Eleonore Van Haute

From: Egea-Association

Sent: vendredi 31 mai 2013 14:41

To: Eleonore Van Haute

Subject: FW: Short meeting in Autopromotech

Attachments: CNB M 08 018-R-E Rev03 Draft - 25 04 2013.pdf

Philip Vogt

Policy Manager



European Garage Equipment Association

From: Fausto.Manganelli@samirogroup.com [mailto:Fausto.Manganelli@samirogroup.com]

Sent: maandag 27 mei 2013 18:40

To: mick.gilliam@stkare.co.uk; info@stertil.nl; Christian Stein (cstein@fog-automotive.com); Vicente Pérez Pérez; nico.hellebaut@tae.be; Carlos Alvarez-Cascos (cascos@cascos.es); hpf@frimsag.ch; Dave Garratt (dave@gea.co.uk); peter.drust@snapon.com; uwe.henn@jab-becker.de; thomas.feldmeier@maha.de; Neil Pattemore; tor.even.bustnes@visas.no; Gary Shepherd; Schmitt, Wolf; Diego I+D; marco.gandolfi@snapon.com; Olivier

 ${\tt GEINDRE\ (ogindre@fog-automotive.com);\ Helen@gea.co.uk;\ figiefa\ secretariat;\ Hans\ Nussbaum}$

(hans.nussbaum@nussbaum-lifts.de); Gonzalo; Diangelo, Gary R; Burger, Klaus **Cc:** Sylvia Gotzen; Neil Pattemore; Egea-Association; Cinzia Fantuzzi

Subject: In: Short meeting in Autopromotech

Dear All

I would like to inform you in brief about the meeting in Bologna and further steps

At the meeting were present Klaus Burger (Maha), Wolf Schmitt (Rotary) and Gary Shepherd (Rotary UK)

With reference to EN1493 5.7.4.3 "Load distribution on lift with arms", it was agreed to try to avoid as more as possible a claim to European Commission so not to arise conflict with authorities like TC98 or VG8. Basically we would accept the proposal of VG8 (see attachment), maybe with some small changes that need to be agreed with Mr. Haase, but only to if this do not give problems with actual lift production. It is not the best solution but it is the faster.

I kindly ask to WG1 Members to check through their own National Association if this solution could give problems to the manufacturer in their actual lift design and calculations or can be acceptable.

If possible, it should be important to have this feedback **before June 10**, in order to be able to give information in EGEA General Assembly in Oslo.

In any case the deadline for replies is fixed for the end of June (no replie will be considered positive replie, in agreement with the above proposal)

Sorry for the great urgency and thank you in advance

I remain at your disposal for any need for clarification

Kind regards

Fausto Manganelli

Da: Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup

Cc: Sylvia.Gotzen@figiefa.eu, technical@figiefa.eu, secretariat@egea-association.eu, Cinzia Fantuzzi <cfantuzzi@autopromotec.it>

Data: 18/05/2013 10:07

Oggetto: In: Short meeting in Autopromotech next week

Dear All

the meeting is confirmed for Thursday 23th, 9.00 am, at AUTOPROMOTEC, Service Center, Block B, 1° Floor, Room "MINUETTO"

Kind regards F. Manganelli

---- Inoltrato da Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup il 18/05/2013 09:41 -----

Da: Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup

Per: "mick.gilliam@stkare.co.uk" <mick.gilliam@stkare.co.uk>, "info@stertil.nl" <info@stertil.nl>, "Christian Stein (cstein@fog-automotive.com)" <cstein@fog-automotive.com>, Vicente Pérez Pérez (velyen@velyen.com) <velyen@velyen.com>, "nico.hellebaut@tae.be" <nico.hellebaut@tae.be>, "Carlos Alvarez-Cascos (cascos@cascos.es)" <cascos@cascos.es>, "hpf@frimsag.ch" <hpf@frimsag.ch>, "Dave Garratt (dave@gea.co.uk)" <dave@gea.co.uk>, "peter.drust@snapon.com" <peter.drust@snapon.com>, "uwe.henn@jab-becker.de" <uwe.henn@jab-becker.de>, "thomas.feldmeier@maha.de" <thomas.feldmeier@maha.de" <th>Vicr.even.bustnes@visas.no" Vicr.even.bustnes@visas.no" <t

Cc: <u>Sylvia.Gotzen@figiefa.eu</u>, <u>technical@figiefa.eu</u>, <u>secretariat@egea-association.eu</u>

Data: 13/05/2013 13:01

Oggetto: Short meeting in Autopromotech next week

Dear All

related to my proposal about an informal meeting in Autopromotech next week:

Please forgive me for the rough organization: this really an unannounced meeting and am trying to fix the schedule matching your availability according with received feedback from you

Now I would suggest Thursday 23thmorning, from 9.00 to 10.00 am (we all are very busy with the exibition and I think that one hour should be sufficient to exchange our opinions)

I am waiting for further feedback and within Friday 17 th I will confirm the schedule and the place.

