

Name:	Anonymous
Title of document:	Technical information sheet – FRNSW compatible Storz hose connections

Page or section no.	Section title / subject of section	Specific comments or suggestions
p2	Section 4 Background, first clause	Change 'cast brass' to 'forged brass'
FRNSW comment: Agreed. Changed as requested.		
p2	Section 5.1, third clause	Add '(forged)' to statement
FRNSW comment: Not adopted as Table 2.1 does not specify 'forged' directly, but rather references the relevant standard		
p5	Section 6.3.4, first clause note	Change to forged brass. Only gunmetal is diecast
FRNSW comment: Agreed. Changed as requested.		
P5	Section 6.3.4(d)	Torque range of given manufactured Storz connectors is 4 to 7 Nm
FRNSW comment: Not adopted as the specified torque range encompasses the given manufacturer denoted above and allows ± 1 Nm of tolerance for other manufacturers.		
P5	Section 7.2	Insert 'UV stabilised' between inert polymer
FRNSW comment: Agreed. Changed as requested.		

General comments or suggestions
None provided

Name:	Bruce Swan
Company:	Dobbie
Title of document:	Technical information sheet – FRNSW compatible Storz hose connections

Page or section no.	Section title / subject of section	Specific comments or suggestions
p1	Section 4 Background	Contains the statement “FBT was based on the London ‘V’ thread which is sometimes referred to as NSW ‘V’ thread.” Yet at Clause 6.3.2 (b) it states the FBT adaptor must have “female 2 ½ X 5 ½ TPI Whitworth form Thread (i.e. FBT)”. I have not previously heard of the Whitworth Thread being referred as the ‘London Thread’. In fact, the Whitworth Thread originated in Manchester, not London.
<p>FRNSW comment: It is FRNSW understanding that the Whitworth thread is defined by having a 55° angle deep-V rounded edge thread. There are many variations of the Whitworth, with the most common being British Standard Whitworth (BSW). This BSW was formerly used in Victoria (i.e. 5 TPI). However, the actual origin of the 5 1/5 TPI thread cannot be determined, but it is referenced by some UK suppliers as the ‘London V thread’ fitting. It is assumed it was an in-house standard of a local supplying foundry. The various V-threads in existence in the UK in the 1800s were superseded by the nationalised British Standard Round Thread. This background will be clarified accordingly.</p>		
p3	Clause 6.3.1 Note	In the ‘Note’ I suggest the inclusion of additional text to read “Note: There is no domestic or international Standard currently applying specifically to the FBT-Storz adaptor. I believe that in this context, the use of the term ‘standard’ should be applied with an uppercase ‘S’ i.e. Standard.
<p>FRNSW comment: Agreed. Changed as requested.</p>		
p5	Section 6.3.4(d)	Where did the value range come from? Which ‘connection/disconnection’ is it referring to? I understand that it is meant to be for the Storz connection but as worded it could be interpreted as being for the (f) FBT adaptor/(m) Hydrant Valve connection. Given FRNSW’s previous position of the requiring the adaptor to be ‘detachable’ if required, this could cause some confusion. Also, how is an installer to measure conformance to this torque value given that they may not have an appropriate loose/hose connection to use (given they are likely to only have fixed/static fittings e.g. hydrant valves & boosters). And one further point, I appreciate this range (3Nm – 8Nm) is designed to control torque value of the connection of the static storz fitting to dynamic storz hose coupling and again I would strongly urge this be clearly worded as such, otherwise, unscrupulous (or ignorant) contractors/testers may try to measure torque between static connection (e.g. booster) and the attendant loose plastic dust cap. This is clearly not the outcome you desire.

Note: If you need more rows, please use the Plus button or insert your cursor in the last cell and hit tab on your keyboard.



Page or section no.	Section title / subject of section	Specific comments or suggestions
<p>FRNSW comment: The torque range has been previously defined by FRNSW within technical specifications and was likely originally based off values achieved by existing manufacturers. It is a necessary performance requirement to couple/uncouple Storz by hand as reflected by the FRNSW hand-grip test. This torque only applies to the interconnection between an <i>NEN 3374</i> Storz hose coupling and the fixed Storz hose connection. This clause will be clarified accordingly.</p> <p>When purchasing Storz, the installer is expected to supply purchasing information as recommended by the Appendix of the relevant standard; they are not expected to directly measure conformance (i.e. torque) themselves. However, FRNSW will expect FBT-Storz adaptors being sold to comply with this technical information sheet, and if not, any non-complying product should be returned to the supplier. The torque can be measured using an appropriate torque test tool (e.g. by a certifying or regulatory authority).</p>		
p5	Section 6.3.6	How do we determine what is a “registered forging mark”? There is no reference to a master list of such marks?
<p>FRNSW comment: Agreed, FRNSW cannot find any actual list of forger marks. It is assumed that these are registered trademarks applied by the forger, and this is likely to be a DIN requirement. The wording has been changed to minimise any confusion.</p>		
p5	Section 8.1 and 8.2	To what Standard will a CAB certify these adaptors? As we know, especially in the case of 65mm Storz x FBT (f) Adaptors, there is no controlling Standard.
<p>FRNSW comment: It is FRNSW understanding that NEN 3374 Storz hose connections currently demonstrate compliance through independent testing as a requirement of Pressure Equipment Directive 2014/68/EU. As FRNSW intends to shift to the standardised Storz hose connection meeting DIN/NEN standards (i.e. BSP), specifying all hose connectors be independently tested will ensure the FBT-Storz adaptor can demonstrate equivalent level of compliance to the NEN 3374 hose connections. Additionally, independent testing and certification is specified within the FRNSW technical specification for the FBT-Storz adaptor. This section has been simplified accordingly.</p>		
p5	Section 8.4	Again, without a universal Standard as a reference, how can terms such as ‘batch’ be defined?
<p>FRNSW comment: This has been deleted as per above commentary.</p>		
p5	Section 9.1	Re: “Inspecting hose connections on installed fire systems”. I was unable to find such a document.
<p>FRNSW comment: The referenced inspection document was withheld from publication until this public consultation had ended. The document will be released shortly.</p>		

General comments or suggestions
None provided

Note: If you need more rows, please use the Plus button or insert your cursor in the last cell and hit tab on your keyboard.

