

Consultation comments received on Rail Industry Standard

Document title: Rail Industry Standard for Wheelsets.

Document number: RIS-2766-RST, Issue number: two, Draft: 2c



Closing date 14 Nov 2022

- 1 Antony Boyle of Harsco
- 2 Sam Foulkes of Lucchini Unipart Rail
- 3 David Polhill - Independent

Summary of comments submitted	Number	CC -Comment categorisation key
Consulted	351	
Critical errors		CE
Editorial errors		ED
Typographical errors		TY
Observations		OB
Total returned		
Classification codes (CC)		
Document change	4	DC
No change	5	NC
Date responses published:		

Consultation					Responses				
No.	Page	Clause	Comment	Proposed revised text	By	Section	Page	CC	[RSSB draft responses] / RST Standards Committee approved responses]
1	49	4.7.1.6	No definition provided as to what a 'flat' is and the difference between 'true flat' and 'wheel under-rotation damage'. On track machines without WSP regularly develop wheel under-rotation damage of the 'multiple flat' type, which does require planned maintenance attention and close monitoring, but does not constitute justification for immediate withdrawal	Provide diagrammatic image showing what is considered to be a 'flat' i.e. a straight chord across a wheel. And additional image showing under-rotation type damage that should be address at the earliest opportunity. The true 'flat' and equivalent out of round and axle load/speed combination should dictate the speed	1			NC	Although this would have been beneficial to include, there would need to be an industry consensus on this content and it's beyond the scope of what can be added after consultation. This has been recorded against the standard and will be included in the next revision.
2	94	Figure 39	Update to full colour image	See attached files.	1			NC	Colour is not normally necessary and coloured items in the background and around the subject can be a distraction. It is agreed that the clarity of the images can be improved and could be added soon after publication of this revision as a limited change release if they depict the same phenomena.
3	11	2.3.3	Clause should be clarified. This could be interpreted as the designer's responsibility to specify a coating/protective system to be used. Alternatively, it could be interpreted that the client specifies the coating/protective system, which the axle designer should simply state within any documentation.	This clause should be steered towards the vehicle builder/maintainer owning the responsibility to suggest a coating/protective system suitable for the application. While wheelset overhaulers may have some return of experience on coatings, axle designers are not typically aware of local operating environments and often, do	2			DC	Specified' changed to 'recorded' and a new guidance clause (G 2.3.10) added: 'A record of the coating system used on the axle is necessary because the need for, and specification of, an axle coating system can have a significant effect on the predicted life of an axle and the maintenance plan.'

Consultation					Responses				
No.	Page	Clause	Comment	Proposed revised text	By	Section	Page	CC	[RSSB draft responses] / RST Standards Committee approved responses]
4	58	4.8.3.2	This clause contradicts Wheelset Overhaul Procedure WOSS 612/10, which is directly quoted by many maintenance plans.	To avoid confusion, this clause should refer the reader to the maintenance plan for any specific criteria for repair & overhaul activities/limits which may have been developed outside the RIS.	2			DC	Guidance clause added to define these marks (taken from WOSS 612/10): 'Axial score marks on axle seats are defined as those with raised edges, burrs, sheared metal or excessive depth, sufficient to cause suspect defects on ultrasonic examination or loss of oil injection pressure on subsequent wheelset overhaul/ dismantling. This excludes raised edges or burrs that have been dressed off using an oilstone or superficial scoring rectified using fine abrasive paper (finer than 360 grade).'
5			RAE/3/-/1 were suggesting BS 5892 series and 2466 & 2766 were updated to be in alignment. Has this proposal approved by WMG been considered as part of this update?		3			NC	Recent RAE/3/-/1 efforts have been to review alignment between the BS 5892 documents and their EN equivalents -with particular emphasis on part 8. In principle requirements set out in the BS or EN standards shouldn't be repeated in GMRT2466 and we have made an effort to avoid that and reference them where it is appropriate.
6	13	2.4.3	Table 3. The superscripts 1, 2 and 3 are not numbered in the Notes below the table	Add numbers to notes	3			DC	Superscript numbering is redundant and has been removed
7	24	G 3.3.4.8	Three or four white lines are mentioned, but it doesn't say which is preferred or if either is acceptable.	Review	3			NC	This guidance is intended to acknowledge historical GB practice and a current EN requirement. Either are acceptable, and as it is not a requirement in this
8	40	4.5	We have been suggesting not to do in-service UAT for a number of years due to being unnecessary, certainly with newer designs of axles and the inherent risks and additional maintenance required to remove covers and end caps. Should a suggestion to move away from in0-service UAT be added? If not a suggestion that the end caps are designed to less dismantling is required. Compare class 373 design for checking hollow axles with class 374.	Consider - If not considered appropriate for a RIS I could add into KTR.	3			NC	The initiatives that I am aware of have not led to any reduction of in-service UAT activity through increased periodicity. Reduction of UAT (at least to overhaul intervals) is a design decision with maintenance benefits and therefore the biggest gains have been made by manufacturers who also maintain their vehicles. Consideration of design features such as hollow axles or more accessible end caps is probably better addressed in the KTR.
9	76-78	Table 14	Is it worth adding more of the previous names into the column? Eg M3 was BRML Wolverton, then Railcare Wolverton. Also TB was Taylor Brothers, the British Wheelsets etc. The important thing is to know where the build and	Consider.	3			DC	Previous names added as suggested.