



**CO-ORDINATION OF NOTIFIED BODIES
PPE-Directive 89/686/EEC + amendments**

CNB/P/10.111
Revision 01
Language: E

RECOMMENDATION FOR USE

Number of pages: 1	Date: 16/03/07	Approval by :	Approved on :
Origin:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vertical Group	16/03/07
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Horizontal Committee	13/09/11
		<input type="checkbox"/> Standing Committee	
Question related to: Perforation		EN ISO 20345	Other:
Annex:	Article:	----- Clause: 6.2.1.2	
Key words: Textile inserts. EN ISO 20345 Clause 6.2.1.2			
<p>Question:</p> <p>CEN/TC 161/WG 1+2 decided to include in the second group of amendments to EN ISO 20344-7 the possibility that the textile penetration resistant insert lies above the toecap flange. The reason was that due to the fact that it was flexible and sewn around its edge, the risk of users trapping their foot is very small. Furthermore, its manufacture would be easier.</p> <p>However, as the approval of these amendments will take a long time, it is advised to revise the RU 10.073 document and change the recommended solution.</p> <p>In order to comply with the above-mentioned clause of EN ISO 20345, two possible options could be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sewing a piece of an insole to the fore part of the textile insert. This insole would lie above the toecap flange and the textile insert would be underneath. - Cutting the textile insert in the shape of the toecap flange and sewing it. <p>The first option would make the manufacturing process more expensive and complicated in order to provide protection against a non-existent risk. And concerning the second option, it is very difficult to carry it out properly in practice, which could result in less protection if there are gaps that are not protected.</p>			
<p>Solution:</p> <p>Clause 6.2.1.2 should not apply to flexible textile penetration resistant inserts (attached to the upper) since the risk of accident would not be higher and the requirement would be adapted to what seems to be the real existing situation. Thus the manufacturing process would be simplified and the competition between companies would be fairer. This deviation should be mentioned at least in the test report.</p>			
Sent to: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> members of the VG <input type="checkbox"/> other(s) VG <input type="checkbox"/> HC (2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TC (3) <input type="checkbox"/> SC (4) <input type="checkbox"/> other (5)			

(1) Essential safety requirement
(2) HC = horizontal committee

(3) N° of CEN/TC (Secretary & Chairman)
(4) EEC Standing Committee 89/392

(5) To be specified