



- Meeting Notes-

**EGEA WG1 meeting
Tuesday, 24th June 2014 (10h30 – 16h00)**

at FIGIEFA offices

Boulevard de la Woluwe 42, BE-1200 Brussels

1) Opening and welcome by the Chairman

Fausto Manganelli welcomed all participants and particularly Jan Fijnvandraat, coming from Steril B.V, the first time in EGEA WG1

2) Roll call of participants

The attendees introduced themselves:

AICA / Ravaglioli – Samiro Group	Fausto Manganelli
AICA / Snap On	Gary Di Angelo
ASA / Blitz Rotary	Wolf-Eric Schmitt
ASA / Maha	Thomas Feldmeier
FMA / Techno Automotive Equipment	Nico Hellebaut
GIEG / Fog Automotive	Olivier Gindre
RAI / Steril	Jan Fijnvandraat
STM / Maha	Peter Surray
EGEA Secretariat	Neil Pattemore (part time)

3) Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was unanimously approved

4) Approval of the minutes of the last WG1 meetings held on 23rd May 2013 in Bologna and on 29th January 2013 in Brussels

With no further remarks the minutes of the previous WG1 meetings were unanimously approved

5) Recommendation for Use (RfU): status of the situation and discussion to agree how to proceed

5.1 Outline of the situation in previous meetings

5.1.2 Meeting 29th January 2013 in Brussels

In the meeting it was decided to classify the issues of EGEA WG1 inquiry according to three priority levels:

- A) Important issue to be fixed asap
- B) Secondary issue: change to be discussed in eventual revision of the standard
- C) No action required

Only two points were classified with A)

- 5.7.4.3 Load distribution on lift with arms
- 5.15 Performance level for safety related parts of control systems....

The update document was "EGEA WG1 Review of the EN1493:2010 – Version 29.01.2013 (copy attached)

It was decided to look for the possibility to fix the urgent issues (priority A) in the RfU under study by VG8 (at that time CNB/M/08.018 Revision 2)

5.1.3 Meeting 23rd May 2013 in Bologna

In the meeting two hypotheses were discussed:

- a) To accept the RfU (at that time revision 3), maybe with some small changes
- b) To claim to European Commission

It was agreed to accept the RfU so not to create an unnecessary conflict with authorities.

5.2 Following developments

Given that only a few member were present in the meeting in Bologna it was decided to ask WG1 Members to check through their own National Associations if the RfU could give problems to the manufacturer in their lift design and calculations or if it could be acceptable.

The result of the survey (few replied, but it was adopted following the rule "no reply= agreement") was the decision to accept the RfU, trying anyway as much as possible to introduce some changes to obtain an RfU more in agreement with our expectations.

An attempt to improve the RfU was made by contacting Mr. Trabold and Mr. Haase, but unfortunately with no result.

In the meantime, the approval process has been completed and the RfU was published as

Document CNB/M/08.018 Revision 5	
Approved by Vertical Group	25.04.13
Approved by Horizontal Committee	26.06.13
Endorsed by Machinery Working Group	26.11.13

The RfU can be downloaded from the link below.

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/mechanical/documents/legislation/machinery/notified-bodies/index_en.htm

The Revision 5 is identical to Revision 3, which had been criticised by EGEA WG1: further confirming that our observations were not taken into account.

5.3 Next steps

Today we confirmed again the decision not to make further pressure on the RFU and **focus on the next revision of EN1493**, also justified by forthcoming five year review.

In summary, the process for the request of the review of the standard should be as follows.

- We have to make an official request to Mr. Trabold (convenor of TC98/WG3), copy Mr. Armin Weih (TC98 secretary) together with various issues that need to be changed or improved and therefore justify the revision of the standard.
- For the moment, these issues can be reported in summary form.
- Then Mr. Trabold will forward the proposal for the revision to the others members of TC98 asking for their opinion and any other observations.
- If at least 5 countries will need to agree the review for the process to begin.

We must therefore prepare the note of the various issues to be sent to Trabold: the aim **is to invite the members of WG1 to send to EGEA Secretariat their observations/proposal before the end of July.**

It has to be pointed out that in the revision process of the standard EGEA WG1 should have an active and important role.

This is to speed up the work and come to the new version of the standard in the shortest possible time and with agreed solutions.

