



WAGON USERS Study Group

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

Amendment history

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Stefan Zebracki	3/3/2017		Drafted following TTI WG meeting of Jan 2017
Approved by TTI WG	31/3/2017		Following TTI WG minutes of March 2017

Title:	Stop cocks - action to be taken under Code 3.3.5.2
Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):	Drawn up by DB Cargo AG
Proposed amendment concerns:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
Proposer:	Stefan Zebracki
Location, date:	Mainz, 3.3.2017
Concise description:	Under Code 3.3.5.2, the action to be taken should be to affix a "K" label and rectify the problem. Code 3.3.5.2 should then foresee the further action "detach wagon" in cases where rectification is not possible. Merely affixing a "K" label is not sufficient for this defect.

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

Currently, the action to be taken under Code 3.3.5.2 (stopping device of stopcock missing or visibly damaged) is to affix a "K" label. The actions "rectify" and "detach wagon" are currently not foreseen under Code 3.3.5.2.

1.2. Mode of operation

-

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:

If the stopcock's stopping mechanism is missing or visibly damaged, this must be rectified in order to enable the continuation of the train run. If it is not possible to rectify the problem, the wagon must be detached, since the defect may compromise the cock's stopping capacity and leak-tightness during the train run.

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

No Yes (state which):

The actions "rectify" and "detach wagon" are already regular, recognised, and tried-and-tested parts of daily practice.

* "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)

The action to be taken under Code 3.3.5.2 needs greater detail. As well as labelling, it should foresee "Rectify" / "Detach wagon" as actions to be taken (see point 3 of this proposal).

3. Additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 11):

Component	Code	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Category
	3.3.5	Stopcock		
	3.3.5.1	Unusable, leaking, warped or handle missing	Detach wagon	5
	3.3.5.2	Stopping device missing or visibly damaged	Rectify + K. If not possible, detach wagon	4

4. Reasoning:

If the stopcock's stopping mechanism is missing or visibly damaged, this must be rectified in order to enable the continuation of the train run. If it is not possible to rectify the problem, the wagon must be detached, since the defect may compromise the cock's stopping capacity and leak-tightness during the train run.

The action to be taken under Code 3.3.5.2 needs greater detail. As well as labelling, it should foresee "Rectify" / "Detach wagon" as actions to be taken.

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts

Assess the possible positive and negative effects (operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc.) on a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Justify observations

Impacts:

Costs, Administration (value: 1)

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

This action is already regularly taken in response to the defect described. Specifying as much explicitly under Code 3.3.5.2 will thus either have no impact or a moderately positive effect.

6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

No need for a risk assessment since a code of practice was applied.

Safety appraisal done by:

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning: x	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning: see template Attach the "significant change" test template.	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk:	<input 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):	
6.4. Have safety measures been applied?	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected: <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 type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	[Appendix]