

**- Meeting Notes-**  
**EGEA WG1 meeting**  
**Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> September 2012 (09h30 – 13h00)**  
**at Automechanika Trade Show, Messe Frankfurt, Frankfurt**

**1. Opening and welcome by the Chairman**

Fausto Manganelli welcomed all participants who attended this meeting at Automechanika during a busy time.

**2. Roll call of participants**

The attendees introduced themselves.

ABL	Tor Even Bustnes
ABL	Arild Hansen
AFIBA/ Cascos Maquinaria sa	Carlos Alvarez-Cascos
AFIBA/ Velyen licensed by ISTOBAL	Vicente Pérez
AFIBA/ Velyen licensed by ISTOBAL	Diego Moya
AICA/ Ravaglioli SpA	Fausto Manganelli
AICA/ Snap-On	Marco Gandolfi
ASA/ Blitzrotary	Carsten Rohde
ASA/ Blitzrotary	Wolf-Erik Schmitt
ASA/ MAHA	Thomas Feldmeier
ASA/ Nussbaum	Ludwig Huber
ASA/ Snap-On Equipment	Peter Drust
FMA/Techno Automotive Equipment	Nico Hellebaut
GEA	Dave Garratt
GEA/ Rotary Lift	Gary Shepherd
GIEG/ FOG Automotive	Olivier Gindre
SAA/ Hetra International AG	Hans-Peter Fritschi
STM	Rafal Sosnowski
USA/ Snap-On Inc.	Neil Davis
EGEA Secretariat	Neil Pattemore
EGEA Secretariat	Sylvia Gotzen
EGEA Secretariat	Eléonore van Haute

**3. Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was unanimously approved.

As Sylvia Gotzen had to leave at 10h00, it was suggested to start with point 5.4 of the agenda to discuss with the secretariat the creation of a list of preferred/recommended NB's to ensure the application of the standard by NB's and local Authorities in different EU countries.

#### 4. Approval of the minutes of the last Working Group 1 meeting with the Notified Bodies held on 6th December 2011 in Berlin

With no further remarks, the minutes of the previous WG1 meeting with the Notified Bodies held on December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2011 were unanimously approved.

#### 5. Implementation of the Standard EN 1493:2010

##### 5.1. Problem of load distribution on two post lifts

- Report from last WG1 meeting with the Notified Bodies
- Creation of a 'Recommendation For Use': State of affairs
- Next steps

##### Discussions:

- Fausto Manganelli reported from last WG1 meeting with the Notified Bodies (NB). He informed WG1 members that Mr. Haase was invited to this meeting but unfortunately due to illness could not attend our WG1 meeting today.  
He then pointed out that although the NB's considered that if both the 2 post lift arms are facing in the same direction, that this is a 'mis-use', but as it can happen, it remains an issue.
- Fausto Manganelli explained that we should keep the 'normative' vehicle as the basis for the load positioning.
- The NB's explained that the regulation is "clear" and it can't lend itself to equivocation and isn't possible to correct'  
Some possible solutions suggested by the NB's to handle this problem could be warning labels (to show the operator the problem of incorrect positioning) or the reduction of safety factor. However, for WG1 members, we should not accept these solutions, we should remain with the normative vehicle and we should insist with NB' to set down a RFU.  
A RFU should allow to avoid problems of self-declaration based on EN1493:2010 as (normally) no lift manufacturer accepts the requirements of the abnormal load positioning. WG1 should continue to clarify with the NB's WG8 the anomaly of this part of the specification.
- The Herrmann lifts proposal (visual load control integrated in pick up pads) on could not be used as an alternative proposal as it is not in line with EGEA WG1 (ref attachment 1: minutes of the meeting with Hermann Lifts).

##### Action:

- Fausto Manganelli to circulate the minutes of the meeting with the Hermann Lifts, held in Bologna on March 12th, 2012 (ref attachment 2)
- Fausto Manganelli to organise a meeting with Mr. Haase to discuss further a common solution/agreement.
- To include list of contentious points regarding load distribution on two post lifts into the EGEA matrix (ref attachment 3) for further clarification/discussion.

##### 5.2. Manufacturers test result about arm deflection rate

- Dave Garratt reported the UK experience and pointed out that it could be the case of the vehicle inclination angle rather than the arm inclination angle.  
Decision: It was commonly agreed not to include this provision in the standards.

