

Amendment proposal to GCU Appendix 10

History

| Amended by | Date | Paragraph | Amendment |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Ann van der Heggen, Lineas | 2018/11/15 | App10, 2.6.1 | New point |
| WG UIC Maintenance | 2019/2/13 | App10, 2.5 | Proposal draft |
| WG UIC Maintenance | 2019/4/3 | App10, 2.5 | Final version |
| Wagon User UIC Study Group | 2019/5/22 | App10, 2.5 | Approval |
| GCU CC | 2019/6/18 | App10, 2.5 | Approval |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Integration of the distance between the axle-box housing and bogie frame in 2.6.1 |
| Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body): | LINEAS / WG Maintenance (GCU Appendix 10) |
| Proposed amendment made by | App10, 2.5 |
| Proposer: | Ann Van der Heggen |
| Location, date: | Prague, 2018/11/20 |
| Concise description: | Comparison between measurements from Appendix 9 and Appendix 10 |

1. Starting point (current situation):**1.1. Introduction****1.2. Mode of operation**

-

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

A comparison of measurements from Appendix 9 and Appendix 10 reveals that a criterion is missing in Appendix 10.

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

2. Target situation**2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)****3. Additional text and/or changes relate only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10**

2.5.1 On wagons fitted with leaf spring suspensions, the distance between the buckle of the suspension spring and any parts of the vehicle body, underframe or bogie frame which may be liable to come into contact with it must be at least 15 mm.

2.5.2 In respect of the suspension of bogie Y25 and its by-products, the distance between the axle-box housing and the bogie frame must be at least 8 mm.

4. Reason

The comparison of measurements from Appendix 9 and Appendix 10 shows that a criterion is missing for this distance in Appendix 10.

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: 1 (additional inspection costs)

Administration 1 (inspection in the workshop only)

Interoperability: 1

Safety: 3

Competition: 1

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:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6.1. Does the change made impact on safety? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Reason: GCU Appendix 9 | |
| 6.2. Is the change significant? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Reason: | |
| 6.3. Determining and classifying risk: | <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): | |
| 6.4. Have safety measures been applied? | <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"> • Code of practice • Use of reference system • Explicit risk estimate | |
| 6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body: | [Appendix] |