





• <b>Preliminary energy test (50%)</b>	125 kJ
– Net height $h_v$	2.32 m
– Penetration of test body	yes <input type="checkbox"/> / no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
– Braking time $t_s$	0.25 s
– Braking distance $b_s$	3.20 m
– Sum of the tensile forces in the upper cables	69 kN
– Sum of the tensile forces in the lower cables	75 kN
– Maximum of the tensile forces in a stay cable	28 kN
– List of damaged elements	No damage to load-bearing structural components. Four of the four braking components were deformed and four were replaced for the main test as was the seam cable in the central area.
– Assessment of repairs	The scope of the repairs necessary after the test is assessed as minor. The time required to complete the repairs was 8.5 man hours.
• <b>Main energy test (100%)</b>	250 kJ
– Penetration of test body	yes <input type="checkbox"/> / no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
– Braking time $t_s$	0.27 s
– <i>Maximum permissible braking distance <math>b_s</math></i>	5.0 m
– Measured braking distance $b_s$	4.20 m
– <i>Minimum permissible residual braking height <math>h_n</math></i>	1.0 m
– Measured residual braking height $h_n$	1.1 m
– Sum of the tensile forces in the upper cables	88 kN
– Sum of the tensile forces in the lower cables	85 kN
– Maximum of the tensile forces in a stay cable	51 kN
– List of damaged elements	Four of the four braking components were deformed. The installed overload cables were extended by different lengths.
• <b>Assessment of special criteria</b>	
– Comments on assembly and on the assembly instructions	The system is very easy to assemble.
– Comments on adaptability to the terrain	Adaptability to the terrain is normal.



– Comments on design complexity

The design is very simple. Damaged components are easy to replace.

– Comments on anticipated service life

The system components are supplied in accordance with the customer's requirements and specifications for the service life of the system. The expected service life of the standard version is assessed as adequate.

## Statics – test results of 30 July 2009

• **Maximum forces at post head**

– Transverse force $V_y$	51 kN
– Normal force N	10 kN
– Tangential force $V_z$	23 kN

• **Static dummy loads at post head**

Load case 1 (y axis)

– Transverse force $V_y$	66 kN
– Normal force N	13 kN
– Tangential force $V_z$	8 kN

• **Static dummy loads at post head**

Load case 2 (z axis)

– Transverse force $V_y$	43 kN
– Normal force N	8 kN
– Tangential force $V_z$	30 kN

• **Demonstrated post cross-sections**

Post with rock mounting

– Net height	2.0 m	2.5 m	3.0 m
– Post length	2.23 m	2.73 m	3.23 m
– Profile	HEA 180	HEA 200	HEA 220
– Steel grade	S 355	S 355	S 355

• **Demonstrated post cross-sections**

Post sand back-filled

– Net height	2.0 m	2.5 m	3.0 m
– Post length	3.63 m	4.33 m	5.03 m
– Profile	HEA 220	HEA 240	HEA 240
– Steel grade	S 355	S 355	S 355

• **Demonstrated post cross-sections**

Post with predetermined breaking point

– Net height	2.0 m	2.5 m	3.0 m
– Post length	2.23 m	2.73 m	3.23 m
– Profile	HEA 200	HEA 220	HEA 240
– Steel grade	S 355	S 355	S 355



## Overall assessment

Test passed

Test passed with reservations

Tested according to the following guidelines: GERBER, W. 2001: Guideline for the approval of rockfall protection kits. Environment in practice. Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL. Berne, 39 pages. Revised June 2006.

and

GERBER W., Anleitung zur Bemessung von Schutznetzen mit eingespannten Stützen, Umwelt Vollzug. Bundesamt für Umwelt, Eidg. Forschungsanstalt WSL, Bern, Entwurf Juni 2007 (Draft guideline in German on the dimensioning of protective nets with support posts, 2007)

**RESERVATION:** Should deficiencies arise following certification of the safety net, FOEN may revoke product release and delete it from the type approval list.

**Date**

14.09.09

**Name, position**

Andreas Götz, Vice Director

**Signatures**