

Template for comments and BIFMA staff observations

Date:	Document: X5.9 Storage
-------	-------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Com men tor	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ¹	Comment (justification for change) by the Commentor	Proposed change by the Commentor	BIFMA observations on each comment submitted
MC	4.2.1 b		te	The wording gives the impression there is necessarily a concentrated top load to be applied whereas it is applicable only for 1 specific case; units<38". This is misleading.	For units with a height <38", Apply the specified...	
MC	4.6		te	The requirements of that section are redundant with sections 4.3 and 4.5	Remove section 4.6 as redundancy will create confusion.	
MC	7.3		te	Section 7.2 limits applicability of the test to units with height of less than 38 ". This test does not.	Suggests adding same wording to end of section 7.3.1	
MC	8.1.2		te	A note should be added that in most cases the worst case for this test is the lightest unit not the biggest/heaviest. A very heavy unit will just not move upon impact	Most of the time, the worst case for this test is the lightest unit not the biggest/heaviest.	
MC	8.1.3.2		te	"The impact shall be centered along a line that is 4"...; figure 8a shows 6 "; which one is the right one? 8.1.3.2 from X5.9 2004 was 6".	Use height from X5.9-2004	
MC	8.2.2.1		te	A note should be added that in most cases the worst case for this test is the lightest unit not the biggest/heaviest. A heavy unit will not disengage as a result of an upward force.	In most cases, the worst case for this test is the lightest unit not the biggest/heaviest one.	
MC	8.3.1.1		te	A note should be added that in most cases the worst case for this test is the lightest unit not the biggest/heaviest. A heavy unit will not disengage as a result of an upward force.	In most cases, the worst case for this test is the lightest unit not the biggest/heaviest one.	
MC	9.2.4		te	Are we allowed to put the unit back into place is it becomes dislodged after one of the force application?	Components shall not become totally separated from the storage unit as the result of the 6 force application (a through f).	
MC	11		te	What about units that have inset casters (non visible) with	Units with a design such that the pedestal body	

1 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and BIFMA staff observations

Date:	Document: X5.9 Storage
-------	-------------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
Com men tor	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ¹	Comment (justification for change) by the Commentor	Proposed change by the Commentor	BIFMA observations on each comment submitted
				the ped body very close to the ground? We got to test such a unit and the bottom would not clear the obstacles.	will not clear the obstacles shall be cycled for a number of cycles equal to the sum of the amount of cycles with and without obstacles for the proper unit category.	
MC	15.2.2.2 b)		te	The note should be identical as the one from 15.2.1.2 a) with the forces detail and it is not why?	Paste note from 15.2.1.2 a) in 15.2.2.2 b)	
MC	17.13.3		te	The standard now calls for 100 drops; 2 X 50 where as it was 50 before and I suspect it is only a cut/paste issue	Remove 17.13.3 b) and c)	
MC	20		te	The standard does not have any provisions for dual pull drawers. Usually interlocks are only on 1 side of the extendible member. Hence; one side is harder to open than the other. What does a lab do if the interlock side fails and the other side passes (yes it happened). The same could also happened or wide pull unit	Add: "For dual pull and wide pull extendible elements, the force shall be measured at the center of each pull (dual pull) and at each end of the wide pulls at a distance equal to one sixth of the extendible element width"	

1 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial