

## WAGON USERS Study Group

### Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 10

#### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
L. Mandelli	26/02/2016	5.9	No.7_2017
L. Mandelli	1/5/2016	5.9	No.7_2017

<b>Title:</b>	Appendix 10, point 5.9
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body</b>	ERFA / Hupac Intermodal SA
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
<b>Proposer:</b>	Luca Mandelli
<b>Location, date:</b>	Chiasso, 26.02.2016
<b>Concise description:</b>	Appendix 10 currently does not indicate the permitted dimensions for grooves on buffer plates with wear pads.

## 1. Starting-point (current situation):

### 1.1. Introduction

Appendix 10, point 5.9 currently contains no tolerances for the permitted dimensions of grooves on buffer plates with synthetic wear pads.

### 1.2. Mode of operation

Need to introduce an inspection tolerance for wagons undergoing maintenance.

### 1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

Currently there are no clear assessment criteria for inspecting steel buffer plates and checking there is no grooving.

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

No  Yes (state which): criteria established by ÖBB's ECM 2.

\* "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)

Introduction of criteria for wear plates. These criteria are based on the collected experience of RUs which regularly use wagons with this kind of buffer.

## 3. Additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10):

We request amendment of Appendix 10 in line with the text below:  
~~5.9\* The steel contact surfaces of buffer heads must not have sharp-edged grooves that could prevent the heads from sliding. This also applies to permanent couplings.~~

5.9.2 The contact surfaces of buffer plates with wear pads must not have burrs or sharp-edged grooves measuring > 3 mm in depth, cracks measuring > 30 mm in length, or shelling or fusion of matter measuring > 15 mm in length.

**4. Reason:**

There is currently no clearly-defined tolerance for assessing grooving on buffer plates.

**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 3  
Interoperability 1,  
Safety 4  
Competitiveness 1  
Costs: 4

**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 performed by:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning: Appendix 9 already stipulates in-service limits. Amending Appendix 10 in this way will clearly define limit values for maintenance purposes on the basis of the tolerances in Appendix 9.	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning:	
<b>6.3. Determining and classifying risk:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
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):	
<b>6.4. Have safety measures been applied?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input 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"> <li>• Code of practice</li> <li>• Use of reference system</li> <li>• Explicit risk estimate</li> </ul>	
<b>6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	[appendix]