##### 5.3. Test on arm locking device in UK

- There is an historic issue of an increasing number of vehicles falling from 2 post lifts, reportedly caused by broken arm locking mechanisms. The GEA feel that the arm locking system was broken as the vehicle fell off and that it was caused by a user positioning the vehicle incorrectly.  
The UK Health and Safety Executive have now started direct testing of the column/arm lock systems from a number of suppliers (both GEA members and non-members).

Action: to include the issue of permanent deformation into our EGEA matrix (ref attachment 3) for further clarification/discussion.

#### **5.4. Compliance - Application of Standard by NB's and local Authorities in different EU countries**

- Discussion on the creation of a list of preferred/recommended NB
- Feedback from national associations/ companies on non-compliance of products
- Discussion on how to improve market surveillance

##### **Discussions**

- Fausto Manganelli thanked Sylvia Gotzen for her support in discussing the creation of a list of preferred/recommended NB's.

Following extensive discussions between the WG1 members, it was suggested to work on a clear definition of the standards to avoid any interpretation from NB's side rather than establishing a list of preferred/ recommended NB's. To define the limits for the interpretation of the standards (which is already a good standard), but with some points for interpretation to allow different technical designs to be acceptable.

- Dave Garratt raised the issue of whether the NB's are aware of the various issues needed for assessment of vehicle lifts. It may be possible to create a specific list of the items needed on an assessment list. The EGEA position must be based on the safety issues as a legal basis.

There is a need to create a better definition of the standards against which a NB can assess.

This could be created as a 'technical specification' created by the EGEA WG1. This then acts as a clear definition for the use of the NB's, lift manufacturers and insurance/health and safety assessors. While this is being developed, any 'blatant' non-compliance can be challenged directly.

- Dave Garratt proposed that we should have an 'EGEA database' of 'known non-compliance' products.
- Fausto Manganelli proposed that WG1 meet to interpret the 'interpretable' elements of EN1493.2010 as soon as possible.

##### **Action**

- All WG1 members will send their list of known issues to be included in a technical specification by EvH by the end of September (see attachment 3). These will be used to create a template as the basis for the next WG1 meeting discussion (not yet fixed).

#### **5.5. Lifts with several drives (ie: mobile column lifts): safety in particular operational mode (single post function)**

- Relates to the issue of operation in single mode in a set of mobile column lift. This operation mode could cause a de-synchronization higher than the allowable defined in paragraph 5.15 unless it is expressly limited within the max allowable value (50mm or 1°)

The question is:

- Paragraph 5.15 refers to unintentional de-synchronization but in this case the operation is intentional, even if with particular precaution (i.e. two hand control, key control etc.)
- Does the single post operation mode comply with the standard?

##### **Decision:**

The single post operation mode is a voluntary decision, and it does not fall in the provisions of the paragraph 5.15

## **5.6. Lifts with several drives (ie: mobile column lifts): performance level (ISO 13849) of safety related parts (EN1493 paragraph 5.15)**

- Fausto Manganelli feels that this is a typing error in the EN1493:2010, (5.15, point 3) as a 'high torsional vehicle' should not apply to 2 post lifts.

**Action:** To include in RFU asap and later to modify accordingly when reviewing/commenting the EN1493:2010

## **5.7. Potential conflict between EN1493 and Directive 2010/48 about the presence of persons on the lift during roadworthiness inspection procedure**

### **Discussions**

- Specifically an issue of a technician being in a vehicle when the lift is being raised/lowered. Neil Pattemore proposed that WG1 prepare a statement (even if it is not used yet) to cover that 'the person should be fully seated in the driver's seat with the driver's door securely closed whenever the lift is in motion'.
- After further discussions, it was agreed in principle that this was a PTI regulation issue and EGEA should not make any statement or guidance to equipment operators. This might be the responsibility of the European Commission to conduct a risk assessment to establish acceptable working practices when conducting a PTI test. This needs to be discussed further on a legal point of view.

### **Actions**

- Neil Pattemore – to check with the lift directive for passenger lifts (Directive 95/16)
- The secretariat to discuss further the potential conflict and incumbent responsibilities with lawyers.

## **6. Next meetings, frequency and location**

- It was agreed to use 'doodle' to arrange a meeting in Brussels (EGEA offices) once the initial feedback was received and there was a better understanding of the magnitude of what would need to be discussed at the next meeting.

## **7. Any other business**

- HPF raised the question of the leaflet, which still needed to be translated into German. Wolf-Erik Schmitt (Blitz) offered to make the translation.

\*\*\*

The Chairman thanked all the participants and the meeting closed at 13.00.

\*\*\*

Neil Pattemore  
EGEA Secretariat