

**UK INTERPRETATIONS GROUP**

<b>INTERPRETATION GROUP # 037</b>	<b>REQUEST FOR INTERPRETATION/METHODS</b>	
<b>Standard:</b> EN71-1 <b>Edition:</b> All	<b>Clause no:</b> 4.7 & 4.8 <b>Clause heading:</b> Edges, Points and metallic wires	<b>Date of Request:</b> 28-01-09
		<b>Source:</b> Tomy
<b>Keywords:</b> Hazardous, functional, sharp edges, sharp points.		
<b>Question:</b> Should the sub-sections of the clause be taken in isolation or read in order? I.E. When assessing sharp edges or points should the assessment to determine whether they present an <i>unreasonable risk of injury</i> be undertaken before the edge/point is determined to be <i>functional</i> ? -A sharp edge/point that is determined to have no <i>unreasonable risk of injury</i> before being determined to be <i>functional</i> does not require a warning. -An assessment which determines an edge/point to be <i>functional</i> regardless of its risk requires a warning.		
<b>Proposer's Comments for an answer:</b> The assessment to determine whether the edge/point presents an <i>unreasonable risk of injury</i> should be undertaken <u>before</u> the edge/point is determined to be <i>functional</i> . An edge/point that has no <i>unreasonable risk of injury</i> should not require an additional (and unnecessary) warning simply by the virtue of the fact that it is also <i>functional</i> , where a non-functional sharp/edge of similar risk does not. It is the risk of injury that is presented by a sharp edge/point and not its purpose, which should determine the need for a warning.		
<b>Interpretation Group Comments/Action:</b>		
<b>Status:</b> <b>Forward to BSI:</b> Interpretation Methods    Amendment <b>No Further Action</b>		
<p style="color: red;">Products such as sellotape dispenser will not fail sharp points, considered functional.</p> <p style="color: red;">It was agreed that "hazardous" takes precedence when deciding whether a functional sharp edge warning is required. If the edge is not hazardous then no warning is required.</p>		