

CIC: “FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS”

PREPARED BY CAI, FLORENS AND TRITON IN JUNE 2008

1. After adopting the CIC inspection standard what has been the experience of CAI / Florens / Triton as a lessor?

Favorable. We've experienced improved turn times, reduction in surveys, and faster approvals. However, we have also realized that multiple inspection standards result in deficiencies in estimate accuracy, difficulties in training / certification of inspectors, and the overall consistency of the inspection process. This is why we are here to discuss the alignment of these standards.

2. Has any type of testing been performed by CAI, Florens, or Triton?

Instead of attempting to simulate the various damage conditions on a limited sampling of containers, we felt that the existing field test results of millions of containers being operated under UCIRC standards for the past 10 years by major shipping lines was much better than any laboratory testing.

3. Why hasn't the entire IICL adopted the CIC inspection standard?

We are not in a position to answer this question. We suggest the individual IICL members should be asked this.

4. Why are front panel criteria different than the side panels?

To retain the IICL format, the proposed standards keep the front panel within the ISO +5mm criteria instead of using the ISO +20mm as applied to the sides. UCIRC applies ISO +40mm to all panels.

5. Why are there two into-cube criteria, 50mm for a bow and 35mm for a dent, bow vs. dent?

As the 50mm into-cube bow criteria already existed in IICL-5, we left it in place. We eliminated all panel dent deflection criteria (mainly to get rid of outside dent repairs) and replaced them with envelope criteria (i.e. out-of-ISO and into-cube criteria). So we needed an into-cube dent criteria. We could have used 50mm as in bows, but decided a more conservative approach of 35mm was conducive to our efforts (i.e. we changed the IICL-5 dent criteria into an into-cube criteria). Note that a dent is visually more evident than a bow.

6. Where did the 35mm panel dent criterion come from / the elimination of standing panel dents / envelope criteria vs. a deflection criteria?

See explanation # 5 above.

7. IICL ISO +20mm criteria vs. UCIRC past-the-casting criteria; particularly as it applies to the roof

When specifying an over-ISO criteria, UCIRC references the corner casting faces while IICL references the ISO envelope. As a result, the UCIRC roof criteria is 40mm above the corner castings. We applied ISO +20mm to the ISO roof envelope which is 6mm below the corner casting to get castings +14mm which we rounded out to castings +15mm.

8. Into-cube measurement on the roof sheet. Why 50mm instead of 70mm?

One would need to consider the real significance of allowing the roof to go 70mm into the cube (70mm below the top of the side rails), We further should consider the value of IICL field measurement methods. We reduced to 50mm as a more realistic and industry acceptable compromise.

9. Why are criteria noted as limits and the use of measuring devices in mm scale?

Criteria are always written as limits (the largest amount that does not require repair), and criteria should always be set at readable points on a metric scale (i.e. 5mm increments).

10. Into-cube vs. cube reduction criteria; What's the difference?

An into-cube criteria is based on a deflection beyond any plane that defines a cube surface (like the plane of the surfaces of the inner standing corrugations). A cube reduction (or width reduction) takes into account the opposite side into-cube dents. But "opposite" has to be defined (IICL uses 200mm vertically and one corrugation width horizontally).

11. Why avoid mixing inspection and repair criteria?

Inspection criteria should only specify repair or don't repair. The repair method is for the repair manual. Also, the criteria should not vary depending on the cause of the damage.

12. Controlling vs. non-controlling criteria (e.g. crossmember web dents) / appearance of criteria vs. actual effect.

Certain criteria do not control the repair, because by the time the criteria is reached, some other criterion has been violated necessitating repair. The UCIRC roof outward beyond the castings 40mm and the UCIRC crossmember web limit of 75mm are likely of this type. Since these are not controlling, it is better to put them at some more moderate level to make the criteria more palatable to users. Take the extremes out whenever possible. Also, even when the extreme criteria are controlling, they usually save only a small number of repairs, as most damage is at lower levels (e.g. the difference between ISO +20mm and ISO +40mm may, in fact, be very small in terms of the number of repairs).

13. What is the history of corner post criteria?

This relates to corner post dents.

UCIRC Rev 3: 21-APR-04: single dent at 20mm

UCIRC Rev 2: 31-MAY-00: single dent at 25mm

UCIRC Rev 1: 04-JUN-99: single dent at 25mm

IICL-5: single dent at 25mm / two dents at 15mm

IICL-4R: single dent at 20mm / two dents at 15mm

14. Certification requirements vs. in-service requirements / pass or fail criteria for physical testing.

We should not expect in-service containers to pass ISO certification tests for new containers.