

## Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Stefan Zebracki	30/01/2018		Drafted following TTI WG meeting of Jan 2018
Stefan Zebracki	21/03/2018		Amended following TTI WG meeting of March 2018
Jean-Marc Blondé	20/03/2019		Amended following TTI WG meeting of March 2019
Approved by TTI WG	20/03/2019		As per TTI WG, March 2019
Approved by WU SG	22/05/2019		As per minutes of WU SG meeting

<b>Title:</b>	ILU frame visibly broken
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / Keeper / other body:</b>	Drawn up by DB Cargo AG
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <span style="margin-left: 200px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11</span>
<b>Proposer:</b>	Stefan Zebracki
<b>Location, date:</b>	Mainz, 26/09/2018
<b>Concise description:</b>	There is currently no code for cases whereby the ILU frame is visibly broken and stability is endangered. By incorporating a code, a uniform coding structure is possible.

## 1. Starting point (current situation)

<b>1.1. Introduction</b>
If an ILU frame is visibly broken and stability is endangered, this represents a significant defect. A uniform coding structure is required.
<b>1.2. Mode of operation</b>
-
<b>1.3. Anomaly/Description of problem</b>
There is currently no coding structure for cases whereby the ILU frame is visibly broken and stability endangered.
<b>1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which):
<small>* 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] No. 352/2009, Article 3 section 19).          "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." (translation/source: German Ministry of Justice: Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit, recital 255)</small>

## 2. Target situation (goal)

Incorporating code 7.5.7 will facilitate a uniform coding structure in the event of a visible crack in the ILU frame.
---

### 3. Amendment proposal

Colour code for changes:

**BLACK:**..... actual text, for info and remains unchanged

**RED:** ..... added or modified text

**BLUE and struck out:**..... text will be deleted

<b>Specific components of ILU, in particular those used for horizontal or vertical transshipment</b>	7.5			
	7.5.1	Device for locking the dollies inoperative, defective or missing	Bind using wire. If not possible, detach wagon	4
	7.5.2	End doors on load units not securely closed or not properly locked		
	7.5.2.1	- door not closed	Close and lock. If not possible, detach wagon	5
	7.5.2.2	- only one door lock operational per ILU and door	Rectify	3
	7.5.2.3	– reserved –		
	7.5.3	Lower corner casting damaged	Detach wagon	5
	7.5.4	Side wall, lining damaged, inadequately secured, unstable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• hinges, securing bolts damaged, broken, missing</li> <li>• edge plank missing, broken, cracked or split; lining holed or broken</li> </ul>	Detach wagon	5
	7.5.5	Tarpaulin		
	7.5.5.1	- tarpaulin torn, holed ≤ 30 mm	Rectify	3
	7.5.5.2	- tarpaulin torn, holed > 30 mm	Detach wagon	5
	7.5.5.3	Danger of damage from humidity to the load or loss of load	Rectify, if not possible, detach wagon	4
	7.5.6	Tarpaulin, walls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- locking, lashings inadequate</li> <li>- sheet; lack of tension/lock damaged, inadequate</li> </ul>	Detach wagon	5
	7.5.7	<b>Frame/load-bearing parts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>cracked</b></li> <li>- <b>broken</b></li> </ul>	<b>Detach wagon</b>	<b>5</b>

#### 4. Reason

An obvious crack in the ILU frame represents a significant defect that is not currently indicated by a code in Appendix 9.

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

*E.g. on operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc., using a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Justify observations*

Impacts:

Operations, Interoperability, Competitiveness, Costs, Administration (value: 3)

Safety (value: 4)

#### 6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

Safety study conducted by:

<b>6.1. Does the change make 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"/> not applicable
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
<p><i>For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Code of practice” (acknowledged technical rules)</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of reference system</i></li> <li>• <i>Explicit risk estimate</i></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]