



## Rigging Working Group

### E1.50-1, Requirements for the Structural Support of Temporary LED, Video & Display Systems Public Review 3 approved comment resolutions

**Reference document:** E1.50-1, *Requirements for the Structural Support of Temporary LED, Video & Display Systems* (Document number Rig/2023-2001r1)

**ANSI Public review period:** 02 August 2024 through 15 September 2024

**Question:** In your opinion, do you think the requirements of BSR E1.50-1, Requirements for the Structural Support of Temporary LED, Video & Display Systems (Document number Rig/2023-2001r1) are reasonable, and adequately address the intended subject matter?

Please answer the question using one of the options below. Select “Yes”, “Yes, but...” (provide comments to support your opinion), or “No, with reasons” (the document’s requirements are unacceptable or unreasonable). Note that you are offering your opinion, which is in no way construed as a vote of acceptance or approval.

#### Responses:

Marc Hendriks – Yourplan Solutions	No, with reasons
------------------------------------	------------------

#### Individual Comments:

No.	Ref. section	Comment	Proposed resolution
1	1.1 Scope	despite as mentioned on the comment resolution. The wording “large format” is still present. What is large in this respect ? I suggest to remove these words. It makes it clearer.	The word was removed in the last revision.
2	2.5 – 2.5 Definitions	For clarity, I suggest to indicate these definitions also in chapter 4 "example diagram".	Accept in principle. The defined terms are already used in the diagram.
3	3.2.3.5	WLL marking is related to lifting equipment and there for it shall not be mentioned on the LED display frame/cabinet. I agree on the safety factors on all parts in the load path but indicating the WLL on a LED frame is fundamentally not correct. It is however correct for the lifting bar. Instead LED Frames shall indicate with “allowable load” of “max load” and the safety factor used plus the max amount of panels which can be hung from each other	Accept in principle. Section 3.3.2 was revised.
4	3.3.2	I strongly advise to re-consider the need of 1% testing. I do agree that there must be some kind of quality assurance system in place at manufacturer of meant equipment but knowing where 99% of the equipment is made, the requirement will very likely be put aside as it will cost a fortune to full fill. I 1% testing will not add 1% to the cost. More	Accept in principle. The requirement was moved to an annex note.

No.	Ref. section	Comment	Proposed resolution
		<p>something between 10 to 20%. this will be transferred to the end-user  Also when analytically proven , engineers will require testing to back their FEM models. I think its not correct to assume that analytically proven items require less testing.  See also my former comment on this subject</p>	
5	A.3.9	1st bullet point 5/6th sentence .... Nice joke	Thank you. The entire annex note has been rewritten.
6	Other notes	<p>I made the remark about the use of magnets . This was rejected. I agree on the use. This is case for many systems on the marked already but its used for positioning and temporary hanging during installation. After that a positive locking system is added. I can not back it by evidence, but I think superseding codes in the US require positive locking for load bearing parts all the time.... They do in Europe.</p> <p>cheers, thanks. keep up the good work. i will do in europe</p>	Accept. Section 3.3 was revised to accommodate this suggestion.