

AM - The ones that are required in terms of the ones that we've agreed to sample.

Your coffins are there already are they?

JA - Ours are there, so it's a fair chunk you have.

JA - No we have 10.

HB - 10 right.

10 total, that's it. And some look spookily alike.

DClark - Again in a logical sense we have to be logical and supporting everyone in this. If by the end of next week she gets 40 manufacturers send 5 coffins each you're not going to be able to move are you. So it needs

HB - Well I will, I don't work there.

DC - Your testing will commence on 23<sup>rd</sup> January, then it is up to me to have my coffins there on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

HB - Listen, if we were given the green light today what we are going to do, so that you guys are aware, was we were going to send out a scheduling letter of submission and this is what we do first. Whether it is socks or bananas or coffins and it is a case of right we have got 100 suppliers we will contact every one of them saying submit your coffins week commencing such and such and that is how we schedule our work flow, rather than just come and hit us with it.

[2.31.39 recording]

JA - So that means communicate the numbers doesn't it.

AM - Just to be clear we have members who have uploaded coffins who have submitted interest to submit their testing, they haven't submitted coffins as yet and what we are looking for is to get the commitment from our members to upload their coffins upload their submission of their coffins. Once they've uploaded the submission of their coffins, because this is where we might have to do tweaks on the website, because as soon as you have uploaded your submission and it tells you where to send the coffins to, it tells you how to break down the samples etc. So what we need to be very clear from them is that we need to be working with Intertek with regard to when exactly that submission is done. So maybe we need to look at the link when they go to click on that submit that there is an interface that then sends a communication.

HB - We see it though don't we.

WH - You see it and then and Henri said they verbally manage it don't they.

HB - Yeah as soon as they click submit we then view it, we can't see those 100 coffins right now because they've not clicked submit. So we view everyone where



they click submit and we'll be checking that every day. So as soon as some clicks submit they'll be sent a schedule.

DC - Henri, just so this is clear, they all go to Leigh?

No they are not going to Lee they are going to Leicester.

That's not been clarified, I knew that, but that's not been clarified. So I'm just clarifying that.

HB - Well to be honest it almost went back to Leigh last week, but that is our issue so.

WH - I'll check that on the website for you.

HB - Trust, it is actually Leicester, to be perfectly honest. If Lee is easier for you guys as far as delivery because they are not little you can't just send them through Royal Mail, drop them and Leigh and we will get them to Leicester, okay we can move them, we can move them around, we don't particularly want to be moving them from Scotland if we can avoid it but if it is sort of like if it is going to be a real pain getting them in to Leicester, get them to Leigh and we'll get them down to Leicester. Okay but Leicester is the main site and we've decided the flammability for example from the cremation tests, that's going to be done at Leigh. But so people aren't confused as to where to send what get them in to Leicester or get them in to Leigh to get them in to Leicester and we organise where the residual - we'd do that you don't have to worry about it. We've actually got vans that go up and down and do everything so we can accommodate a certain degree, we just don't obviously want to be moving a 100 from Leigh to Leicester or. It's pretty easy, it should be fine, but like I say if there is a real issue and there is going to be a problem tell us that you are going to give them to me don't just deliver them because it will frighten them and we'll get them down to Leicester. I think one did turn up and Leigh and they didn't know what it was it just came with no paperwork or anything just a coffin being delivered in reception and nobody knew what it was there for until one of the Leicester staff said.

DC - So everyone happy with that?

Yes.

Yes.

Okay thank you.

[2.34.46 recording]

DClark - Does that satisfy you Richard?

RP - I'm okay with that bit, but I think we have another one or two things from my friend Mr B....This we touched on just now I think there.....from the point if you like you decide that you've done it you are all systems go look at a 6 month introduction period. And I mean obviously that is key. I think one thing that does worry me and I've got to be absolutely honest is where we are with dignity on this, because dignity are a major major player in the UK from a funeral director point of view and from a coffin manufacturers point of view. If we haven't got

them on board with us that is going to create huge .....and some problems, our position was. Once you give us the go if you like to say you are ready to go and we say we haven't got any for 6 months period of whatever you want to call it. Our members are then going to be faced with funeral directors supplying coffins that are certificated that have a number, and we were going to advise that the prelim form which was the form that the funeral directors submit to the crematorium with the details, the .....they want around what music they want, the coffin, the size of the coffin all the rest of it. And on that we suggest that there is that we ask for the certificate number. Now if all of the coffins that Dignity are supplying whether that is through their own funeral directors or whatever it might be are falling outside of that category I don't know how that will be manageable, because it won't just be the Dignity crematorium that are affected by this it will be all the others as well. I mean if you look at my old patch in Birmingham there are a number of funeral directors around Birmingham that are under the Dignity banner. Birmingham City Council are advised to only accept coffins that have the FFMA stamp on them then they from day one they are going to be compromised. And it is just a case of asking you guys of where you think you are or how you think you are going to do.

RB - I think I would like to make a comment if I may, after you. Have you finished, sorry.

RP - I just think it is one of those things that I don't think I've stressed it strongly enough the effect that that will have on Dignity.

