

Brussels, 24<sup>th</sup> of November 2016

## EGEA Working Group 1 (WG1)

### Vehicle Lifting Equipment

Dear Members,

On behalf of the Chairman of Working Group 1, Fausto Manganelli, we have the pleasure in inviting you to the meeting of Working Group 1 of the European Garage Equipment Association, to be held on:

**Monday, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2016, 10h00 – 16h00**

at “Old” EGEA offices  
Boulevard de la Woluwe, 42  
BE- 1200 Brussels – Tel: +32 2 761 95 10

Please find hereunder the draft agenda rev00.

#### Draft Agenda (Rev00)

1. Opening and welcome by the Chairman
2. Roll call of participants
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Approval of the minutes of the last Working Group 1 meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> of April 2016 in Brussels
5. Official revision of EN1493:2010
  - a) Report from the last CEN/TC 98/WG 3 meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> of June 2016 in Bologna
  - b) Review of resulting documents
    - N0028 Meeting reports
    - N007 template of comments. Base of discussion in the meeting
    - N0021 template of comments updated after decisions agreed in the meeting
    - N0027 EN1493 draft version updated after decisions agreed in the meeting
  - c) Main issues, with reference with doc N0027:

- **Scope: Potential conflict between EN1493 and Directive 2014/95 / EU)**

The sentence "*The standard does not mean that a person can enter into a raised vehicle for particular activities, PTI and lifts for railway vehicles*" was introduced to solve somehow the potential conflict between EN1493 and Directive 2014/95/ EU

This compromise solution is derived from the negative response of the CEN Consultant on the specific question.

From this chance to get in the vehicle raised also it derives the inclusion of the note p to point 7.3.1, which refers to the user the need to make a special assessment of the risks in terms of means to enter / exit safely from the raised vehicle.

- Action: The issue should be discuss in EGEA WG1 to be reconfirmed in next CEN/TC 98/WG 3 meeting. It is anyway advisable to keep a "low profile" on the subject to avoid drastic decisions such as that of preventing the use of lifters in field PTI

- **3.1 >> Including or not motorbike in the standard**

Section 3-1 as it was also includes motorbikes.

In point 31 of Doc N0021 , with respect to paragraph 5.7.4.2 of the standard, is clear the intention of Mr. Trabold not to include motorbikes with 2 wheels but to include motorbike with more than 2 wheels:

*"...In the Scope of EN 1493 lifting platforms for 2-wheel-motorbikes shall be excluded, because on these lifts nobody works under the lifted load and therefore some of the hazards of "normal" vehicle lifts don't exist.*

*These lifting devices shall be regarded as lifting tables according to EN 1570-1.*

*Remark: Instead of changing the scope Trabold proposes to put this exclusion in the definition of the vehicle lift (clause 3.1).The definition than would read:*

*Vehicle lift: lifting device with guided load carrying device for lifting land based means of transport such as cars, motorcycles with more than two wheels, lorries, buses, trams, rail vehicles, industrial trucks and similar, in the following named vehicle, and designed for working on or under the load"*

- To be discussed: if bikes with more than 2 wheels must be included in the standard, in addition to changing the definition in paragraph 3.1, also the normative vehicle will be affected. To be considered also that in paragraph point 5.7.2.1d of the standard motorcycles are considered (it seems that this was included in the latest version of the standard: in the 98 version was not there. To be clarified)
- Other considerations: if bikes with more than 2 wheels must be included in the standard, having to relate to a completely different type vehicles would be appropriate to assess whether convenient to split the norm in general and various specific parts dedicated to different types of vehicles

- **5.4 >> Control position**

It reiterates the need to reorganize the whole paragraph providing for the revision of 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 to better define the aspects related, among the other things, to the use of remote control (wired or wireless), the visibility, the safety distances of the place control, the possibility of being under the vehicle to the lift in motion

Some points to be considered:

- Visibility: must be best defined to avoid having to provide for remote control or double operator even in the case of car scissor lifts (the side opposite the vehicle operator remains hidden)
- The use of a remote control raises the possibility of the presence of persons in the dangerous area.
- With remote control, likely misuse become more predictable (i.e.: operator under the load)
- In case of use of remote control, a warning device (acoustic or optical) could be activated, to remind potentially hazardous condition.
- Restrictions on the use of the remote control should be introduced to avoid unpredictable proper misuse (i.e.: Limit the remote control operation only for the initial 300mm stroke

- With remote control in use automatically the speed of the lift is reduced to that permitted value in case of presence people under the load in motion.
  - FM aims to rewrite the text and share it with EGEA WG1 members.
  
