Amendment proposal to GCU Appendix 10

Amendment history

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
B. Schlor, WG UIC Maintenance	2019/1/15	App10, 5.6.1	First proposal draft
WG UIC Maintenance	2019/2/13	App10, 5.6.1	Study of the proposal
Dirk Oelschläger, UIC	2019/2/19	2.1 of this form	Correction of the applicable text cited; adaptation of DE/FR language versions
WG UIC Maintenance	2019/4/3	App10, 5.6.1	Final version
Wagon User UIC Study Group	2019/5/22	App10, 5.6.1	Approval
GCU CC	2019/6/18	App10, 5.6.1	Approval

Title	Updating of Appendix 10, 5.6.1
Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):	ÖBB – Technische Services / Maintenance WG (Appendix 10 GCU)
Proposed amendment concerns:	App10, 5.6.1
Proposer:	Bernhard Schlor
Location, date:	2019/1/15
Concise description:	Clarification that only a visual inspection - without cleaning the buffers - is required when inspecting grooves on the buffer casing/plunger.

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

The criteria for assessing grooves on the guide surfaces of buffer casings are listed in Appendix 10, 5.6.1. On account of the limit values provided, many workshops presumed that it was necessary to clean the buffer and to then measure the grooves. However, this goes beyond the scope of this inspection, which should only be a visual inspection, with the limit values intended to serve as useful evaluation criteria. 5.6.1 is to be simultaneously adapted to the application for GCU Appendix 9.

1.2. Mode of operation

-

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:

Time-consuming cleaning and measurements rather than visual inspection

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

☐ No ☒ Yes (state which): DIN 27202-2:2014 and 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)

5.6.1 Buffer casings must not be damaged to the extent that their fastenings are no longer sufficiently robust or that buffer plunger guidance is no longer sufficiently guaranteed. The buffer casings and plungers must not be cracked.

The buffer’s visible guide surface must ~~not~~ present no more than 2 sharp-edged ~~notches or~~ grooves, each more than ~~over 1~~ 2 mm deep and ~~15~~ 60 mm long. This examination shall be performed as a visual inspection, and as a measurement in case of doubt only.

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

We are asking for amendments of 5.6.1 App10 according the above changes proposal.

4. Reason:

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 on costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness:

Costs: 3 (lower inspection costs due to elimination of cleaning)
Administration: 1 (no impact)
Interoperability: 1 (no impact)
Safety: 1 (no impact)
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:

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	☒No ☐ Yes
Reason: Adoption of the provisions from GCU Appendix 9 without any changes	
6.2. Is the change significant?	☒No ☐ Yes
Reason: Clarification of procedure. No change to the instructions provided	
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]