I'm not raising history ..... from the point ..... so we don't have to re-live it. But originally I had a conversation with Andrew Davis who heads up people service for Dignity, and yes he was as you know when we very first started this, bob and I went to the dignity factory and it was fine until, I mean let's say it as it is, Dignity are not members of the FFMA the impression is that there is no love lost at the moment, but I did get Andrew Davis to say look when we've got this in place please let us come and explain to you. I've not been back to him, because there is nothing worse than going back to him without something very concrete to say, with a very positive presentation. Julian may be closer to this than me and he may be the better bloke to do it but I think what we need to work towards is getting a meeting, there may be a problem with this but I'll explain. You certainly need a meeting with Andrew Davis and if you can get them to have Steve Gant there ..... crematoria there at the same time that would be good, the only caution I'm issuing is that if you talk to them on some of these things and they say, their words not mine, they run 3 separate businesses funeral planning, funerals and crematorium, that is what they'll say to you. So there probably needs to be some pre-empt of how to do this and as soon as we have got this, as soon as after Christmas break, my own view is we should try to make an approach. It is just a question of the best way to do it.

JA - I can't disagree with anything you have just said. They are a big player and we would like to have them on board.

AM - People are going to have relationships with Dignity for example we supply them with all their hand woven coffins, so we have an actual contract with them.

So essentially we are talking about their ..... solid coffins, their willow and bamboo is supplied by us as part of the scheme. Not too sure where they get their cardboard offerings from but we have a relationship with the likes of ..... and the other people with. I very much take on board what you are saying, they need to be on board as do all manufacturers of coffins in the industry. To have big players on board obviously is key to underpinning this.

RP - That's where I was coming from really Adam, if any of you have got relationships with Dignity we could start to use those and start pushing this in the right direction.

Absolutely.

RB- If you are best to do that, then I don't have a problem at all.

We are tasked to do that with Andrew in the first instance to get them on board and we'll take it from there. AT the end of the day we can only promote the scheme, it is down to any manufacturer to want to submit their coffins. But we need to be clear of, we all know from what has happened up until now, that there is an alternative testing regime that has all of a sudden appeared and we need to make sure that once we have agreement in terms of the testing protocol from associations again that is rubber stamping it and underpinning it in terms of reputation of this testing regime, that we are fully armed to go to the likes of any manufacturer to say that this has been thoroughly thought through this has been thoroughly tested this has been thoroughly tried and we can put in the relevant guidance to all relevant parties whether that be crematorium or funeral directors and manufacturers. So I think it all works in synergy in terms of where we are at from this point onwards in moving forward.

AM - The testing protocol is agreed and we can start testing, we get evidence, I'll use the words that will underpin.

RP - If you knew Andrew's sort of explanations.....the complications that that is going to drive and the position that is going to put cremation authorities in and crematorium managers you know in accepting I'm being told by the ICCM and the FPCA and the APCC that I can only be accepting coffins if they have got a rubber stamp on them, and you've got a mass .....of coffins coming in that have got nothing to do with either scheme.

[2.42.00 recording]

RB- I think if you could advise before you have a meeting when it is going to be and so on. We will try and do it subtly if you let Steve Gant know that it is happening and then hopefully, let him do that, and we are not accused of. Yeah? Steve?

I think it is very important. My impression and I can't speak for him. My impression is that the crematorium side are in favour.

SS - Well they started it all off didn't they.

Well yeah.

It was Terry Davison that came here in the first place.

We've got to get over this barrier of 3 separate business and what funerals say funerals goes, so you have got to get around that.

RB - It was Terry that arranged the access to the crematorium, for you to go and look round.

SS - Can I make a point of the Funeral Association, they are going to be massive allies to us. As well as the leverage that we need to get this scheme going. The Dignity crem guys are more funeral, I'm not quite sure but it is.....are obviously on board, which we know they are then surely.

RB -It's like we have got to re-educate on NFD because we've got a new Chief Exec.

SS- Yes we've had the nod haven't we because they've been here.

RB - They have been there, but as Rick will say. There are certain funeral directors that are not helping this process because they are trying to bring it round to different terms say well, it is important that we actually go, and the society goes and actually see the NAFE, I'm not so worried about SAFE.

RP - Wasn't there a problem with SAFE? Are they not something to do with....  
No no, the problem is they put this on their portal and they are not quite sure how to take it off that is the basic problem. I think support is too strong a word Bob, I think it sort of got there and now they don't quite know what to do  
It's like a news column that's all.  
That's the sensitivity, I will take it upon myself to speak to Alan Tucker again about it. I'll take that.

HB - Sorry I'm confused, what other testing organisation and, what other testing programme?  
One member left.

HB- I'd actually like to know.

AM- There was a member of this working party that fell out with us over the particular instance of using you as a testing house. He has gone away and set up his own associations rival with FFMA and set up his own testing programme that was essentially stolen from this. He stole this test protocol.

HB - Sorry he is using the original test protocol from the last meeting he sat up on Kings which is still under our copyright so he has taken it and he has set up a testing programme.

SS - And it is on his website.

HB - And it is in the public domain.  
Run that past your legal team.

That was after the Milton Keynes meeting the last meeting he attended and that was still under our copyright. No he wouldn't have a sandwich as he thought we were trying to influence him.

TM - If at that point that was still under your copyright.

HB - It was our intellectual property, it was all on our copyright and everything.

WH - He has only got one member up there.

HB - I don't care how many members he has got, he has put it in the public domain. Where do I find this.  
I'll send you a link.

DC - Can we hear from David.

I hate to talk history, past 2 years ago, but at the first meetings I did make the point that if the 2 big players in the market Funeral Care and Dignity weren't on board it was going to cause big problems. And it worries me a little bit. I can't speak for Funeral Care they might have a better insight, they said when John Wray was there all in favour. And if that thought process has now changed due to management change, I don't know, but hopefully they are with us.

RB - They've certainly not changed on the crematorium list.

JA - It's not changed.

DClark - Sometimes what the crematorium think and what the coffin manufacturers think, and I said from day 1 that nobody is going to turn revenue down, they are not going to stop cremating coffins, especially traditional style. My concern would be, we supply Dignity ..... stamp, Bob you supply Dignity and you're stamped, why do they need to go and then spend thousands of pounds on getting traditional coffins chipboard, mdf and timber, you know what I mean, why would they need to do it, because you're the verifier. Julian is in to funeral care the exactly the same.

TM - If they are buying Julian's coffins and Julian's had them tested, they wouldn't have them tested again.

WH - Coffins are in their own factory.

JA - I think we can't put words in Andrew's mouth or the board of funeral care. What we can say is when I spoke to Andrew he said look, let me know when things are certain. I'm sure we can have a meeting at the factory with John Burn and if we go through it all and then if.

RB - That's why I haven't approached him.  
Not going with a maybe or an if.

JA - You know how these things work it's a coffee and a biscuit in the foyer of a hotel at one of the conferences. Funeral Care said exactly the same as long as it doesn't affect our interests and so on. That caveat is going to remain, they are not going to lose by it, anything that is going to improve standards in the market it is going to help them, I can't see what the push back is going to be.

AM - We can't get the ..... approval until we've got something sorted today.

JA - No we can't. IN fairness you can't if someone turns up with a coffin that isn't, Joe Public goes to B&Q makes a plywood coffin, turns up at your door, are you going to not cremate. There are hurdles that we are going to encounter over the next 6/12 months and there has got to be test, and it is going to test what the resilience of all this is.

I think once they see the final test protocol and they understand.

AM - I think picking up on Rick's point, playing devil's advocate, I mean let's play devil's advocate that we push forward the test programme it proves to be a successful test programme we are confident that it works and you are confident it terms of the guidance that you issue to your members. And let's play devil's advocate I know Andrew Davis, he can be very stuck in his ways and he has a very very strong opinion and let's just say that his opinion is I don't see the point of this as it doesn't give me any benefit or my organisation any benefit and because of how many coffins we are putting through the crematoria they are not going to turn them down. Again, just playing devil's advocate. He may very much sit along that side of the fence. We have to then analyse in terms of particularly the guise as issued the crematoria, how do they deal with that situation when the preferred case scenario is that they are working to a coffin that is certified by this testing programme. That is a potential a real possibility. It doesn't detract from the fact that what we are doing for this is right for the industry as a whole.

RP - It is just the credibility of the whole thing.

[2.50.56 recording]

RB - And the practicality.

RP - And the difficulties is that, because I mean we make no secret of it I mean we are certainly as far as the federation is concerned and I think the same goes for the ICCM we will say are recommendation is that you accept coffins or don't accept coffins that are accredited. That will be our goal.

DC - Rick, Rick, quick question, do you think that they wouldn't want to be part of this?

RP - Who Dignity?

DC - Yes.

RP - I don't know because I don't know Andrew Davis. I mean I know Steve Young very well and I know Steve is extremely supportive and has been all the way through and that is, we have had everything we have asked of Dignity. But you know I don't know Andrew Davis or that side of the business. I just wonder

whether you've got. I mean I've got no influence of Andrew Davis, you guys have probably got more influence than anybody. And if you can actually bring that to there and start talking to him and start talking to him about the sensibility and the logic of what you are trying to achieve and what it will mean to them if they do or they don't.

AM - Let's just say it is in our interests to do that.

RP - Yes but it isn't necessarily going to cause Andrew a problem. What it is going to do is create problems for the funeral director side of the business. Because they're the ones who are going to be faced with a crematorium. Some may weaken at the knees and say oh blimey go on, okay then because of the weight that Dignity will put on or the pressure. Others will stipulate and say over my dead body basically, this is the guidance I have been given by my associations and I'm sticking to it. You know funeral directors aren't going to know if they are coming or going unless we can get some kind of unity.

DClark - I think from my perspective, I mean I don't know the guy, I think we have to trust the guys in this room Adam and Julian, I mean we know these guys relatively well to have those conversations, to try to bring them on board to where we need to be.

DC - Is that a suggestion David.

DClark - I think that is reality. Subtle conversations will help the cause. I will do my best and you know the benefits outweigh what we are bringing to the market, I don't want to speak to Andrew Davis, but I can have a conversation with him, as Alan can. And it is up to Andrew, if Andrew won't, if he doesn't see the benefit then we won't and we'll have to deal with that. That is on Andrew's shoulders. How we deal with that.

JA - I've got one thought. They do have their coffins formally tested, so they then have an accepted test procedure. The other thing would be to get that submitted and see if that met our criteria. And where it didn't require testing, I'm not saying do it I'm saying it is an option. It is an option because it exists, if we can't do it then fine.

[2.54.39 recording]

SS - Emery objected to that before quite rightly as it is a different testing house. Let's keep this in perspective Dignity they buy a lot of alternative products in, they don't make that much, the actual costs ..... spent more on testing than Dignity would, I don't think, the amount of money they are talking I can't think they would.

