



**SLOVENSKI STANDARD**  
**kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024**  
**01-julij-2024**

---

**Oprema otroških igrišč - 2. del: Odgovori na zahteve za razlago standarda EN 1176:2017 in njegovih delov (2020 -- 2022)**

Playground equipment for children - Part 2: Replies to requests for interpretation of EN 1176:2017 and its parts (2020 -- 2022)

Kinderspielplatzgeräte - Teil 2: Antworten zu Interpretationsanfragen der Jahre 2020 -- 2022 zur EN 1176:2017 und deren Teilen

Équipements d'aires de jeux pour enfants - Partie 2: Réponses aux demandes d'interprétation de l'EN 1176:2017 et de ses parties (2020 - -2022)

**Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z: FprCEN/TR 17842-2**

[kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024](http://standards.slovenski-institut.si/standards/slovenski-standard/17842-2-2024)

<http://standards.slovenski-institut.si/standards/slovenski-standard/17842-2-2024>

**ICS:**

97.200.40      Igrišča      Playgrounds

**kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024      en,fr,de**



TECHNICAL REPORT  
RAPPORT TECHNIQUE  
TECHNISCHER REPORT

**FINAL DRAFT**  
**FprCEN/TR 17842-2**

April 2024

---

ICS

English Version

Playground equipment for children - Part 2: Replies to  
requests for interpretation of EN 1176:2017 and its parts  
(2020 -- 2022)

Équipements d'aires de jeux pour enfants - Partie 2:  
Réponses aux demandes d'interprétation de l'EN  
1176:2017 et de ses parties (2020 - -2022)

Kinderspielplatzgeräte - Teil 2: Antworten zu  
Interpretationsanfragen der Jahre 2020 -- 2022 zur EN  
1176:2017 und deren Teilen

This draft Technical Report is submitted to CEN members for Vote. It has been drawn up by the Technical Committee CEN/TC 136.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye and United Kingdom.

Recipients of this draft are invited to submit, with their comments, notification of any relevant patent rights of which they are aware and to provide supporting documentation.

**Warning** : This document is not a Technical Report. It is distributed for review and comments. It is subject to change without notice and shall not be referred to as a Technical Report.

[ksIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024>



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION  
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION  
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

**CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Rue de la Science 23, B-1040 Brussels**

---

<b>Contents</b>		Page
<b>European foreword</b> .....		3
<b>Introduction</b> .....		4
<b>1</b>	<b>Scope</b> .....	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Normative references</b> .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Terms and definitions</b> .....	7
<b>4</b>	<b>EN 1176-1:2017, Playground equipment and surfacing — Part 1: General safety requirements and test methods</b> .....	7
<b>5</b>	<b>EN 1176-2:2017+AC:2019, Playground equipment and surfacing — Part 2: Additional specific safety requirements and test methods for swings</b> .....	22
<b>6</b>	<b>EN 1176-3:2017, Playground equipment — Part 3: Additional specific safety requirements and test methods for slides</b> .....	26
<b>7</b>	<b>EN 1176-4:2017+AC:2019, Playground equipment and surfacing - Part 4: Additional specific safety requirements and test methods for cableways</b> .....	27
<b>8</b>	<b>EN 1176-5:2019, Playground equipment and surfacing — Part 5: Additional specific safety requirements and test methods for carousels</b> .....	28
<b>9</b>	<b>EN 1176-6:2017+AC:2019, Playground equipment — Part 6: Additional specific safety requirements and test methods for rocking equipment</b> .....	30
<b>10</b>	<b>EN 1176-7:2020, Playground equipment and surfacing — Part 7: Guidance on installation, inspection, maintenance and operation</b> .....	31
<b>Bibliography</b> .....		33

[ksist-tp FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024>

## European foreword

This document (FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024) has been prepared by Technical Committee CEN/TC 136 “Sports, playground and other recreational facilities and equipment”, the secretariat of which is held by DIN.

This document is currently submitted to the Vote on TR.

CEN/TR 1784 consists of the following parts, under the general title Playground equipment for children — Replies to requests for interpretation of EN 1176:2017 and its parts:

- Part 1: Replies to requests for interpretation of EN 1176:2017 and its parts (2018-2019)
- Part 2: Replies to requests for interpretation of EN 1176:2017 and its parts (2020-2022)

**iTeh Standards**  
**(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)**  
**Document Preview**

[kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024>

## Introduction

### Interpretations and no-action decisions

This document contains all agreed responses to interpretation requests of the years 2020 to 2022 concerning the understanding of clauses and requirements in EN 1176 and its parts. The responses concern those requests that have resulted in an interpretation or a decision that no action is required as the standard is sufficiently clear. It should bring a close to all interpretations made to EN 1176 and its parts.

An interpretation does not have the same status as the text of the standard. However, following an interpretation gives assurance that the relevant clause of the standard has been applied correctly.

An interpretation is a clarification of the meaning of the standard.

