

## Amendment proposal to GCU Appendix 10

### Amendment history

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
B. Schlor, WG UIC Maintenance	2018/9/18	App10, 5.9.1/5.9.2	First proposal draft
WG UIC Maintenance	2019/2/13	App10, 5.9.1/5.9.2	Study of the proposal
Dirk Oelschläger, UIC	2019/2/19	2.1 of this form	Improved readability of the proposed amendment
WG UIC Maintenance	2019/4/3	App10, 5.9.1/5.9.2	Final version
Wagon User UIC Study Group	2019/5/22	App10, 5.9.1/5.9.2	Approval
GCU CC	2019/6/18	App10, 5.9.1/5.9.2	Approval

<b>Title</b>	Updating of Appendix 10, 5.9.1 and 5.9.2
<b>Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):</b>	ÖBB – Technische Services / GT Maintenance (Annexe 10 du CUU)
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	App10, 5.9.1/5.9.2
<b>Proposer:</b>	Bernhard Schlor
<b>Location, date:</b>	Brussels, 17/10/2018
<b>Concise description:</b>	Amendment to GCU Appendix 9

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

<b>1.1. Introduction</b>
5.9.1 and 5.9.2 are to be adapted to the amendment of GCU Appendix 9.
<b>1.2. Mode of operation</b>
-
<b>1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:</b>
Differing limit values in GCU Appendix 9 and Appendix 10

<b>1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which): DIN 27202-2:2014 and Appendix 9
<p>* "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)</p> <p>"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)</p>

**2. Target situation**

<b>2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)</b>
<p>Points</p> <p>5.9.1* The steel contact surfaces of buffer heads must not have several sharp-edged grooves measuring &gt; 1 mm in depth and &gt; 50 mm in length. This also applies to permanent couplings.</p> <p>5.9.2* The contact surfaces of buffer plates with wear pads must not have burrs or sharp-edged grooves measuring &gt; 3 mm in depth, cracks measuring &gt; 30 mm in length, or shelling or fusion of matter measuring &gt; 15 mm in length.</p> <p>are replaced by the following texts:</p> <p>5.9.1* The contact surfaces of buffer plates must not have more than 2 sharp-edged grooves measuring &gt; 3 mm in depth and &gt; 50 mm in length. This also applies to permanently-coupled wagon units.</p> <p>5.9.2* The buffer plates with wear pads or plastic plates must not</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– be broken, cracked right through, missing</li> <li>– have crumbling/melding &gt; 3 mm in depth and &gt; 25 mm in length</li> <li>– have loose or missing fastening bolts.</li> </ul>

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

We are asking for amendments of 5.9.1 and 5.9.2 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: 1 (no impact)
- 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:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: Adoption of the provisions from Appendix 9 without any changes	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: Clarification of procedure. No change to the instructions provided	
<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]