



Newest findings about possibilities and limits of visual rope inspection

Marina Härtel, B.Sc., IFT University of Stuttgart Dipl. Ing. Sven Winter, IFT University of Stuttgart Dipl. Ing. Konstantin Kühner, IFT University of Stuttgart Urs Amiet, Federal Office of Transport (FOT)

Overview

- Introduction
- Current situatuion
- Field trials
- Evaluation and findings of field trials
- Optical inspection device Winspect
- Development of a rating system



Introduction – Aim of project

- Determine the reliability and limits of the visual rope inspection type A and C
- Development of a system to improve the visual rope inspection
- Intervals (frequencies) of visual inspections were <u>not</u> part of the project
- Recommendation of OITAF Committee No. II regarding visual inspection

Parameter	Type A	Туре В	Type C
Speed	<0,3 <i>m/s</i>	0	<1 <i>m/s</i>
Stop on demand	yes	Not applicable	yes

Table 18 — Definition of inspection types

Source: PrEN 12927:2016



Introduction – Necessity of visual rope inspection

Magnetic Rope Testing		Visual Inspection
Inner wire breaks Wire breaks in strand valley	Heavy corrosion Heavy wire damaging Outer wire breaks Former clamp areas Lightning strike	Notches, scratches, hair lines Touching of strands Beginning corrosion Wire Distortion Disturbance in rope symmetry Lightning strike



Introduction – Necessity of visual rope inspection

Example: Damage of slipped clamp



- Martensite and brittle surface at a length of 41 cm
- Discovered at MRT testing \rightarrow 40 % loss of metallic area



Current situation

- Work environment often not ideal
 - Narrow work platform or no work platform at all
 - Inspection on ladders (could be unsafe if ladder is not permanently installed)
 - Insufficient light situation (blinding sun, dark environment, ...)
- Inspection without any breaks (Decreasing concentration)









Current situation



Inspection with two people: hardly possible to see whole rope circumference

Field trials

Examples for artificial damages



corrosion



hair lines



clustering of wire breaks





Field trials

- Inspections at 4 installations / 5 stations
- Different speeds
- Different workplace environments
- With and without tools
- 21 participants









Evaluation of field trials





Evaluation of field trials



Evaluation of field trials

- Biggest influences during an inspections according to research results
 - Lighting conditions
 - Sun protection
 - Background
 - Workplace environment
 - Possibility to sit or lie down
 - Secure
 - Sufficiently comfortable
 - Sufficient distance to rope





Optical inspection device



Source: http://www.winspect.info/

- Recording of the whole rope circumference by four cameras
- Analysis and Evaluation of the image data by the software
- Advantages:
 - High inspection speed
 - Inspection with one person possible
 - Documentation
 - Extension of inspection intervals possible (depending on local regulations)



Optical inspection device

Evaluation of the rope





Evaluation of the rope diameter and lay length



Bozen/Bolzano 6 - 9 June 2017

- Aim: Operator gets an impression regarding the quality of the inspections
- Content:
 - Rating of the workplace environment
 - Rating of inspection conditions
 - Rating of inspector
- Classification of results in three categories



Nr.	Criterias	max. points
2	Sun protection	4
4	Background	4
6	Switch to stop rope	1
8	Distance to rope	2
10	Duration of inspection until taking a break at 0,3 m/s	2
12	Rope alignment	2
	Sum	30



23-30 points	17-22 points	Less than 17 points
Category 1	Category 2	Category 3
No improvements necessary	Improvements possible to increase rate of detected damages	Improvements recommended, rate of detected damages not sufficient



• Useful Illustrations to demonstrate possible improvements

for example:











Thank you very much for your attention

