Meetings Notes

Meeting of the EGEA Working Group 1 with NB VG8 in Berlin

Tuesday, 6th December 2011 (11.00 – 16.30)
at Berufsgenossenschaft für Transport u. Aufsichtsdienst

1. Opening and welcome by the Chairman

Hans-Peter Fritschi welcomed all and thanked notified bodies/VG8 for making this meeting possible, sponsoring the meeting room and F + B. Not all NB's in attendance, but all have been informed and some have sent statements. Rolf Trabold, Convenor of the CEN TC98 had been invited, but had other engagements.

2. Roll call of participants

Notified Bodies	
NB0417 BG Verkehr, Chairman VG8	Hermann Haase
TUV Nord CERT GmbH	Felix Korte
TUV RL	Eberhard Frejno
EGEA	
ABL	Arild Hansen
AFIBA/Cascos	Carlos Alvarez-Cascos
AICA/ Ravaglioli	Fausto Manganelli
ASA/JAB	Uwe Henn
ASA/Maha	Thomas Feldmeier
ASA/Nussbaum	Hans Nussbaum
ASA/Snap-On	Luca De Marchi
GEA	Dave Garratt
SAA/ Hetra Int'l. AG, Chairman WG1	Hans Peter Fritschi
STM/ Sosnowski	Maciej Dziemidzik

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was unanimously approved.

4. Implementation of the Standard EN 1493:2010

4.1. Problem of load distribution on lifts with special position of supporting arms

Mr. Manganelli and Mr. Henn raised the concern of creating a critical load distribution when positioning the short and long arms on same side when testing/using a 2 post lift. Manufacturers can prevent this by limiting arm movement, however. This is not a good idea because it makes it difficult to position the vehicle between the posts.

There are two ways to fix the problem … change the standard or have an understanding with the NBs (**Recommendation for Use (RfU)**) to produce a clear load distribution reference for calculation and test

that should be used instead of what is now written in section 5.7.4.3. The ideal solution is to keep the normative vehicle concept (and therefore the load rectangles) for all lifts placed in most unfavourable position.

Conclusions:

1) Produce a RfU for the NBs to work with.

   VG 8 will complete the presented draft of the Recommendation for Use (RfU) for the NB's. The RfU should clarify how to perform the load test of two post lifts with load bearing arms. The meeting participants agreed that the load distribution rectangle from section 5.7.4.3 a) and b) also applies to two post lifts with arms.

2) The procedure should include a check of the load angle; the amount of permissible angle will be set after tests, which will be done by the manufacturers (the UK NB's are already using 5 degrees).

Personal notes of Mr. Manganelli:

Maybe the proposal of addition of load angle check should be better evaluated:

- The load angle check should be introduced in any load test condition not only in two post lifts
- The extra force caused by the inclination of the load should then be considered in the consistent way (pick up plates and arms locking system...)
- Maybe it should be better to ignore the matter and concentrate the RfU only on the main issue.

Should we set an arm deflection rate, during the load test? …. No, but we could set a maximum load angle inclination of the load during the rated load test at max. height.

Visual load control: (Herrmann lifts proposal)

Herrmann Lifts had proposed a visual load control system to be adopted:

A load detecting device on each pick up plate can be helpful but doesn't cover the hazard in discussion:

- To be aware about the load on the single arms it is not sufficient to evaluate the stress condition of the lift, because this depends also on the position of these loads
- Moreover, a safety device has to be automatic and should not depend on the attention of the operator

In general, the discussions are about two different approaches:

- To be in the position of lifting in safety a "blind vehicle" – this is the basic concept of "normative vehicle"
- To have a reliable automatic load monitoring device that prevent lifting when the load doesn't comply with the designed condition.

EN 1493 is based on the first approach.
The second approach to be really reliable would substantially increase the cost.

A load detecting device would be a good idea when a load is missing from one of the arms and is an indication that the load has not been positioned correctly.

<u>Action to be taken:</u>

- VG8 will discuss these problems at their next meeting in **April 2012** and give us a clear statement and/or recommendation in order that manufacturer and NB's can work under the same conditions
- Concerning overload system EGEA writes to HERRMANN Lifts

4.2. Reduction of lifting capacity of 2 post vehicle service lifts by the Swedish Environment Authority

The Member State (Sweden) has said that all lifts put on the market with load capacity calculated with the condition of non reversible load distribution, will be downgraded to the rated load that allows reverse positioning of the vehicle.

In the specific case a lift with rated load of 2.75 ton not reversible will go down to 2.2 ton, (estimated adding four times the allowable load on short arms) because the lift should be able to take the load in both directions.

The Swedish authority states that a lift must be stable and designed so the vehicle can be placed in both directions. This is already specified in EN1493:1998. Therefore the capacity shown must be for the worst case so the maximum capacity must be for when used in both directions

We should ask Sweden and or the Commission (Alexandra Jouir-Schroder) for more information on this case, for example who was the NB and which lift was involved etc.

P.S. EGEA WG1 is not the rule-maker, but only the distributor of the correct information.

Action to be taken:

- EGEA writes to Gilbert Fransson, Sweden and Commission.

4.3. Application of Standard by NB's and local Authorities in different EU countries and procedure with second hand lifts (responsibility, approval)

In practice it is difficult to control the same interpretation of standards across all approx. 100 NBs, but effort is made by emails and meetings etc, however, it's not possible to maintain perfect interpretation.

The VG8 group is concerned that some manufacturers may approach an unknown NB and be able to have an inferior product approved. The VG8 group supports the proposal from EGEA to hold a list of known competent (commended) NBs which the RfUs are known and who contribute in this group.

The situation will improve as the Commission starts to check the Technical Competence of NBs are better harmonised.

Action to be taken:

- EGEA makes an inquiry to all WG 1 members, asking for their preferred and recommended Notified Bodies, including whether they participate in the VG 8. This list shall be distributed as a quality indication.

Procedure with second hand lifts (responsibility, approval)

The user is responsible for having all equipment inspected before using for the first time and has a lift periodically inspected thereafter. This is the case in the UK and Germany, but may not be in other member states.

4.4. Terms of application the Standard (4.8.2011 or 8.10.2011 = 6 months after publication)

→ **8th October 2011** should be the right date.

4.5. Market survey by the Authorities, especially for lifting equipments manufactured outside EU countries

Some NBs may run an office in the East and these should be OK and maintain same standards. The Chinese are constantly improving their products, so the problem of poor quality will disappear in the future

Lifting equipment manufactured outside EU countries – the **Importer/distributor** is responsible for CE Conformity

5. EGEA WG 1 Leaflet – discussions of the contents and firm approval

The leaflet has been drafted and sent out for comment. All comments have been reviewed and changes made. The draft is now ready for printing by EGEA secretary. As to other languages than English, according to the secretary this should be translated by each member association

6. Any other business

Placed on the market means, put in the place of sale, so if the lift does not meet the new standard, but is at the distributor, then it can still be sold.

There is no licensing scheme for lift operators in any member state. (Ongoing discussion)

HSE in the UK, may be conducting **a test on arm locking devices**, to see that they meet the side forces laid out in the Standard. This investigation comes from some cases of fall down of vehicles, probably caused by poor loading.

The chairman thanked the participants for their engaged and fruitful discussion and inputs, Mr. Haase and the Berufsgenossenschaft for the hospitality and the tasting lunch-sandwiches. He wished to all a good and safe return, merry Christmas and a happy and successful new year.

***

Closure at 16.30 hours

18. January 2012, D. Garrat, H. Haase, F. Manganelli, H.P. Fritschi