

## WAGON USERS Study Group

### Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

#### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Jean-Marc Blondé	15/3/16		Drafted
Jean-Marc Blondé	31/3/16		Amended as per minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2016
UIP GCU WG	16/3/17		Decision change 16/3/2017
Decision of WG TI	31/3/17		See minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2017

<b>Title:</b>	Hard manganese wear plate on axle box
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body</b>	UIP
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <span style="margin-left: 200px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11</span>
<b>Proposer:</b>	Jean-Marc Blondé, Technical Wagon Dept.
<b>Location, date:</b>	Olten, 15/3/2016
<b>Concise description:</b>	New code 1.8.4: Hard manganese wear plate on axle box

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

### 1.1. Introduction

Under the present Appendix 9, Annex 1, irregularities on hard manganese wear plates on axle boxes cannot be documented by means of a defect code.

### 1.2. Mode of operation

Under the present Appendix 9, Annex 1, only defects on the hard manganese wear plates on Y bogies can be reported by the wagon inspector. There is no separate defect code for irregularities detected on the hard manganese wear plates of an axle box.

### 1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

In order to supply the keeper with a detailed description and damage report, a new code 1.8.4 needs to be introduced for irregularities on hard manganese wear plates on axle boxes.

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

No  Yes (state which):

\* "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)

Point 3 shows the new damage code 1.8.4 to be used by wagon inspectors to report such irregularities.

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

We request a new code 1. 8.4 (Appendix 9, Annex 1) in line with the table:

Component	Code	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Category
Axle box	1.8			
Hard manganese wear plate on axle box of Y bogie or derivative designs	1.8.4	- <del>loose-displaced</del> or missing	Detach wagon	4

The text "Hard manganese wear plate on Y bogie **or derivative designs**" is added to damage code 4.4.2.

Hard manganese wear plate on Y bogies <u>or derivative designs</u>	4.4.2	Plate <del>loose-displaced</del> or missing	Detach wagon	4
--	-------	---	--------------	---

A reference to damage code "**1.8.4**" is added to damage code 1.7.2.

<b>Signs of out-of-round wheels</b>	1.7.2	Brake triangle pin sheared off Brake safety stirrup broken (see also no. 3.1.2) Shiny traces on the brake triangle end washer Shiny traces on the inner spring (load spring) (see also no. 2.5) Lifting safety catch ("T") missing or loose (see also no. 2.5.5) Y25 bogies: hard manganese wear plates on axle boxes or axle-box guides have fallen off or welded joints loose (see also no. <b>1.8.4</b> and 4.4.2) Tread crushed in places, uneven contact surfaces or irregular protrusions on the wheel rim (see also no. 1.3.2)	If at least two of these signs are noted on or near a wheel:  K + add comment "Suspected out-of-round wheel"	4
-------------------------------------	-------	---	--	---

**4. Reason:**

At present, there is no separate defect code via which to provide information on damaged hard manganese wear plates on axle boxes.

**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*

## 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:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning: the irregularity described may represent a hazard to operating safety.	
<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]