Kindest regards

F. Manganelli

----- Inoltrato da Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup il 13/05/2013 12:03 -----

Da: Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup

Per: "mick.gilliam@stkare.co.uk" <mick.gilliam@stkare.co.uk", "info@stertil.nl" <info@stertil.nl", "Christian Stein (cstein@fog-automotive.com)" <cstein@fog-automotive.com>, "marco.gandolfi@snapon.com" <marco.gandolfi@snapon.com>, Vicente Pérez Pérez (velyen@velyen.com) <velyen@velyen.com>, "nico.hellebaut@tae.be" <nico.hellebaut@tae.be>, "Carlos Alvarez-Cascos (cascos@cascos.es)" <cascos@cascos.es)" <cascos@cascos.es>, "hpf@frimsag.ch" <hpf@frimsag.ch" <hpf@frimsag.ch" <pre>, "Dave Garratt (dave@gea.co.uk)" <dave@gea.co.uk">, "peter.drust@snapon.com" velven@uwe.henn@jab-becker.de" <uwe.henn@jab-becker.de</ur>, "thomas.feldmeier@maha.de" <thomas.feldmeier@maha.de</th>, Neil Pattemore<technical@figiefa.eu</td>"tor.even.bustnes@visas.no" <tor.even.bustnes@visas.no</td>Gary Shepherd <gshepherd@rotarylift.com</td>"Schmitt, Wolf"

Data: 10/05/2013 17:16

Oggetto: Info about actions after EGEA WG1 meeting in Brussel

Dear All

I would like to summarize the situation about the issue "Review of the standard EN1493 2010" after last meeting in Brussel on January 29

- In the meeting it was decided to classify the issues of EGEAWG1 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

This was done and 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....
- Mr Rohde met Mr Trabold in ASA meeting on February 6:
 - Mr Trabold support us but " without mr Haase and NB's he can do anything"
- Mr.Trabold strongly suggested to try one more time to convince Mr. Haase so he can bring VG8 members on our side with an RFU: this should be the only chance to avoid to ask for an official revision of the standard
- On April 4 I had a meeting with Mr Haase in Berlin together with Hans Peter Fritschi.

Our goal was to let Mr Haase to share our position so he could convince VG8 members in the following VG8 Meeting on April 9

We explained our point of view related to top priorty issues A of EGEA WG1 inquiry We supplied old documents and also new ones expressly prepared to clarify better the issue It seemed that Mr Haase really got our reasons.

- The result is in attached e-mail on April 26
 - 5.7.4.3 Load distribution on lift with arms

Our proposal was refused

- 5.15 Performance level for safety related parts of control systems....

Our proposal was accepted

- Here below you find my answer bto Mr Haase
- I have not received jet feedback from Mr Haase
- Now I think that we have two possibilities
- a) To accept the proposal of VG8 about 5.7.4.3 >>> is not what we want, is not according with the philosophy of the standard,....but it is better than nothing and we can close a never ending story!
- b) EGEA officially inform CEN/TC98 secretary that the convenor of CEN/TC98 and VG8 are not taking seriously our problems with tEN1493:2010. This possibility could be considered in next EGEA GA in Oslo next June.
- I kindly ask for your opinion and the opinion of EGEA Secretary, Sylvia and Neil.
- I would also give you a proposal: I would be pleased to speack with you about this issue and if you agree we could organize an informal short meeting in Autopromotech Fair on week 21, for those of you that will be available. I Know that we are all tight on time but this could be a possibility.

Waiting for your comments

Kindest regards

Fausto Manganelli

Da: Fausto Manganelli/Ravaglioli

Per:

"Haase, Hermann" < hermann.haase@bg-verkehr.de>
"HPF" < hermann" < hermann.haase@bg-verkehr.de>
"HPF" < hermann" < hermann.haase@bg-verkehr.de> Cc:

05/05/2013 16:55 Data: Rif: VG 8 documents Oggetto: Inviato da: Fausto Manganelli

Dear Mr Haase

I regret but I have to point out that evidently one more time we were not able to let VG8 understand our aim and our proposal

Let me try to write what I understand should be an abstract of EN1493+RFU according to VG8 proposal

5.7.4.2 Wheel support wehicle lift

The reference is the normative vehicle, according to table 4

Load distribution related to number of axles and weight of the vehicle

Worse positioning respect the end of the platforms

Chassis supporting vehicle lift 5.7.4.3

<a> Lift without arms (ie: short platform lifts)

The reference is the normative vehicle, schematised with various load rectangles (100x140cm,

170x140cm, 100x180cm, 170x180cm) related to the weight of he vehicle

Load distribution related to the weight of the vehicle

Worse positioning of the vehichle respect the end of the platform

 Lift with arms (ie:two post lifts)

The reference is a deviation from the normative vehicle

Load distribution related to the weight of the vehicle as in <A>

There is no load rectangle but the positioning of pick up points is related to a distance in wheel track direction of 100cm and in the wheel base direction the positioning is only related to the concept of the lift (arm length and swiveling capability of arms)

But with some more distinction (defined in RFU)

- A distance of pick up point in wheel base direction less than 100cm has not to be possible or has to be avoided in use (instructions and warning label on lift)
- With distance in wheel base direction of 100cm the calculation has to be done according with a reduced safety factor of 1,2 instead of 1,5
- With distance in wheel base direction of 140cm the safety factor goes back to 1,5 (and reference goes back to the normative vehicle)

Some questions

- The points (*) (**) are to be considered only in case of lifts with "all four arms on one side of the lift?"
- What has to be considered for distances in wheel base direction between 100 and 140 cm (a progressive increase of safety factor from 1,2 to 1,5?)
- From where it comes the value 1,2 of safety factor?
- The third from last sentence of RFU says..." in that case an additional warning label on the lift and appropirate note in the user manual shall include the prohibition to use the lift in this position"

What does it mean? I have to calculate the lift with a reduced safety factor but I have to prohibite the use of the lift in this condition? What is the sense?

- Last sentence of RFU says "If the use of the lift in this way is approved by the manufacturer, a reduction of lift capacity in this position by labeling is not allowed"

What is the sense?

Some further remarks, already pointed out also in last meeting in Berlin

- With reference to item 6 of report 21st Meeting CNB/M/VG8 on 09.04.2013)

if "....After a long discussion (!!!) the group came to the following view: in practice ther are existing a lot of vehicles where the distance of the pick up point in wheel base is less than 1,4m which is required in the normative rectangle..." it means than the concept of normative vehicle is not clear to VG8 members: the normative vehicle is not the worse vehicle (we do not recognize only today that small vehicles exist!. The normative vehicle has been considered the best compromise to have a simple reference for calculation which could be also representative of all the vehicles (including compromise between dimensions and loads, referring to lift calculations).

If there are doubts about the normative vehicle itself we should discuss about it to improve the reliability of the concept!

But the standard has to keep the same philosophy!

If we think that the normative vehicle to day is not representataive we have also to remember that in the old standard the normative vehicle was 100x180cm, much more distant from small cars then now! And we did not have any problems!

- The question in RFU "it is necessary for two post lift where both arms...could swing in the same direction.....to consider this position...? has no sense.

It is obvious that this possible situation has to be considered.

And it is obvious that this is not a misuse.

- The real question should be: why in this kind of lift we shouldn't make reference to the normative vehicle as in all other cases but we have to make reference to an unreal situation that overload the lift?

Only because the standard says that "On vehicle lifts with carrying arms the rated load shall be distrubuted on the four corners of a rectangle with 100cm .(width) with the maximum load at the maximum length of the longest arm and the short arm inthe position which gives the worst condition"??

This is the key sentence, it is very clear and do not lead to misunderstanding.

But it is quite so sure that it doesn't not represent the goal of CEN/TC98WG3 members in writing the standard. And this position was shared also by Mr Trabold (Convenor of CEN/TC98WG3)

Now, since "it is not the role of VG8 to interpret the intention of the standard in a different sense" (see item 6 of report 21st Meeting CNB/M/VG8 on 09.04.2013) it derives from this that the only chance to solve the problem is to ask for a clarification to Standardizatio Group sending an official request to CEN/TC98 Secretary (Mr Armin Weih)

But this never ending story will take so much more time!!

And this is not bearable!

Frankly speacking I personally think that VG8 Members should take on the responsability to set up a RFU that change what it is not correct in the standards!

Sorry if I dwelled so long on explanation but I would like to reach a real conclusion with you before taking decision about how to proceed with EGEA WG1 Members

Many thanks for your attention and waiting for your comment

Kindest regards

Fausto Manganelli

"Haase, Hermann" < hermann.haase@bg-verkehr.de >

Per < Fausto. Manganelli@samirogroup.com >

CC

26/04/2013 15:20

Oggetto VG 8 documents

```
Dear Mr. Manganelli,
```

as discussed by phone I send the report of the last VG 8 meeting and the last edition of the RfU. In the RfU only the last section was amended.

Since I'm on vacation on Monday and Tuesday, I wanted to finish documents quickly. I hope there are not too many mistakes.

If there ar questions please contact me.

Best regards

H. Haase

Leiter

Prüf- und Zertifizierungsstelle

Fachbereich Verkehr und Landschaft im DGUV Test

Hofmühlenstraße 4 01187 Dresden Germany

Notified Body 0417 Fon +49(0)351 4236521 Fax +49(0)351 4236591

e-mail: hermann.haase@bg-verkehr.de

[allegato "CNB M 08 018-R-E Rev03 Draft - 25 04 2013.pdf" eliminato da Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup] [allegato "Report 21st Meeting CNB-M-VG8 09.04.2013 Berlin.pdf" eliminato da Fausto Manganelli/SamiroGroup]