- **5.7.1 >> Allowable inclination of vehicle in chassis supporting vehicle lifts**

With lifts loaded with nominal load the inclination of the level of the pick-up device shall not exceed 3 ° from the horizontal.

Manufacturers (especially of two-post-lift) will check possible reachable values to avoid too restrictive requirements.
  
- **5.7.4.1 >> Alternative: load sensing device/normative vehicle**

The phrase written in red makes possible the alternative load sensing device/normative vehicle. If this alternative is to be provided it is necessary that the load control devices are normed. There should be comparability of results between the application of the load sensing device and normative vehicle.

It also sees the risk of difficulties in defining the capacity of the lift, since it may depend on the characteristics of the vehicle.

  - Action: To be explored in the next meeting EGEA WG1
  
- **5.7.4.2 5.7.4.3 >> Adequacy of Normative vehicle**

Within CEN / TC98WG3 there is widespread view that the normative vehicle is no longer appropriate to the current fleet.

In both cases (5.7.4.2 wheel support vehicle lifts and 5.7.4.3 chassis supporting vehicle lifts) references to the Normative Vehicle could actually be no more aligned to the fleet since the various values were defined many years ago, and so it might be sensible to a new analysis of the same, maybe even introducing the vehicle types now absent (bikes, tricycles, quad, ...)

FM underlined in many occasions the difficulties linked to the collection of the necessary data to doublecheck the actual provisions therefore demands the effective cooperation of EGEA WG1 members in this activity to be able to bring specific proposals to the next meeting of CEN / TC98WG3

  - Action: Mr Fijnvandraat will provide CEN/TC 98/WG with a table containing a comparison of the American standard and EN 1493 before next meeting
  
- **5.7.5.2 >> Sizing of synchronization ropes**

It would be good to establish a value of lateral imbalance of loads equal to 25% of the capacity of the lift, on which to perform the sizing of synchronization ropes, always in reference to the calculation method provided for in the standard ISO4308

  - Note: in the same way should also be considerations of other synchronization devices (torsion bar in scissor lifts, ...)
  
- **5.9.5 >> Arm locking device: Allowable play in positioning of pick up pads**

The total play at the fully extended arm shall not exceed one pick-up plate diameter.

The restriction introduced on the maximum play in positioning of the pick-up pads seems acceptable, anyway it is good that each manufacturer make the necessary checks on their production to avoid too restrictive requirements
  
- **5.9.5 >> Arm locking device: strength test procedure**

Fully agreement on the modification of sizing criteria for arm locking device component:

“... arm locking systems shall be designed to resist a force of 4,5 % of the capacity of the lift without permanent deformation, ~~or~~ and to resist a force of 6,75 % of the capacity without breakage...”

  - Action: A testing procedure should be specified: Mr. Garratt and Manganelli will prepare a proposal.

To be discussed in EGEA WG1

- **5.9.6 >> Roll off safety device**

It shall not be possible that a wheel of a rolling vehicle puts an end stop out of function.  
In the new Table 4 a column with maximum wheel diameters shall be introduced

- **5.15 >> Asymmetries of the load**

The note on non-symmetrical load is removed while in similar considerations (synchronization ropes) a lateral imbalance of 25% of the capacity could be suggested.

This issue could affect also normative vehicle, so far always considered symmetric respect geometrical axis of the vehicle

- Action: To be reconsidered, perhaps with by analogy with the provisions of the ALI standards for testing "out of level"

6) **PROSAFE Initiative - joint market surveillance action on vehicle service lifts: state of affairs**

7) **Installation and periodical check of vehicle lifts in different Member States' Regulations – discussion on the creation of EGEA guidelines to harmonise requirements across EU**

- How to organize data research to assess the adequacy of Normative Vehicle?

8) **Digitalisation/connectivity/Internet of Things/Industry 4.0/Robotics: possible impacts on vehicle lifting equipment**

9) **Next meetings, frequency and location**

If there are any other issues, which you would like to discuss during this Working Group 1 meeting, please inform the Secretariat before **Thursday, December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016**

\* \* \*

We are looking forward to seeing you all in Brussels for this Working Group,

With kind regards,

Eléonore van Haute  
EGEA Secretary General