RB - I don't think it is money I think it is previous historic relationships that are the problem rather than money.

Rp - I tell you what amongst friends Dignity are the most press sensitive organisation.

RB- Yes they are absolutely.

RP- Press as far as Dignity are concerned make sure that that doesn't expose them.

So there is a of a ..... thing here.

AM - Not a ..... at all, we do what we can to promote this test protocol, sitting here with my commercial hat on as a supplier for Dignity that is all I can do. Is stand behind my own beliefs on this test programme and convince essentially what is someone that employs me to.

RB - The reason I said ..... Is I think that Steve Gant will help the process if we approach it right. That is the reason that I used that term.

RB - Where I was coming from was to say how disappointed I am or we are because we are disappointed that you are or we are because we have been unable to actually get them to come on board with us.  
We don't have to accuse them of anything that we don't want to.

AM - Let's leave that as an option.

RB - I'm not suggesting doing that now. Something to have in your back pocket. Softly, softly first.

DC - Anything else to say on that subject.

HB - Please don't! They'll be another bloody test .....come out. I used to feel special and I don't feel remotely special anymore.

RB - Mr Wayman's testing programme is not complete.  
That's his surname is it. Thank you for that, I had his first.  
He's the little man.

DClark - The little man in big shoes.

RB - Once you've got this out you can make it clear that his testing programme is not complete.  
We are not going to even discuss it, we are not entering into conversation about it at all. The fact is that was he has been very naughty.

AM - Can I just be clear the reason why I brought that up, we knew that it was in existence then I know the answer, but I'm sort of it's a Hypothetical question, but ultimately not want to be seen back a different programme. I just wanted to bring that up because I know that your involvement, and you've had no involvement with that.

RP - I mean we know that nothing at all about it at all, we can only assume that it is the same protocol as you have put together.



HB - No it is actually our protocol. The actual words are if you are backing that one you are backing ours anyway. So it is actually at fine.

AM -Have a look.

HB -Yes I'm going to look. If there is too much similarity he will be sent a cease and dismiss to remove it and if he doesn't then it goes further.

DC - I would suggest Henri that it is more or less the same.

Word for word.

Yes Steve.

JA- I think it is called copy and paste isn't it.

RB - I don't think there was any effort on modifications.

HB - The interesting thing is that rightly or wrong whatever anyone has paid to get these coffins tested and passed.

Who is doing the testing? He is not surely? Oh that is where that lady got her testing? That is what it is based off.

DC - That's the lady that has been ringing round manufacturers come and join us.

WH - Not Louise, she has got them tested but is coming back on board. From the AGM she decided it was wise.

DC -As we discussed this morning it's incomplete, we are sitting here ..... I would suggest if anyone has a coffin tested through this, then if they have got a pass then it is a fail.

JA - That's done. That will be done ratified emailed out to you. That gives us basis to go and talk sensibly to Steve and Andrew at Dignity and found out how they feel and feed that back. We move on, whether brick wall is still ahead of us and we know that down. And hopefully in 6 months' time we have this exactly in the place that we want it.

RB - Can I just go back to the timescale, because it has gone wrong. Is it realistic to say, you were saying ..... And there is bound to be some finishing off, so what we would want to do I'm suggesting that there will be a number of things brought up at the same time. To say that the actual launch of the active trial period will be 1<sup>st</sup> April and the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter. You then have 3 months to bed it in.

Trail period in terms of.

RB- In terms of you giving, people accepting it. Before you put it in stone. So you've got a bit of, if someone gets in a muddle you've got a little bit of concession.

JA - I don't think it is sensible to commit to a date because if we fail on the date we make ourselves look silly. But I don't see a problem in saying that we should have this done and dusted in late spring. You say 1<sup>st</sup> of April.

RB - The problem is that we are being criticized.

WH - By February we'll start seeing passed criteria coming through and that will naturally build.  
The more specific we can be.

AM - I think it is quite simple that testing start next week. We are pushing on with getting the testing done. The period of time is to give us a bit of time to check the data to validate the data and to look at the pass test criteria. I'd be quite happy to use the word hope, but the more specific we can be in terms of date the more good it will do us.  
Just going back to your question in terms of a trial period, I think it is more for you guys to be advising the associations as to what you believe would be the acceptable trail periods before you then start saying it i.e. it will be 6 months from 1<sup>st</sup> February.

RB - And we need to take the funeral associates with us?

RP - Doesn't that tie in with what we were talking about that sort of 6 week clearance period to get rid of existing stuff.....  
That hasn't changed has it.  
If we use that as a bedding in period because during that period you ..... Submitted that have got a certificate number..... at the end of that period we can draw a line and say that is the end of it.  
*2 conversations happening unable to transcribe.*  
If you could time it with that.

[3.03.43 recording]

JA - I think we agreed 12 months of introduction phase of existing stock. Because you've got as seasonality because in the summer it is a hell of a lot quieter than in the winter and I remember discussing a scenario of a 6ft 6 x 36 in the back of the garage and all that.

RP - But if you remember Julian what we said was that if that coffin is proved to be exactly the same as the coffin that we're still producing then  
Then that's fine.  
Then that is tested and that is approved.

WH - Remember the red stamp.

RP - There is no reason why it shouldn't be stamped, absolutely no reason at all.

WH - There is a red stamp built in to this.

RP - If it is the existing stock is exactly the same and processed in the same way.

AM - Practicality though is that we can't get round the country and find all the coffins in the back of garages and stamp everyone.

JA - We can discuss it again but it's not on the agenda to be honest. For the point of clarity what was written up was that all old stock must be used up and for our direction to funeral directors look use your stock up you don't want to be hanging anything over and that the period of time that that would be was 12 months. I don't disagree with what you are saying but in an ideal world if someone has got a large coffin out the back of the garage it has got to be used back.

RB - But if he goes back and gets a confirmation from the manufacturer that it is to the same spec. Then surely it can be submitted under the same certificate provided you've got proof from the manufacturer that it is the same thing.

JA - I don't want to agree to picking up coffins from all over the country to see. The point is.

AM - If a coffin turns up at a crematorium in 12 months' time and it is a coffin that has subsequently be tested and passed then the crematorium will now the manufacturer of the coffin, go on to the FFMA website and see that that coffin is the same coffin that has subsequently been tested and approved. The only difference is that it won't have a stamp on it.

SS - I don't quite agree Adam, when it gets to the crem no one knows who has made it, they all look the same, obviously mine are better, but they do look the same. So I think whatever we do decide it has got to be stamp driven. Whether it's a period of time, originally I think what we were originally looking at was a 12 month roll out period.

JA - They were stamped with red ink.

SS - We'll use a different colour, and I agree we don't want to be going round the country stamping things, but after a 12 month period maybe it is a service that we offer and charge for.

JA - That's a good point and where you've got clarity that in 12 months' time. Well 12 months' once this commences. In the first 12 months you might receive coffins with red and blue stamps, are you okay with that. After that period only blue stamps. That just gives that transition so what's out there can be stamped. If that is not the case then there is no chance of getting Dignity on board, no chance at all. They go to stock they don't build to order.

RB - If it is a problem the other way to do that would be to get the manufacturer to give the funeral director a waiver and confirm that it was the same spec. Which could be done on a simple standard slip.

SS- No, you've still got coffins arriving at cremas .....

AM - In all the coffin workshops they could have a number of different coffins suppliers coming in and the point that Steve is making is valid that general a new coffin will look similar. The people working in the coffin shop putting bodies in ready to go to a funeral will not necessarily always know, a majority of them will, whether that is a coffin from Steve or a coffin from Julian.

SS - We can't deviate from the stamp.

[3.08.08 recording]

Otherwise you'll have a funeral director..... buy a coffin from Julian with stamps on and cheap coffins from anywhere else and a bit of paper saying that it is a Julian coffin. The stamp on the product, I don't think we can move on that.

RB - But it's the funeral director that has got to decide he is the one.

SS - It's the roll out period, we've got to give him a reasonable role out period.....

*Unable to transcribe for few seconds as two conversations*

JA - Can we leave it at that, because we have got bits to get through. 12 months and we are

WH - looking at red stamps.

HB - Sorry 12 months what?

HB - Clearance.

HB - 12 months clearance.

WH - This is clearing old stock down Henri.

JA - In that period of time visibility of those two colours, after that period time there should only be visibility of a.... you and me whatever would go out and stand their coffins there and say you must use those up in 12 months.

WH - That is included in the system of control.

DClark - Are you alright with that?

RB - Yes.

JA - Can we move on?

Yes.

JA - Well site visits by Intertek, so Henri this is something that has come up when all this is up and running what is your position?

HB - All-come all welcome. No seriously its, if you want to see your coffins tested - what else would you want to see us for? If you want to do that more than

welcome or if anyone has got concerns or concerns over the results or anything like that, anytime you are welcome just obviously call us first, don't just show up.

RB - How long does it take to take one coffin?

HB - 3 days.

3 days?

Sorry we are giving them 3 days. They're saying that they want 5, we are saying no 3, well we started at 2 and then we said 3. In a week Monday to Friday we would look to finish a coffin reported out the door, the testing would actually be finished in the 3. The longest test is 24 hour we can't do it, we can't watch it, well you couldn't watch it. The thing is you can't just walk away from it because if it starts bowing and this and that and everything else. We looked at setting them up overnight and then obviously if they are on the floor, by the morning and they failed. We need to be able to tell you when it failed oh it failed within 10 minutes or this or that. We only do it when people are there. Yes we are looking at about 3-4 days.

RB - The only reason I think the associations need to visit sites is to assure that there is a set up right because it will effect the legal opinion b. our insurers.

HB - No that is fine because it is all covered by our processes as well.

RB - We need verification of that and then we have effectively covered our base.

HB - No no that is actually okay, but the only thing I would say is the fact that if someone shows up, we cannot test someone else's coffin while they are there. We won't because it is confidentiality and you can only watch your own coffins being tested. We do that on whether it is toilet paper, coffins or anything else, you can't watch somebody else's test being done. And also if it is one of the associates and they don't own any of the coffins being tested then we just need who ever's permission that it is okay for them to do that testing, because it is confidential. We don't, it's not open to all.

We wouldn't even want to know who's coffin it was we just want to view the process.

People may say that actually they don't want you watching. Say for example we loaded up a coffin and it failed, we're like oh it failed. See what I mean it is entirely up to them whether they allow you.

