

## Amendment proposal to GCU Appendix 10

### Amendment history

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
B. Schlor, WG UIC Maintenance	2019/1/15	1 <sup>st</sup> paragr. Ann6 App10	First proposal draft
WG UIC Maintenance	2019/4/3	1 <sup>st</sup> paragr. Ann6 App10	Final version
Wagon User UIC Study Group	2019/5/22	1 <sup>st</sup> paragr. Ann6 App10	Approval
GCU CC	2019/6/18	1 <sup>st</sup> paragr. Ann6 App10	Approval

<b>Title</b>	Updating of Appendix 10 annex 6
<b>Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):</b>	ÖBB – Technische Services / Maintenance WG (Appendix 10 GCU)
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> paragr. Ann6 App10
<b>Proposer:</b>	Bernhard Schlor
<b>Location, date:</b>	2019/1/15
<b>Concise description:</b>	Specification of the basic information required when providing information on coded interventions.

**1. Starting point (current situation):****1.1. Introduction**

The codes for wagon interventions, the purpose of which is to enable the wagon keeper/ECM to keep the vehicles' maintenance history up to date, are defined in Appendix 10, Annex 6.

**1.2. Mode of operation****1.3. Anomaly / description of problem**

To have a complete history of repairs, wagon keepers/ECMs require basic data that is not yet defined in the GCU.

**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" (Source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – German Ministry of Justice)

**2. Target situation****2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)****CODING OF INTERVENTIONS**

This list comprises the interventions possible under the GCU. They must be communicated to the keeper by the RU or its auxiliary performing the work, using the coding given in column 2. All codes of the interventions are to be communicated, ~~irrespective of the type of damage concerned~~. Codes shall be indicated on the invoice and/or sent separately to the keeper. ~~The wagon number, workshop name and date of entry to/exit from the workshop must be at least indicated as basic data~~. Any additional information necessary and measurement values may be communicated with the codes or in a separate list. All reports mentioned shall be sent immediately.

**3. Additional text and/or changes relate only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10:**

We are asking for amendments of the 1st paragr. Ann6 App10 according the above changes proposal.

**4. Reason:**

Annex 6 has been updated and supplemented as part of the feedback process as an aid for workshops.

**5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts**

*Assess the impacts at the level of e.g. operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc., using a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).  
Justify observations*

Impacts on costs, administration, interoperability, safety and competitiveness:

Costs: 2 (Reprogramming of automated records and/or invoices)

Administration: 1 (no impact)

Interoperability: 1 (no impact)

Safety: 3 (establishment of legal certainty)

Competitiveness: 1 (no impact)

## 6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

The risk assessment is rendered invalid inasmuch as only recognised regulations are implemented.

Risk assessment conducted by:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No wagon intervention	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No wagon intervention	
<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
For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:	
<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]