

# Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

# **Record of amendments**

| Amended by         | Date       | Paragraph | Amendment                                   |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|---|
| Claude Weis        | 27/12/2019 |           | See minutes of TTI WG meeting of Oct 2019   |
|                    |            |           |   |
| TTI WG decision    | 24/03/2020 |           | See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2020 |
| Approved by SG WU  | 26/05/2020 |           | See minutes of WU SG meeting of May 2020    |
| Approved by JC GCU | 15/06/2020 |           | After change                                |

| Title:   | Amendment of code 6.1.1.2                                       |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Proposed amendment<br>made by:<br>RU / keeper / other body | CFL Cargo   |  |  |
| Proposed amendment concerns:                               | Appendix 9 Appendix 11  |  |  |
| Proposer:  | Claude Weis   |  |  |
| Location, date:  | Dudelange, 27.12.2019   |  |  |
| Concise description:                                       | Amendment of code 6.1.1.2 (following TEN-RIV transition period) |  |  |

# 1. Starting point (current situation):

### 1.1. Introduction

The transition period agreed by UIP on 08/07/2015 for continued authorisation of the "TEN-RIV" marking, which is no longer authorised since 31/12/2010 in accordance with the TSI WAG: EU Regulation 321/2013, comes to an end on 01/01/2021.

# 1.2. Mode of operation

-

# 1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

The transition period agreed by UIP comes to an end on 31/12/2020 and thus the TEN-RIV marking is no longer authorised.

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

No Yes (state which): TSI WAG: EU Regulation 321/2013

\* "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" (translation/source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – German Ministry of Justice)

# 2. Target situation

# 2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)

Only markings in accordance with the TSI WAG: EU Regulation 321/2013 are authorised from 01/01/2020.

# 3. Additional text and/or change relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 9:

Amendment colour code:

Black: Current text, for info and remains unchanged Red: new text Blue: (if crossed out): text to be deleted

| Component                | Code<br>no. | Irregularities/Criteria/Notes  | Action<br>to be<br>taken | Irregu-<br>Iarity<br>class |
|--------------------------|-------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Wagon body               | 6           |  |                          |                            |
| Wagon body in<br>general | 6.1         |  |                          |                            |
| Markings on wag-<br>ons  | 6.1.1       | Missing, illegible, incomplete   |                          |                            |
|                          | 6.1.1.1     | - wagon number <sup>7</sup>  | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.2     | <ul> <li>"RIV" sign, <u>"TEN-RIV",</u></li> <li>"TEN" + "GE" or acceptance<br/>marking ("TEN" + "G1", country<br/>acronym in approval plate)<sup>7</sup></li> </ul>                        | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.3     | agreement plate (if showing ex-<br>change codes 41, 43, 45, 81, 83<br>or 85) <sup>7</sup> or an acceptance marking<br>("TEN" + "CW" + country acro-<br>nym in approval plate) <sup>7</sup> | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.4     | - tare weight <sup>7</sup>   | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.5     | - braked weight of hand brake <sup>7</sup>   | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.6     | - load limits7)  | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.7     | - capacity of tank wagons <sup>7</sup>   | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.8     | <ul> <li>both the VKM and full address of<br/>wagon keeper<sup>7</sup></li> </ul>  | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.9     | - length-over-buffers of wagon <sup>7</sup>  | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.10    | <ul> <li>"high voltage" warning sign on<br/>wagons with step or ladder ac-<br/>cess up to a height</li> <li>2 m above rail level</li> </ul>  | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.11    | <ul> <li>indication of compatibility with<br/>ILUs on carrying wagon<sup>7</sup></li> </ul>  | Detach wagon             | 4                          |
|                          | 6.1.1.12    | – reserved -   |                          |                            |
|                          | 6.1.1.13    | - reserved -   |                          |                            |

#### 4. Reason:

The TEN-RIV marking is no longer authorised from 01/01/2021.

### 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, safety, competitiveness: 2

Safety: 3

# 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 study becomes obsolete insofar as only the known repositories are implemented Safety study conducted by:

| 6.1.  | Does the change made impact on safety?   | 🗌 No 🖂 Yes |
|---|--|------------|
| Reas<br>the "T  |  |            |
| 6.2.  | Is the change significant?   | ⊠No 🗌 Yes  |
| Reas  |  |            |
| Attac   |  |            |
| 6.3.  | Determining and classifying risk:  | ⊠ deleted  |
| 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: |  |            |
| 00 30   | "Code of practice" (acknowledged technical rules)                              |            |
| •   | Use of reference system  |            |
| •   | Explicit risk estimate   |            |
| 6.5.  | Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?                     | ⊠No □ Yes  |
| Assessment body:  |  |            |
| Attac   | [appendix]   |            |