Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Jean-Marc Blondé	15/3/2016		Drafted
Jean-Marc Blondé	30/3/2016		Amended as per minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2016
Jean-Marc Blondé	30/1/2018		Amended as per minutes of TI WG meeting of October 2017
Jean-Marc Blondé	30/1/2018		Amended as per minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2018
Decision of WG TI	21/3/2018		As per minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2018
Decision of WG TI	28/3/2018		As per minutes of SG WU meeting of March 2018
Dirk Oelschläger	27/6/2018		According to decision of JC 12/6/2018

Title:	Adjustment of code 1.8.3, in 1.8.3.1 and 1.8.3.2
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body	SBB Cargo AG
Proposed amendment concerns:	☒ Appendix 9 ☐ Appendix 11
Proposer:	Jean-Marc Blondé – Technical Wagon Dept.
Location, date:	Olten, 15/3/2016
Concise description:	Adjustment of code 1.8.3, in 1.8.3.1 and 1.8.3.2

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

In the wake of several derailments attributed to defective axle boxes (hot axle boxes), we note that it is not possible to register faults identified by automatic detection equipment under a specific fault code.

1.2. Mode of operation

Under Annex 1 of Appendix 9 in its present form, the inspector can only detect a hot box by touching it with the back of a hand. There is no separate fault code in the event that detection equipment is triggered, and the fault has been confirmed.

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

To ensure that the keeper is given a precise indication via the PVCA form, it is necessary to subdivide code 1.8.3 into two sub-codes.

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

☐ No ☒ Yes (state which): EN-15313 / 2016

* "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)

Under code 1.8.3, a code 1.8.3.1 is required in the event of observation by the inspector and a code 1.8.3.2 is required in the event of detection by automatic measuring equipment. More details in Point 3.

3. Additional text relates only to the proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9:

We request that code 1.8.3 be amended and that sub-codes 1.8.3.1 and 1.8.3.2 be introduced into Annex 1 of Appendix 9 in line with the table below:

Colour code for changes:
Black: actual text, for info and remains unchanged
Red: **new text**
Blue**: (possibly struck out): text will be deleted**

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Category
	1.8.3	Hot box		
	1.8.3.1	- housing too hot to touch with back of hand • traces of rust	Detach wagon	5
	1.8.3.2*	Confirmation by the RU of box overheating during transport	Detach wagon	5

*1.8.3.2 Hot box: Observation by automatic detection – Observation outside the scope of TI by special inspection.

4. Reason:

There is currently no separate fault code to inform the keeper via the PVCA form of the confirmation of a hot box triggered by detection equipment.

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 impacts:
Operations, interoperability, safety, competitiveness: (value 3).

The impact on costs & administration is very low: (value 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 study conducted by:

6.1. Does the change make impact on safety?	☒No ☐ Yes
Reason: Different measurement type	
6.2. Is the change significant?	☒No ☐ Yes
Reason:	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk:	☒ deleted
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*" *(acknowledged technical rules)* ☐ *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]