EGEA WG1 could be some sort of Mirror Group of TC98/WG3 (likely and desirable that the people involved at the manufacturer's level are the same)

The document "EGEA WG1 Review of the EN1493:2010 – Version 29.01.2013", integrated with the comments received by the end of July, could be the basis for the working document of the TC98/WG3 in the revision of the standard.

In the meeting it also was highlighted some lack of knowledge about the organizational aspects of the various bodies involved in the topic, with different responsibilities (TC98, VG8, Horizontal Committee, Machinery Working Group, ...):

See also attached document "CEN Internal Regulation" (here attached), paragraph 11.2.8 "Review and consequences." (... the responsible of Technical Committee shall ensure that ENs are periodically reviewed the periodical review shall occur at intervals not exceeding 5 years ...)

6) Other changes in EN1493 resulting from the EN1493 review in WG1 and not included in RfU

In the classification of the topics in the document "EGEA WG1 Review of the EN1493:2010 – Version 29.01.2013" there is just only another theme classified as "A" in addition to the load distribution on two post lift.

This is related to paragraph 5.15 "Performance level for safety related parts of control systems...."

The penultimate sentence should be corrected to read: "Safety related parts of control systems for vehicle lifts mentioned under **c3**) shall comply with performance level d of EN ISO 13849-1:2006."

That means that only vehicles with high torsional rigidity needs PL d, whereas the other vehicles need PL c. It is a typographical error and this was confirmed also by Mr Trabold.

An official statement by Mr Trabold may be the temporary solution.

In the future revision of the standard it must be corrected.

7) Installation and periodical check of vehicle lifts in different Member State's Regulation

It is known that the subject is treated differently in different countries.

It is agreed that it would be useful for lift manufacturers to have a clear picture of the existing rules in different countries, especially in relation to the first installation check, periodic inspection and the division of responsibilities between manufacturer and user.

It was decided to promote a survey among the members of WG1 for the collection of this information

The survey will be made on the basis of a template that will be specially prepared by Mr. Schmitt and Mr. Feldmeier and then will be circulated to the members of WG1.

8) New PTI Roadworthiness Directive: brief presentation of the outcome and implication for the lift manufacturers

- The problem in a nutshell is that some checks required by the Roadworthiness Directive are incompatible with the standard EN1493 concerning the presence of people in the raised vehicle
- The points of the standard which shows this incompatibility are:

Page 6 Paragraph1

It's clear that **lifts to which the standard refers are not allowed for the lifting of persons.**

The sentence "... and working **on** or under the vehicles..." might suggest to allow the presence of people in the raised vehicle but it has to be intended that operator **work on part of** the vehicle (like for example in brake maintenance, where the operator works on the wheel, being on side of the vehicle, with lift partially lifted)

Pag 42 Paragraph 7.2

The sentence "...if the lift is not designed for this purpose..." refers for example to lift with balconies (see paragraph 5.10)

The balconies can be fixed to the carrying devices of the lift (i.e. platform lifts) and in this case, if needed safety devices are present, the presence of people during the movement could be allowed (but it has to be confirmed)

But usually the balconies are provided with access stairs to allow access to the operator when the vehicle is raised.

Pag 44 Paragraph 7.3

The sentence "...unless via a specific designed access..." also refers to balconies or equivalent system.

- It should be possible to think that the standard only prevents the presence of people **during the movement** thus leaving the possibility of having people in the vehicle stationary (before the vehicle is raised without operator inside and after the operator gets into the raised vehicle).
But in case of an emergency, or simply through inattention, the person who is inside the vehicle may go out and fall to the ground (because the lift has no protection relevant to this possibility).
To admit the presence of people in the raised vehicle it has to be ensured safety in case of exit
Balconies or similar devices could fulfill this requirement.
- It is agreed that it would be better to try to change the EN1493:2010 standard rather than creating a complex and expensive lift. In addition, it has to be considered that some checks in the PTI Directive necessarily lead to the engine running and this can be very dangerous both for the operator inside the vehicle and for the operator under the vehicle.

N.B - Neil Pattemore subsequently contacted the Commission, who supported a rewording of the EN1493 standard as the best/most practical solution to avoid a conflict between the wording of the standard and the Roadworthiness Directive.

9) Next meetings, frequency and location

At this stage it is worth waiting for the start of the procedure of revision of the standard before scheduling next meeting.

10) Any other business

No other issues were discussed