

Proposed amendments to GCU Appendices 9 and 11: No. 8

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Claude Weis	01.04.2015		Entry following to WG TI held on 02/2015 in Paris
Jean-Marc Blondé	19.05.15		Modif. following to the WG TI held on 05/2015 in Paris
Decision of WG TI	19.05.15		Following to the minutes of WG TI held on 05/2015

Title:	Change of Point 1 of checklists (Appendix 9)
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body	CFL Cargo
Proposed amendment concerns:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
Proposer:	Claude Weis, CFL Cargo
Location, date:	Dudelange, 23.03.2015
Concise description:	With point 1 of checklists, we speak only about old interoperability signs. The same signs have to be introduced as in the point 6.1.1.2 and 6.1.1.3 of Annex 1

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
Currently point 1 Appendix 9 on checklists for expired period of inspections and wagons with irregular operations refers the old interoperability terms
1.2. Mode of operation
-

Study Group **WAGON USERS**

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

To avoid any misunderstanding with point 6.1.1.2 and 6.1.1.3 of Annex 1, the text in the point 1 of checklists has to be adapted

1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?

No Yes (state which): TSI-Wagon and "UE 2009/107/EC "

* "Code of practice: a written set of rules that, when correctly applied, can be used to control one or more specific hazards."
(source: Regulation EC 352/2009, Article 3)

"Technical provisions laid down in writing or conveyed verbally and pertaining to procedures, equipment and modes of operation which are generally agreed by the populations concerned (specialists, users, consumer and public authorities) to be suitable for achieving the objective prescribed by law, and which have either proven their worth in practice or, it is generally agreed, are likely to within a reasonable period of time" (translation/source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – German Ministry of Justice)

2. Target situation

2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)

it's necessary to have a reference to point 6.1.1.2 and 6.1.1.3 of Annex 1 in the point 1

3. Additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 9):

Appendix 9

Inspection of fitness to run for wagons with an expired maintenance plate

Inspection of fitness to run in the event of irregularities in operations

1	2	3	4	5
Num-ber	Question	Answer	Go to number	Comments
Provisions common to vehicles with individual axles and bogies				
1	Is the wagon marked with an interoperability sign conform to point 6.1.1.2 and 6.1.1.3 of Annex 1? <u>the RIV or TEN sign or is it covered by a bi- or multilateral agreement? Are the corresponding RUs marked in the agreement plate?</u>	Yes No	2 12.2	

4. Reason:

The modification is conform to interoperability signs foreseen in “TSI Wagon” and “2009/107/EC directive”

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts

E.g. on operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc., using a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Justify observations

Positive impacts:

Operations, Interoperability, Safety, Competitiveness:(Value:3)

Harmonization of Appendix 9 Annex 1 is ensured thanks to this change

Security :(Value :4)

With the harmonization it is ensured a situation conform to “TSI Wagon” and the directive “2009/107/EC”

Study Group **WAGON USERS**

6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

Description of actual/target system, and scope of change to be made (see points 1 and 2).

Safety appraisal done by: cancelled because the adaptation is done upon the basis of mentioned standards

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason:	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: see template. Attach the "significant change?" test template	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> deleted
6.3.1. Effect of change in normal operation: 6.3.2. Effect of change in the event of disruption / deviation from normal operation: 6.3.3. Potential misuse of system: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse):	
6.4. Have safety measures been applied?	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<i>For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of practice • Use of reference system • Explicit risk estimate 	
6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	[appendix]