

## Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 10

### Amendment history

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Luca Mandelli, ERFA	2018/11/6	App10, 1.1.2	First proposal draft
Dirk Oelschläger, UIC	2019/2/19	App10, 1.1.2	Alignment of DE/FR language versions
WG UIC Maintenance	2019/4/3	App10, 1.1.2	Final version
Wagon User UIC Study Group	2019/5/22	App10, 1.1.2	Approval
GCU CC	2019/6/18	App10, 1.1.2	Approval

<b>Title</b>	Inclusion of a permissible difference of maximum 2 mm for measurement of the distance between inner faces in 1.1.2.
<b>Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):</b>	ERFA / Hupac Intermodal SA
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	App10, 1.1.2
<b>Proposer:</b>	Luca Mandelli
<b>Location, date:</b>	Chiasso, 2018/11/6
<b>Concise description:</b>	Insertion of a permissible difference of a maximum of 2 mm for measurement of the distance between inner faces in 1.1.2.

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

Only the limit values are provided in 1.1.2 in respect of the distance between inner faces. A maximum difference during measurements is not currently prescribed. The proposal is to also include the maximum difference of 2 mm in Point 1.1.2. (This difference of 2 mm is already provided in GCU Appendix 9 but is not contained in Appendix 10, 1.1.2)

**1.2. Mode of operation**

Alignment of limit values in Appendix 9 and the current 1.1.2 in GCU Appendix 10.

**1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:**

1.1.2 does not consider the highest permissible difference of 2 mm.

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

No  Yes (state which): GCU Appendix 9

\* "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)**

The maximum permissible difference in respect of the distance between inner faces should also be clearly defined in Appendix 10, 1.1.2.

The same limit values/evaluation criteria should be applied for measurement of the distance between inner faces

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

1.1.2 Distance between the inner faces of tyres or rims of monobloc wheels:

- maximum 1363 mm<sup>1)</sup>;
- minimum 1357 mm for wheels with a diameter of greater than 840 mm<sup>1)</sup>;
- minimum 1359 mm for wheels with a diameter of less than or equal 840 mm<sup>1)</sup>.

The difference between the distances measured for the relevant axles must be  $\leq 2$  mm ( $E_{\max} - E_{\min} \leq 2$  mm).

Measurements must be taken in accordance with 1.17.

<sup>1)</sup> These rules also apply to the intermediate axles of wagons with a 3-axle articulated underframe, but not to the intermediate axles of vehicles other than bogie wagons, nor to the intermediate axles of the bogies themselves.

#### **For information purposes only:**

1.17 *If a check is required on the distance between the inner faces of the tyres or rims of monobloc wheels, then this distance shall be measured with a gauge at rail level in at least three points on the wheel, at 120° intervals.*

#### 1 *Derailement*

*When a wagon has derailed, the distance between the inner faces of the tyres (or rims for monobloc wheels) must be measured on the wheelsets that derailed, as specified in Chapter A, point 1.17.*

*If the difference in the dimensions is greater than 2 mm, the wheelset must be replaced.*

### 4. Reason:

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

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

*Justify observations*

Operations: 1 (no impact)

Interoperability: 5 (detailed limit values included in 1.1.2)

Costs, administration: 1 (procedure already being applied)

Safety: 5 (detailed limit values included in 1.1.2)

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:	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason:	
<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]