### Disclaimer

The interpretations have been prepared by the interpretation panel of CEN/TC 136/SC 1 in accordance with an agreed process and finally confirmed by the whole CEN/TC 136/SC 1 prior to responding back to the enquiring National Standardization Body. The information contained herein should always be considered in association with the original published text contained in the EN 1176 standard series.

Requests for interpretations can be submitted by a CEN member body through its national mirror committee or by a CEN/TC 136 liaison organization (but not directly by an individual or a company) – in accordance with the interpretation panel process agreed by CEN/TC 136/SC 1. The requests are channelled to the CEN/TC 136/SC 1 interpretation panel, which will then deal with the request.

A request for an interpretation may lead to:

- a) an interpretation of the standard with no action to the standard (no revision and no amendment)

This should reflect a reasonable interpretation of how the standard should be used, taking into account:

- 1) the wording of the standard;
- 2) the rationale of the standard;
- 3) the history of the standard.

This is also applicable when it is agreed that the standard appropriately specifies how playground equipment is assessed.

- b) a proposal for an amendment of the standard

This is applicable when it is agreed that the existing standard clauses need urgent update, for example, if the interpretation identifies a serious conflict that compromises safety.

**NOTE** All replies to interpretation requests received since 2017 are published in the CEN/TR 17842 series. As required, additional parts of this TR are published to include any new interpretations that have been agreed since the publication of the previous TR part. Proposals for amendments will be progressed as new work item proposals in accordance with CEN rules.

## c) a future revision

It is not part of the interpretation panel process to carry out new work that was not previously covered within the published EN 1176 parts and clauses. Future work requests should always be raised by National Standard Bodies using the “Future work request template” to ensure full consideration is given to the necessity and possible consequences, before starting any new work on EN 1176 and its parts.

**Responses to interpretation requests**

Since requests for interpretations are submitted through a CEN member body, it is assumed that the member body will keep itself informed about decisions concerning the request and its progress and will itself inform the originator of the request, as appropriate.

The following information requests have been included in this document:

**2020****Table 1**

<b>Request Number</b>	<b>Standard reference</b>	<b>Clause</b>	<b>Submitting country</b>	<b>Key words</b>
2020-01	EN 1176-1	4.2.12.2	Sweden	Sand cranes
2020-02	EN1176-2	4.5, 3.13, 4.6.3 & Annex B	Netherlands	Parent-child swing
2020-03	EN 1176-5	5.2.3	Finland	Ground clearance, tapered underside
2020-04	EN1176-6	3.11, 4.5	Denmark	Restraint of motion, damping
2020-05	EN 1176-2	3.13	Denmark	Group swing seat, parent-child swing
2020-06	EN 1176-1	A.2.6.1	Denmark	Swing seats, gondola, traditional
2020-07	EN 1176-1	Annex H	Lithuania	adequate level of impact attenuating surfacing
2020-08	EN 1176-7	scope	Lithuania	Scope
2020-09	EN 1176-2	Impact Area, Group swing seat	Netherlands	Impact area, group swing
2020-12	EN 1176-5	4.3 and 4.5, Table 1	Sweden	Type D, user stations, Annex E
2020-13	EN 1176-4	4.9	Türkiye	Impact test method
2020-14	EN 1176-1	4.2.8.5.4	Finland	Adjacent platforms

**FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024 (E)****2021****Table 2**

<b>Request Number</b>	<b>Standard reference</b>	<b>Clause</b>	<b>Submitting country</b>	<b>Key words</b>
2021-01	1176-1	4.2.8.2.4, table 4	Sweden	Bark, woodchip, particle size
2021-02	1176-1	4.2.7.2b	Sweden	Entrapment, partially bound test probe

**2022****Table 3**

<b>Request Number</b>	<b>Standard reference</b>	<b>Clause</b>	<b>Submitting country</b>	<b>Key words</b>
2022-02	EN 1176-1	7.2.7.2	Sweden	Partially bound openings
2022-03	EN 1176-3	4.8	Finland	Impact areas, slides, falling spaces
2022-04	EN 1176-1	4.2.8.4	Finland	Falling space, obstacles, climbing, risk assessment
2022-05	EN 1176-1	4.2.4.3	Finland	Guardrails, falling height, climbing

**iTeh Standards**  
**(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)**  
**Document Preview**

[kSIST-TP FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/a7095c68-006b-427e-8700-f082539fdbf0/ksist-tp-fprcen-tr-17842-2-2024>



## 1 Scope

The purpose of this document is to publish replies to requests for interpretations to all parts of EN 1176 which have been drafted by the interpretation panel and confirmed by CEN/TC 136/SC 1.

## 2 Normative references

There are no normative references in this document.

## 3 Terms and definitions

No terms and definitions are listed in this document.

ISO and IEC maintain terminology databases for use in standardization at the following addresses:

- ISO Online browsing platform: available at <https://www.iso.org/obp/>
- IEC Electropedia: available at <https://www.electropedia.org/>

## 4 EN 1176-1:2017, Playground equipment and surfacing — Part 1: General safety requirements and test methods

### 4.1 Interpretation request 2022-05 – Finland: 4.2.4.3 Guardrails

#### 4.1.1 Member body question

1. Is the underside of a guardrail (A) allowed to have elements or geometries (B) that could be used for climbing? See Figure 1.
2. If geometries that could be used for climbing do exist, should the guard rail be included to falling height?



Figure 1

#### 4.1.2 Member body proposal

1. Yes. The requirement to discourage climbing is given only for barriers and not for the guard rails.
2. In line with interpretation 2011-04, only if the guardrail allows access to higher locations, the guard rail is considered a climbing element and should be included to the falling height.

**FprCEN/TR 17842-2:2024 (E)****4.1.3 Interpretation Panel**

Proposed track: No action

**4.1.4 Comments/proposal for an answer**

A Guardrail' is defined in EN 1176-1:2017, clause 3.23, as 'rail intended to prevent a user from falling'.

Requirements for 'Guardrails' are given in EN 1176-1:2017, clause 4.2.4.3, which do not require them to discourage climbing.

To answer the specific MB Questions:

1. Yes. The requirement to discourage climbing is given only for barriers and not for the guardrails.
2. Yes. Any elements that encourage climbing to higher sections of the equipment should be included in the 'Free Height of Fall'. (EN 1176-1:2017, clause 4.2.8.1, includes examples of what features could encourage climbing 'for roofs, or other features not intended for play'. Guardrails are not specifically mentioned although they would generally be expected as a 'feature not intended for play'.)

The Interpretation Panel also noted that when considering a fall onto a platform that is more than 1m high, the surface of the lower platform shall present the necessary impact attenuating properties, in line with EN 1176-1:2017, clause 4.2.8.5.4.

**4.2 Interpretation request 2021-02 – Sweden: 4.2.7.2 b) – Entrapment, partially bound test probe****4.2.1 Member body question**

Our questions relate to paragraph 4.2.7.2 b) and the connected test method D2.2. This works perfectly fine for rectangular openings. However, for angular/V-shaped openings in range 2, you get totally different minimum angle depending on whether you use the shoulder part or the test template D.

See also separate document for further illustrations and explanation of the problem.

Based on the findings in the separate document, should we:

- Use only the shoulder portion, approving angles >75 degrees?
- Use only the test template D, approving angles >60 degrees?

**4.2.2 Member body proposal**

Either change the clause and the test method to use ONLY one of the following:

- Shoulder portion of the template
- Test probe D

**4.2.3 Interpretation Panel**

Proposed track: No action

#### 4.2.4 Comments/proposal for an answer

EN 1176-1:2017, 4.2.7.2, b), 2) states:

'Range 2: (template centre line from horizontal to + 45°); when the template apex contacts the base of the opening, the depth of the opening shall be less than the 'A' portion of the template. If the depth of the opening is greater than the 'A' portion of the template all parts of the opening above the 'A' portion shall also allow insertion of the **shoulder section** of the template or **probe D**.'

The two test methods given in EN 1176-1:2017, 4.2.7.2, b),2) produce different results, for the same angular openings, when tested with either the shoulder section of the template or probe D. Because of that, use of probe D is labelled in Figure D.6 'pass but not the minimum requirement'.

The intention of EN 1176, when alternative tests are given, is based on whether the test requirements are published as an 'and' or 'or':

- If the requirement says 'and,' then both tests must pass, and it is worst case situation that is taken.
- If the requirement says 'or,' then only one test must pass, and it is not worst case.

The example we are considering in EN 1176-1, 4.2.7.2, b),2) is 'or', so not worst case.

Both of the methods (shoulder section and probe D) are shown in Figure D.6. As the requirement is an **or**, the opening can be considered to pass if either method gives the pass result.

#### 4.3 Interpretation request 2022-02 – Sweden: 4.2.7.2 b) – Entrapment, partially bound test probe

##### 4.3.1 Member body question

We appreciate the clarification given to our previous request about this paragraph. We have an additional request regarding the same paragraph, 4.2.7.2 b) and exactly how the probe D should be used.

The standard states 'all parts of the opening above the 'A' portion shall also allow insertion of the ... probe D.'

The test procedure connected to above is shown in Figure D.6.

In the annex attached to this document, we illustrate two different ways of performing this test, Example A and Example B. Should the probe be used with its EDGE (example A) or its centre (example B) in tangent with depth A?

Using example B, the test will not pass any angles less than 90 degrees given the relationship between the radius of the probe and the depth of the A-portion.

Using example A will pass angles from around 60 degrees and upwards.

##### 4.3.2 Member body proposal

The result when testing according to example A is in line with both clause 4.2.7.1 (60 degrees) and the text description given under 4.2.7.2 b) ('...all parts above...'). Hence our proposal is that the procedure should be performed with the edge of probe D in tangent with depth A.

To avoid confusion:

- Figure D.6 should be revised accordingly.
- Add an illustration of how the test should be performed in a V-shaped opening for interval 2.