

Candidate for Standardization Pilot Program - Status Report

September 27, 2011

Michael Burshtin, Standardization Coordinator

Dale Engelhardt, Vice Chair Technical Subcommittee



Basic Standardization Approach

- Development of Standards embraced same process used to develop vehicle specifications
- Use of Technical Subgroups to disposition suggested Standardization Candidates, and to develop wording for resulting Standards
- These Technical Subgroups are our Subject Matter Experts, and intimately know the vehicle specification details

Standardization Process Flow

- Candidate for Standardization Form submitted
- Assigned to appropriate Technical Subgroup
- Subgroup does initial assessment (Proceed? Y/N); if approved develops appropriate wording for draft Standard, economic check
- Draft Standard reviewed by Standardization Working Group, and Executive Board
- Standard then issued, using the Document Management System

Pilot Program Used to Test Standardization Process

- Pilot Program
 - Established in May
 - Seven standardization candidates identified; at least one for each Technical Subgroup to process
 - Train set specification delayed work
 - First standards should be processed this month

Seven Pilot Program Candidates

- 1 – Wheelset – still in process
- 2 – Brake Discs – Standard developed
- 3 – Brake Shoes – Standard developed
- 4 – Brake Valves – Rejected
- 5 – Seats – Rejected
- 6 – Windows – still in process
- 7 – HVAC – Rejected, no interface baseline

Issues Found During Pilot Process

- Process took much longer than expected
- Major issues – lack of Subgroup member interest in participation; no current baseline vehicle yet designed to use as basis for subsystem interface Standards
- Minor issues – improvements in process steps; some Candidates were too broad and Subgroups couldn't come to full agreement on all items of a Candidate

Greatest Challenge

- Most significant issue encountered by all Subgroups was an extreme lack of interest and participation by their members to work on the concepts of Standardization
- Only one quarter to one-third of Subgroup committee membership have been participating in Standardization work

No Urgency

- Of those members who did participate, a great lack of urgency to respond to Standardization work tasks was also encountered
- This is in general contrast to much higher member responsiveness found when drafting a vehicle specification (except for Trainset, which had limited interest)

Delays Resulted

- Lack of participation, combined with slow response to task assignments, have resulted in lengthy delays in developing the Pilot Standards

Must Determine Reason for Low Member Support

- We need to determine why this is so
- Perhaps the next step might be to determine how to assemble a similar team for standardization, if it is not happening within the Technical Subgroups
- Consultant support may be needed, but this may result in backlash from volunteer members and further reduce their active involvement

Lack of Current PRIIA Vehicle Hinders Interface Standards

- Where a Subsystem interface mounting standard was proposed, the Subgroups found it difficult to proceed further without having a starting point with a candidate PRIIA car already designed, as a starting point
- When considered worthwhile to proceed, they found it necessary to defer further work until the design efforts have started upon the first PRIIA standard railcar order

Process Improvements Are Needed

- Research work that takes place at the start of the standardization process was found much more complex than expected
- Determining if work on a proposed Standard should be pursued takes some time
- If approved, then must establish the process to be used to create a Standard (use an existing one, purchase one, write one, etc.)

Recommend Workflow Improvements

- Divide into additional initial steps
- Evaluate the merits of the candidate
- Identify/recommend sources of a standard or inputs to a standard
- Conduct a limited life cycle cost analysis
- Then develop or acquire the standard itself

Economic Analysis Not Understood

- Technical Subgroups not clear as to what is the process for a Candidate economic analysis
- Financial Advisor assigned also not clear as to what should be done as a formal process
- Have found that AAR does little/no formal economic analysis of freight car Standards
- Formal economic analysis was not practiced in Technical Subgroup preparation of vehicle specifications, process not well understood

Summary - Recommend Changes

- Decide if Technical Subgroups should continue to be used for Standards development
- If not, need to determine their replacement
- Need to determine why is there so little Technical subgroup member interest in Standardization
- Make needed improvements in workflow
- Defer formal economic analysis until this process is better defined and understood