

EGOLF Agreement 040-2021

Subject of Agreement (max. 60 characters)	Common interpretation of the requirements to classify C0 for fire and smoke control doorsets and windows
Related test standard	EN 1634-1, EN 1634-3, EN 16034, EN 14600, EN 13501-2
Date of issue	06/12/2021
Reference original query	EGOLF Workshop on durability of self-closing fire and smoke control doors (22.09.2020 online meeting)
Previous publication number (if applicable)	TC2 N951rev3
EGA for attention of (please state CEN TC/WG/TG)	n/a
Keywords (max. 20)	durability, self-closing, classification, C0, minimum requirement, pre-conditioning

Problem

There is a misinterpretation of minimum requirements in the C0 classification of fire and/or smoke control doorsets.

Proposal

Mechanical pre-conditioning tests defined in EN 1634-1 (8.2) or in EN 16034 Annex A shall not be considered as a substitute to actual cycling (repeated opening and closing) test according to EN 1191.

The mechanical pre-conditioning test (25 cycles) shall not be taken into account as evidence to classify doorsets/window according to EN 16034 Table 1.

One single mechanical pre-conditioning test according to EN 1634-1/EN 1634-3/EN 16034 Annex A is not equivalent to one single cycle according to EN 1191.

Praxis

EN 1634-1 test + mechanical pre-conditioning tests = fire resistance + self-closing (e.g.: EI₂₃₀-C)
EN 1634-3 test + mechanical pre-conditioning tests = smoke control + self-closing (e.g.: CS₂₀₀)

EN 1634-1 test + mechanical pre-conditioning tests + EN 1191 test = fire resistance + self-closing + durability of self-closing (against degradation) (e.g.: EI₂₃₀-C0)

EN 1634-3 test + mechanical pre-conditioning tests + EN 1191 test = smoke control + self-closing + durability of self-closing (against degradation) (e.g.: C0S_a)

Reasoning: The test conditions described in mentioned parts of EN 16034:2014 / EN 1634-1 / EN 1634-3 are different when compared to conditions required by EN 1191 (e.g. opening angle, velocity of moving etc.).