RB - All you can do is inform them, but that is not the bit we are interested in.

JA - Well you're interested in having access so if you want to see.

RB - We need access to make sure we can turn around and say we were satisfied that it had been set up right and carried out right.

AM - We don't have an issue with that.

We'd like to confirm that you have access to visit.

WH - We need permission from the manufacturer don't we. They'll need permission from the manufacturer.

*Unable to transcribe more than one conversation.*

[3.13.25 recording]

JA - Can we move on from 5 and to number 6. There is a point where I thank you for your input.

.....one or two other things which we were told we could do.

Yes.

Sorry what was number 4 coffin certification start date.

Test date.

Sorry test date.

ASAP.

February.

No we didn't say February.

WH - Sorry start - 2 days time.

HB- Sorry we've started. We're doing the paperwork, we haven't physically started the coffins. Relax. So we have started the paperwork process just so you know. Okay, move on.

In fairness if it doesn't relate to this agenda Richard, I'd prefer to pick up your comments in any other business.

RB - Well the only trouble is we are going to have to wait and go out while you deal with something.

JA -Can't you just go and have a coffee somewhere.

RB - Well why can't we just do any other business.

JA - Well it is our agenda and that's what we've agreed.

RB - Well I don't know about the others but I've got to go down the south coast tonight.

JA - We've all come along way.

DClark - Can we stop faffing about it and just get on with it.

RB - Well why can't we cover these point, cover any other business, then you have your discussion, if my colleagues are in agreement if not then I will defer to them.

JA - What other points do you want covered, if the discussions are going to be lengthy or have a bearing on what we are going to discuss then I do have a problem.

RB - You do have a problem?

JA - Yes.

WH - What are the points?

AM - Why do they have to leave the room for this next point?

Yes why. I'm not being funny but surely.

JA - It's an FFMA matter. It's an FFMA matter.

SS- Open and transparency. That is my question.  
There can't be anything here that is going to...

JA - I disagree, talk about point 6 as an FFMA matter, not a cremation sector matter.  
It's to do with ....

AM - I was thinking in terms of point 6 I think we need to be clear as to what happened the background and stuff so I think it would be good for us to hear that first.

JA - David had set the meeting and it is your agenda

SS - giving us a bit of feedback first before we.

DClark - Can I ask a question, on point 6. Is that in relation to you guys. Are you wanting feedback on that or is it just something for us to discuss.

[3.16.17 recording]

RP - We do need some feedback. I was instructed by my deputy committee on Thursday last week, which I did, asking for a full retraction of the submission that was made to the Scottish parliament. And also a further submission to the Scottish parliament actually stating that the FFMA did not support the submission that had been made. That was an instruction from my deputy committee on Thursday last week. The letter was actually sent to David, and I there was a supporting email and a supporting letter from both Tim's organisation and from Richards. That is where we are with this point.

AM - We need to discuss that privately to see what the response is to that.

RP - I don't want to make too much of a get to dramatic about this, but this particular point is a deal breaker I can assure you.

WH - It's a deal breaker?

RP - Well, potentially.

AM - We need to look at it and discuss it.

RP - If my colleagues believe we should wait then I will defer to them .....

TM - Firstly I think if you are having your own private meeting that if we've got a couple of items to raise we should be allowed to raise them and then we can go and leave you completely on your own. Rather than just stand outside, I'm not prepared to stand outside and wait until you finished.

AM - I just wondered if we wanted to clear up all aspects, I didn't think we wanted to meet then you go then us not report back to you face to face. Personally I think, I'm easy either way to be honest.

RB - While you were talking I have been going through, the agenda that we did submit to you, I think there is only, I think most of it can come when we have got, we have covered the trial test results, we've covered the final test plan, pass fail criteria we've covered, test protocol we have covered. Intersek, being able to talk to Intersek comes back to one subject that I want to raise which is intercommunication, .....test site visit we've done. And then hopefully the work programme that comes out of this meeting will be a work programme for you and a work programme for us and we'll exchange them. We will come up with a programme in terms of what we are going to do in terms of garden space, what we are going to do the approach the funeral directors and all the rest of it. We will come up with that actual programme. So the only thing that remains which we had on was future communication procedures. So that is the only one that I think needs any further discussion. Is that okay gentlemen? What we think is very important, we have got to this stage and communication is key to this absolutely key. We have for some time being making sure that whatever you get, is the final agreed version of all three of us. Absolutely. We just think that in all communications and whether we are talking about ..... Whatever we do we keep you informed we send emails whatever, we need to talk to Intertek, we do. But we feedback all the time, and the most important thing is that everything we would send to David as president, copy to ..... and all members of the steering party. So the whole steering committee there is no chance that anything gets missed, whatever whatever. And if it is something that you get from us we will make it clear - a bit like Tim sending out our agenda. They are bypassing what you said yesterday - that can't happen. It has to be a system of control through you.

WH - It is kind a complete reversal on what we agreed to yesterday in the email. And we were adhering your request from the letters that communication goes through the president and then to the organisation. Not from other organisations to the members or the working group, because there was an issue with some of my direct communications so David has said and we were discussing it in the meeting the other week that all communications through us goes through our president once he's agreed to the organisations and that should happen in return.

DClark - Can I just say this that they Wasn't that what I just said.

WH - No that wasn't.



