WAGON USERS Study Group

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

Amendment history

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Jean-Marc Blondé	7.3.2017		Drafted
Approved by TTI WG	31/3/2017		Following TTI WG minutes of March 2017

Title:	
Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):	Drawn up by SBB Cargo AG
Proposed amendment concerns:	☒ Appendix 9 ☐ Appendix 11
Proposer:	Jean-Marc Blondé
Location, date:	Olten, 17.3.2017
Concise description:	No need for a three-point measurement of the wheelset on wagons having sustained an "abnormal buffering shock" (irregularities in operations).

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

Currently, in the event of irregularities in operations, the wagon is handled in accordance with Code 8.1 and Annex 9, check-list 3 (Inspection of fitness to run).

1.2. Mode of operation

-

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:

Experience shows that there is no need for a three-point measurement of the wheelset on wagons having sustained an "abnormal buffering shock". If the shock has caused the wagon to derail, the complete procedure (including three-point measurement) is still required.

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)

Adapt existing procedure by amending check-list.
Determine whether or not to inspect wheelsets by means of a yes/no question. For derailed wagons, the procedure remains unaltered.

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

Inspection of fitness to run in the event of irregularities in operations

➢ **Reference:** Annex 1, code 8.1: additional handling of the wagon following irregularities **in operations**

1	2	3	4	5
Point	Question	Answer	Go to number	Remarks
	Provisions common to vehicles with individual axles and bogies			
1	Is the wagon marked with one of the interoperable markings given in Code 6.1.1.2 or 6.1.1.3 (Annex 1)?	Yes No	2 13.2 ~~11.2~~	
2 2.1	Is the loading gauge of the participating RUs respected? Have the participating RUs agreed for the wagon to be handed over?	Yes No Yes No	4 ~~3~~ / 4 ~~3~~.1 2.1 4 ~~3~~ / 4 ~~3~~.1 13.2 ~~11.2~~	
3	Has the wagon derailed?	Yes No	5 4	
4	Has the wagon sustained an abnormal buffering shock?	Yes No	8 13.1	
5 ~~3~~ 5 ~~3~~.1	Does the wheel tyre thickness conform to the criteria of point 1.1.1 of Annex 1? **or** (for monobloc wheels) is the groove indicating the minimum thickness visible as per Code 1.2.1 of Annex 1?	Yes No Yes No	6 ~~4~~ 13.2 ~~11.2~~ 6 ~~4~~ 13.2 ~~11.2~~	Measure
6 4	Do the values Sd, Sh, qR and E lie within the permissible limits?	Yes No	5 11.2	For value E, measure at three points
7 ~~5~~	Does the distance between active surfaces satisfy the following criteria: – no more than 1426 mm? – at least 1410 mm for a wheel diameter > 840 mm? – at least 1415 mm for a wheel diameter ≤ 840 mm?	Yes No	8 ~~6~~ 13.2 ~~11.2~~	
8 ~~6~~	Is the wagon clearly fitted with a uniform type of suspension springs?	Yes No	9 ~~7~~ 13.2 ~~11.2~~	
9 ~~7~~	Does the buffer height lie within the permissible tolerances?	Yes No	8 13.2 ~~11.2~~	Measure
10 ~~8~~	Does the wagon (or its load) have superstructures liable to rotate, be displaced or otherwise move during the journey?	Yes No	11 ~~9~~ 12 ~~10~~	

11 ~~9~~	Are there sufficient devices (outwardly visible) for securing moving superstructures and are they present and effective?	Yes No	12 ~~10~~ 13.2 ~~11.2~~	
12 ~~10~~	Is the wagon otherwise free of safety-critical damage or defects?	Yes No	13.1 ~~11.1~~ 13.2 ~~11.2~~	

	Results of the examination of fitness to run	**Action to be taken**
13 ~~11~~.1	The wagon may continue to run at the marked speed with the brake isolated, as a special consignment.	Fill out label I, indicate wagon as fit to run.
13 ~~11~~.2	The wagon may not be included in trains in its present condition.	Do not fill out the certificate (label I), indicate wagon as unfit to run, giving reasons.

4. Reasoning:

Experience shows that wagons having sustained an "abnormal buffering shock" do not derail and there is therefore no need for a three-point measurement. By amending the existing procedure as above, a yes/no question allows respondents to skip sections 5, 6 and 7 in case of non-derailed wagons. For derailed wagons, the procedure remains unaltered.

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

Safety (value: 4).

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?	☐No ☐ Yes
Reasoning: x	
6.2. Is the change significant?	☐No ☐ Yes
Reasoning: see template Attach the "significant change" test template.	
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]