TOPTESTER OY

TEST REPORT

EN 13964 BALL GUN TEST

Customer:	Ewona Finland Oy
Device name:	Ewona Acustica® suspended ceiling plates Premium+ Madaline

TOPTESTER
Your partner in reliability testing

TOPTESTER OY

1. TEST INFORMATION

CUSTOMER:	Ewona Finland Oy
TEST NAME:	EN 13964 Ball gun test
TEST DATE:	14. – 23. September 2026
TEST SITE:	Toptester laboratory, Rovaniemi

EQUIPMENT UNDER TEST

DEVICE NAME:	Suspended ceiling plates Ewona Acustica®
VERSION:	Premium+ Madaline (3 pcs)

Test ID:	BALL_Ewona_ceiling_plates_260910
Report version:	1.0
Class:	Cust

Persons in charge of the test

Customer:	Markku Taskila
Toptester:	Ossi Hiltunen

2. TEST REPORT HISTORY

Version	Date	Change description	Changes made by
1.0	29.9.2026	First version of the report is 1.0. If no changes are necessary, it will be also the final version.	Ossi Hiltunen

3. CONTENTS

1. TEST INFORMATION 1
2. TEST REPORT HISTORY 2
3. CONTENTS 2
4. TEST SUMMARY 3
5. INTRODUCTION 4
5.1. Background 4
5.2. Equipment under test 4
5.3. Goals of the test 4
6. TEST METHOD AND MEASUREMENT DESCRIPTION 5
6.1. Test Method 5
6.2. Acceptance Criteria 5
6.3. Analyses 5
6.4. Test Equipment, Reliability Control and Measurement 5
7. TEST PROCESS 7
8. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS 11
9. QUALITY CONTROL 12

4. TEST SUMMARY

Used standard or test method summary

This test was done according to annex D: Impact resistance from EN 13964:2014 standard, Class 1A: (16,5 ± 0,8) m/s.

Description of equipment under test

Suspended ceiling plates Ewona Acustica® Premium+ Madaline (3 pcs).

Test result summary

All units withstood the impacts without compromising the functionality and only visual defects detected were dark ball marks caused by impact. Test result is **pass** for all three samples.

Signatures

Test performed and reported by: Ossi Hiltunen

Date: 29.9.2026 Ossi Hiltunen

5. INTRODUCTION

5.1. Background

This test was a part of Equipment Under Test (EUT) product reliability testing.

5.2. Equipment under test

3 pcs of suspended ceiling plates, samples were numbered from 4 to 6 (Figure 1):




Figure 1. Suspended ceiling plates were attached to plywood before the test.

5.3. Goals of the test

The goal of the test was to check the EUT's resistance against handball impacts.

6. TEST METHOD AND MEASUREMENT DESCRIPTION

6.1. Test Method

This test was performed according to annex D: Impact resistance from EN 13964:2014 standard. EUT was fastened to a rack from the plywood with screws and then lifted up to desired height to reach minimum distance from the ball gun barrel. A size 3 handball pressurized to 1,2 bars was shot 36 times total to the EUT distributed like so:

- 12 shots directly from below
- 12 shots with 60° angle
- 12 shots with 60° angle from opposite side

The ball gun was moved between the shots to distribute the impacts as evenly as possible. If a weak spot was found during the test that could affect function or safety, two additional shots were done at this spot. The ball velocity was Class 1A (16,5 ± 0,8) m/s.

6.2. Acceptance Criteria

Acceptance criteria were according to the standard:

"After the impact test, the strength, function and safety of the suspended ceiling shall not have been adversely affected and its appearance shall not have changed to any great degree. Visual examination is adequate to assess this."

6.3. Analyses

Visual checks were carried out continuously between the shots to see possible changes.

6.4. Test Equipment, Reliability Control and Measurement

Ball gun used in the test is presented in Figure 2. The speed of the handball was measured before the test using Speed measurement system - Photo cell and a software created by Toptester. Laboratory conditions were measured with Ruuvi Tag 4in1 sensor.

Table 1. Used equipment

Equipment	Purpose	Serial number	Last calibration	Calibration valid until
Speed measurement system - Photo cell	Ball speed measurement	TT00001	3.6.2026	3.12.2026
Ruuvi Tag 4in1	Lab conditions measurement	ED5C	11.8.2025	11.2.2027



Figure 2. Ball gun used in the test.

7. TEST PROCESS

Laboratory conditions during the test:

Temperature: 17.7 °C
Relative humidity: 48.3 %

Before the test each sample was visually inspected for possible damage. None was found. After the initial inspection, the EUT was attached with screws to the rack. The rack was then lifted to the desired height. In this case, that distance from barrel to the EUT surface was a minimum of 150 cm. (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Test setup (impacts aimed at EUT from 60° angle on the left and directly from below).

The EUT were inspected between each shot and after the test. The after-test pictures are shown in Figure 4, Figure 5 and Figure 6.




Figure 4. Sample 4 after the test. There were no mechanical defects detected and only visual changes detected were dark ball marks from impact.




Figure 5. Sample 5 after the test There were no mechanical defects detected and only visual changes detected were dark ball marks from impact



Figure 6. Sample 6 after the test. There were no mechanical defects detected and only visual changes detected were dark ball marks from impact

8. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

All units withstood the impacts without compromising the functionality and only visual defects detected were dark ball marks caused by impact.

Sample 4 functionality was not compromised. Only visual defects detected were dark ball marks caused by impacts.→ Test result is **pass.**

Sample 5 functionality was not compromised. Only visual defects detected were dark ball marks caused by impacts.→ Test result is **pass.**

Sample 6 functionality was not compromised. Only visual defects detected were dark ball marks caused by impacts.→ Test result is **pass.**

9. QUALITY CONTROL

