



### **Impact Tested Products – PSSA Members Code of Conduct**

The purpose of this document is to ensure that all impact rated products being sold have a clear definition of their rating and how it has been arrived at with the aim of improving the professionalism within supply and installation of HVM systems.

When marketing, selling or installing impact tested (Hostile Vehicle Mitigation), it is important that you follow the guidance below.

1. All marketing material and documents issued or posted online, including hard and soft copies must clearly state the following:
  - a) The full Performance Rating from the impact test e.g. V/7500(N3)/80/90:0/8
  - b) The relevant impact test standard(s) used
  - c) The relevant blocking segment height and clear span of the actual product tested

If any variants of the “as rated” product are being made available then these variants must have valid design calculations that have been independently assessed and confirmed by an RSES (Register of Security Engineers and Specialists) Principal HVM specialist Engineer using the Design Method in accordance with IWA14.2 but must be fully compliant with requirements.

Each modified version of the product would then have a design method performance classification.

N.B. Testing to one standard does not confer a rating to another standard.

- d) Any post impact test modifications (these must be limited to cosmetic changes only ie. no structural changes) should be clearly identified including gate leaf cladding changes - height / infill / material).
2. Products must not be sold or marketed as 'rated' if they have been modified or are not in the original 'tested' format.

When rated products are being sold that are not in an “as tested” format (e.g. Barrier tested at 4m span being sold as a 5m span unit) they must be clearly identified (in writing) to the customer as “not as rated” and must be issued with a copy of the design assessment from the RSES Principal HVM specialist Engineer.

3. Video, imagery, drawings and specification used for selling or promoting impact rated product must accurately reflect the test conditions for which the product has received its performance rating.

Images and footage from an impact test cannot be misleading in anyway and cannot be used as marketing material for products arrangements that have a design assessment.

4. If the installation and/or the project installation foundation design of a rated product is not in accordance with the “as tested/rated” installation, for whatever reason, then the variant must have valid design calculations that have been independently assessed and confirmed by an RSES Principal HVM specialist engineer. Each modified version of the product would then have a design assessment. The installation must be clearly identified (in writing) to the customer as “not as tested / rated” and must be issued with a copy of the design assessment from the RSES Principal HVM specialist engineer.

Unless agreed with the RSES consultants at the time of engagement, design modifications to suit a specific installation cannot be adopted for other installations.

It is also worth noting that the design method is different for PAS68 and IWA14.2. It is the manufacturers responsibility to ensure they are familiar and fully apply where necessary the ‘design method’ for the applicable standard (PAS68:2013, para 6. IWA14.1: 2013, Annex B).

5. If a product has been impact tested and rated twice at differing widths, using the same impact standard (e.g. PAS68, IWA-14 etc.) with the same vehicle type, weight and speed, then it would be acceptable for all width iterations between the two tested widths to be considered as having the same result and no design assessment would be required subject to the following. This only applies to the non-permeable equipment such as Road blockers, Barriers and Gates but not Bollards.
  - a) The penetration and debris dispersal (if applicable) results used for any of the above iterations will be the greater of the two physical test results.
  - b) The widths of equipment used in the two tests must be within a sensible spectrum e.g. Between 2m and 6m – a 1m wide rated unit would be likely to perform very differently to a 2, 3, 4 or 5m iteration. Our recommendation would be that a minimum blocking segment at the lower end of the spectrum be 2m with the higher end of the spectrum being a maximum of 3 x the minimum (e.g. 6m spectrum upper end for a 2m lower end).

We would still recommend that valid design calculations are carried out on the revisions and that confirmation of these is received from an RSES Principal HVM specialist engineer.