RB - I said that I was going to copy the working group. We are working on the programme together.

WH - No through the president.

RB - I'm not suggesting that we write to your members.

DClark - Can I just say Richard, I replied to Tim's email yesterday, 12.06, thanked him for the agenda etc etc and his thoughts. But just to finish I put 'Tim can I kindly ask that your organisation submit all communications to myself and our secretary Sue. We can now forward your thoughts to our members. This request was agreed by our members after your last joint letter requesting how we handle our communications'.

TM - So you've agreed. You've all agreed that?

SS - That's a point that I'd like to know, I've not agreed to that. But this has now moved on massively in the last 2 hours. And for the sake of copying in everyone in I haven't personally got a problem with it. The rules should be that if you have been copied in then you don't respond because it is just a courtesy copy. But I don't have a problem with that at all.

AM - Can I just highlight one thing if I may the danger with copying in particularly via email. Let's just say that you send a letter to David as president of the FFMA at the time you are sending the letter you are copying all the working party in. We need to just make sure, we need to be clear about what we are talking about. If anyone in the working part or likewise and it is reciprocated on the other side, that any response has to be formulated back via the president or via the. ....

RP - We are not sending anything that we haven't agreed ourselves.

Am - So that's what you're saying, for copying purposes by Steve if you like that working parties get to see.

JA - I don't think it is normal protocol.

WH - It's not normal protocol

JA - It ends up a confusion act. With the agenda yesterday David asked Will to prepare it and the next thing we had an agenda prepared by yourself Richard, which you forwarded to Tim which Tim forwarded to us. Which you know, via email with everyone copied in.

DClark - Let's make sure that we don't make any more slip ups or anything whatever word you want to use. Well I've got to be honest. Let's just try and keep it on a level.

AM - Well I think we should stick to what is agreed and that is communications come from David and jointly from you guys. Ultimately we are making sure that we give the right considered response.

DC - Tim?

TM - Can I make a comment. Not only will our proposal save time which it will it will also demonstrate a high level of trust, which we would have hoped that we had built up today.

I think we have done.

DClark - I personally haven't got an issue with trust.

WH - I don't think it is normal protocol.

DClark - We had our meeting last week amongst the steering committee, what was said was said and kept behind closed doors. Me personally I'm comfortable following the guidelines we set up, it goes through our president to yourselves and back. Mainly because I don't want 5000 emails, but that is my personal choice. And I think that transparency is there. We can demand that information at any time from our president, that we know this meeting is taking place and we wish to see it as and when. And I'm sure that David would email it to us promptly or within minutes of receiving it. To you guys there is only one port of call and the response back should be one port of call.

RP - Is that something new for you guys? Because is that the process you followed when you

WH - It is followed after receiving your letter last week.

RP - If that was the protocol that was followed when you actually made your submission.

WH - It was literally a new policy since the letter was raised.

DClark - It is to save that happening again.

AM - We will comment on that.

DC - Because this is a working group, everyone has a chance or opinion to agree on something. It's to make sure that all the working group are copied in or have an opinion before or has something to say about before something goes out.

TM - So that fell down at some point.

WH - This is new policy introduced since the letter.

JA - I don't think this is discussing item 6.

TM - I'm not discussing item 6 I'm discussing communication.

It is just a way that this committee wants it.

TM - As I previously said Tim we had a meeting amongst ourselves because for want of a better phrase things didn't go quite how all of us wanted it to go. We needed to not wash our dirty washing in public. We wanted to become a united front again and find out what went wrong and where it went wrong. We know what went wrong and where it went wrong so we put in a process that said better if it leads through David all the time and the communication is one line and one way only. And you don't get any issues with miscommunication people being missed off. It goes directly. AS regards transparency I don't have an issue with transparency at this time I think it is quite good. Not saying that mistakes weren't made but that was for us to sort out and deal with I think we have dealt with it.

RB - Well it is up to these gentlemen if they accept it, I know my view. It is up to them.

DClark - For my clarification, when you say through the chairman, are we, would David be dealing with Rick and Tim.

RB - We said that everything we put out will be the 3 associations talking in one voice.

In this moment Richard where do you sit.  
Where I sit with.

DClark - Where are you representing?

RB - Well I've come here wearing almost your hat because. The associates will speak with one voice, is what we are saying. Nothing will come out from us three that we are not agreed on, is that right gentleman.

TM - Yes, we've no objecting to sending things to 3 of us simultaneously. I received David's email yesterday, I then forwarded it to Rick and Richard pointless. I much rather if David put all 3 names on it and pressed the button.

RB - It will then be a unified response that you can rely on.

DClark - All I'll say Richard is from the committee's. If you're saying to David you want it simultaneously emailed to you 3 at the same time then so be it.

TM - You don't see a problem with that.

DClark - No.

WH - You are all representing your own organisations.

AM - Let's get out of this. It is not a big issue. If we get copied in at the same time as stuff you are sending via the president and we can get that information at the same time personally I don't have a big deal with it. We can formulate, we can

have private discussions and formulate a response and the response can be for David. I don't have a problem with that at all. I think we just need to get over that.

WH - I agree that is fine.

Am - It is not an issue we have been sitting in this room enough times this last two years and we are at a stage where you know we are as close as we can be to completing this testing programme. And we need to push on.

DC - Do you want to propose that then and make that decision.

AM - So essentially we are happy with Tim's proposal that future communications come from jointly from the 3 of you. And when you send those communications you send them to the president and you can copy in by all means members of the working party.

RB - We can copy them in?

AM - You can copy them in we do not have a problem with that at all, let's not split hairs here. Our response will be via the president and when we send a response it will be to all 3 of you at the same time.

RB - That is fine, if that is what you are agreeing. If that is the majority view then that is fine.

[3.30.28 recording]

DC - It means gentlemen that you won't get an individual reply back.

RB - That is fine. ....what it is it will make it clear that it has been cleared by the other 2. So you've got a unified response that you can rely on. That is the whole point.

AM - Point 6 that has almost been drawn into that. WE do need to discuss that and we do need to give you a considered response from what you said in terms of the letter you sent to David in terms of your retraction of that letter. We need to discuss that and get back to you.

SS - Can I just say and I will be unpopular .....next action, I think we need to know exactly your opinion exactly what you are trying to say. A retraction of why, what, when.

RP - Perhaps one additional point if I can, that wasn't in the letter. Because it was an enquiry that I actually made with David Cullem who is the ..... Committee for government and regeneration, it is the committee that Tim and I presented all the evidence to in the Scottish government last week. I wrote to David and asked him, I mean as things stand at the moment, the original submission is back on the website with 2 paragraphs actually blacked out. Which significantly draws attention to the fact that something has been taken out of that letter. Now that is on the Scottish website and on the Scottish Parliament

website and available to the press and available to the public and any other interested party. Now if someone was to submit a freedom of information enquiry to Scottish parliament demanding that they have an original copy of that letter with the paragraphs as they were supplied, then they are bound to do that. So it hasn't been taken off the market as such, it is very possible that it could be disclosed as it was originally sent and I am not here to make threats or anything else, but that could result in legal action.

SS - Sorry, again, we have unanimously agreed on a position have we not.

JA - Are we not going to do this in private?

SS - Fair enough lads, I'd prefer it if you did actually. I'd prefer not to be here while you discuss this.

The discussion in part yeah but I thought the statement that was the idea of why we actually formulated.....

SS - That might be enough.

AM - We are considering the options in relation to the letter being submitted. Hypothetical question, complete hypothetical, let's just say the letter cannot be retracted and a statement would not be accepted, retracting that submission - What would your stance be - If it is physically if we are unable to do that.

TM - I think we would have to refer that to the institute's board.

RP - And I would have to refer that to my members.

I think there are two different issues here, two different stages, one is the letter of retraction that you may wish to send to federation to the ICCA and the APCC and another is a letter of retraction that you may want to send to the Scottish Parliament. Now Scottish Parliament may or may not decide to accept a different stage, bearing in mind that view is somebody ..... submission. They may, although we have well passed the closing date for submission, they may well accept another submission from the FFMA basically if that what we chose to do saying the letter was sent in error or without full knowledge of the information. It is not supported by the whole of the working group.

WH - Rick, can I just confirm, the conditions of that, basically relate the outcome of whether you support our test protocol. I think that is what you said.

RP - I don't know Will, let us be clear that has not been said.

WH - A deal breaker.

Am - Let us just be clear that was a ..... question that I was asking you. So that we can go away and discuss in private and discuss it and understand all aspects of what we are discussing.

RP - I think you have got to accept, how important and how significant those words were that were in that submission. And what that actually meant. And the fact that really and hopefully we can explain that to you today, statements that were made in there were unsubstantiated.

JA - I'm not going to be drawn on that.

RP - The statement about cremated remains, ashes whatever you want to call them not being not being returned to families was appalling. I'll make no secret of that and I'll make no fuss about the way I put it to you. That was quite unbelievable. And if you really believe that that is what is happening in the sector, then it is time that I certainly got up and walked out of here.

AM - That is why we give you a considered response once we have discussed it.

RB - But you need to understand the importance of the statement that you made.

TM - Can I just support exactly what Rick has just said.

RB - Which is why you have got letters of support which weren't properly cleared as far as I'm concerned.

Am -We will go away and discuss this particular issue.

RP - Just taking that letter and compare it to the significance of the lord bolmy enquiry and suggest that there should be a similar enquiry because of ashes not being returned to families. As I said, that is unbelievable.

RB - I think we made the point.

TM - Can I leave on a more positive note. Just going back to the opening of the meeting, I read to you the transcript of the Scottish Parliament. I didn't want to labour it, I finished it early, the part that was relayed by the NAFD representative from the Co-Op, is in there, I highlighted the relevant pages I will leave that with you.

DClark - I'd just like to say David , Thank you both for your input regarding three issues which weren't sitting round a table and discussing it in a more pragmatic approach.

RB - Are you including me in that?

[3.37.41 recording]

DClark - No Richard. Because you was asleep for two of them. Thank you very much Rick and Tim, your input was very valuable.  
Well thank you gentlemen.

DC - I would like to reiterate what David said, I, coming in to this meeting this morning I'm sure we all had the same sleepless night and thoughts, everything

and how we go on. It's been great to know that we have pushed that forward pushed it through with agreed I think we have come a long long way today with the working party and I am very pleasing that we are all working together.

Thank you.

Another 5 minute break.

Thank you Tim, thank you Richard.

**The recording then moves onto the FFMA private meeting Item 6 on the agenda - transcript is available if required.**