WAGON USERS Study Group

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 7

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Geoffroy MAILLE	22/4/2016	Appendix 7-Form Hr	N°11_2017

Title:	Add code 1.8.4 to Form Hr as a reason for withdrawal from service.
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body	SNCF
Proposed amendment concerns:	☒ Appendix 7
Proposer:	Geoffroy MAILLE
Location, date:	22/4/2016
Concise description:	Add code 1.8.4 to Form Hr as a reason for withdrawal from service.

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

In 2017, Appendix 9 is set to incorporate a new defect code for loose or missing wear plates on axle boxes (1.8.4).

1.2. Mode of operation

Loosening or loss of a wear plate requires the axle to be removed and replaced using Form Hr.

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

This reason for withdrawal is not coded in the current Form Hr.

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

☐No ☒ Yes (state which): Appendix 9, code 1.8.4

* "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)

Add code 1.8.4 to Form Hr.

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

See enclosure

4. Reason:

Align Form Hr and Appendix 9.

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/negative impacts:
Operations 1
Interoperability 1,
Safety 1
Competitiveness 1
Costs: 1

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:

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	☒No ☐ Yes
Reasoning:	
6.2. Is the change significant?	☒No ☐ Yes
Reasoning:	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk:	☒ 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: ☐ No ☐ Yes (describe possible misuse):	
6.4. Have safety measures been applied?	☒No ☐ Yes
For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected: • *Code of practice* • *Use of reference system* • *Explicit risk estimate*	
6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	☒No ☐ Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	[appendix]