

Minutes of the meeting in Bologna on March 12, 2012 with Mr D.Hartmann and Mr J.Hermann

During the meeting we examined the conclusions that were drawn in the report of EGEA WG1 meeting in Berlin on December 6, 2012.

We discussed and we shared the following comments

- The debate in Egea WG1 does not refer to the load distribution: as this latter has already been discussed in TC98 WG3, during the revision of EN1493 and the concept of Normative Vehicle has been confirmed.

At the present the topic is limited to the case of two post lifts where short and long arms can be positioned on the same side. In this case, in fact, the present standards EN1493-2010 may lead to false interpretations and too heavy load conditions.

- Today there is no lack of assessment with regard to the subject "Load Distribution".

The concept of Normative Vehicle, already present in the previous issue of the standards, is maintained (in the sense that the lift is dimensioned on the basis of the Normative Vehicle, and if it is well representative of the circulating vehicle park, nothing else is required.)

Obviously everything can and must be improved: for example we have to keep the circulating vehicle park constantly monitored so to verify the need of further interventions or changes on the normative vehicle itself.

- The concept of normative vehicle has the aim to consider the vehicle "blindly", no special cares or skills should be required during the lifting operations.

- The variations that were introduced by the new EN1493 may lead to heavier burdens as far as the dimensioning of the bearing structures and therefore higher costs, but it was agreed that this is the best compromise in terms of safety/costs.

- As regards the proposed "visual load control" device, the critical aspect is that it entrusts the evaluation of the safety level to the operator during the use of the lift; this principle is not considered acceptable because it lays on the operator's judgement and therefore solely on his skill. This concept was confirmed also in TC98 WG3 during the revision of EN1493 standard: a safety device may be considered as such if it is automatic and it can not be based on the operator's discretion.

- We agreed that the "visual load control" gives an indication on the conditions of the load on the pad and, by doing so, it avoids any potential critical condition such as a wrong positioning of the pads (a wrong adjustment of the height of the pads could alter the load distribution on the arms with consequent possible overload).

It also allows the ascertainment of critical conditions if the distribution of the load is altered: as it happens when a heavy part is removed from the vehicle.

Also, the device shows unquestionable advantages, warning the operator in case of special vehicles that are not fully represented by the normative vehicle.

- We, however, point out that the knowledge of the load conditions on the arms do not cover the risks originated by the position of the load in relation with the lift (in the case mentioned above of two post lift having the arms on the same side, the device can not help avoiding possible the overload of the columns). Therefore the device, in the proposed configuration, can not be considered the only referent for the safety in relation to the load distribution.

- In conclusion: we all believe that the proposed device can not be considered an alternative to the present standard as far as the "load distribution" is concerned, but it can be a useful device to increase the safety in the use of the lift.

In terms of safety the further evolution of the device could be a real step forward: automatic stop of the lift and monitoring of the position of the rubber pads, but most probably this evolution involves too height costs for this kind of product.