

## 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

<b>Title:</b>	Long-stroke damper - action to be taken under Code 5.9.1
<b>Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):</b>	Drawn up by DB Cargo AG
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Stefan Zebracki
<b>Location, date:</b>	Mainz, 13.3.2015
<b>Concise description:</b>	The action to be taken and the defect category under Code 5.9.1 both need to be modified since a long-stroke damper which is off-centre can foul the loading gauge.

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

### 1.1. Introduction

The long-stroke damper cannot be off-centre relative to the wagon underframe. This is a defect which can cause the loading gauge to be fouled in tight curve radii.

### 1.2. Mode of operation

-

### 1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:

Currently, the wagon is given a K label and left in the train, even if the long-stroke damper is off-centre and there is a risk of gauge fouling.

### 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)

The action to be taken should be changed from "K" to "detach wagon", since in tight curve radii the loading gauge may be fouled. In addition, the defect category should be changed to "5" in the light of the potential gauge fouling (= critical defect as per the defect category definitions).

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

Component	Code	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Category
Long-stroke damper (e.g. on container wagons)	5.9			
	5.9.1	Sliding element not in mid-position with respect to wagon underframe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the two headstocks are at different distances from wagon body</li> </ul>	<del>Detach wagon</del>	4-5
	5.9.2	No danger marking (diagonal black bands on yellow background) on wagons with front part liable to move with respect to underframe during impacts (impact absorption devices, etc.), on surfaces at risk and liable to over-ride	Detach wagon	4

### 4. Reasoning:

If the long-stroke damper is off-centre, this can cause the gauge to be fouled in tight curve radii. Altering the action to be taken will solve this. In addition, the defect category is upgraded to 5 (critical), in line with the defect category definitions.

### 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 (2)

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

Safety (value: 5).

Safety will be increased by eliminating the risk of gauge fouling. It is not currently thought that the measure will lead to more wagons being detached; the impact on costs will therefore be minimal.

### 6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

The change is not seen as significant, and will increase safety.

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>Reasoning:</p> <p>Level of innovation : low</p> <p>Level of complexity : low</p> <p>Consequences of failures : critical</p> <p>Tracability : high</p> <p>Reversibility : given</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> </div>	

<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>• <i>Code of practice</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of reference system</i></li> <li>• <i>Explicit risk estimate</i></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]