

## Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 11

### 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		

<b>Title:</b>	Amendment of marking examples under 2.1., Appendix 11
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body</b>	CFL Cargo
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Claude Weis
<b>Location, date:</b>	Dudelange, 27/12/2019
<b>Concise description:</b>	As agreed with UIP, the transition period comes to an end on 01/01/2021 and, thus, the TEN-RIV marking is no longer authorised.

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

<b>1.1. Introduction</b>
Adaptation of the examples of markings under 2.1., Appendix 11 to the GCU.
<b>1.2. Mode of operation</b>
-
<b>1.3. Anomaly / description of problem</b>
As agreed with UIP, the transition period comes to an end on 01/01/2021 and, thus, the TEN-RIV marking is no longer authorised. The examples under point 2.1 of Appendix 11 must be adapted.

<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): TSI WAG 321/2013/EU
<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 352/2009, Article 3)</small>
<small>"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)</small>

**2. Target situation**

<b>2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)</b>
Addition and amendment of the markings in accordance with the TSI WAG 321/2013/EU.

### 3. Additional text and/or change relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 11:

Amendment colour code:

**Black:** Current text, for info and remains unchanged

**Red:** new text

**Blue:** (if crossed out): text to be deleted

#### 2.1 Wagon number, country of registration, keeper, type

The markings shall be made on the side of the wagon as follows (examples):

31 RIV 80 <u>D</u> -DB 0691 235-2 Tanoos	32 RIV 80 <u>D</u> -BASF 7369 553-4 Zcs	33 RIV 84 <u>NL</u> -ACTS 4796 100-8 Slpss	43 87 <u>F</u> 4273 361-3 Laeks
---	--	---	--

or

<del>23 TEN 80 <u>D</u>-ORFC 7369 553-4 Zcs</del>	<del>31 TEN - RIV 80 <u>D</u>-DB 0691 235-2 Tanoos</del>	33 TEN 84 <u>NL</u> -ACTS 4796 100-8 Slpss	87 TEN 82 <u>L</u> -CFLCA 4978 006-4 Sdmrs
---	--	---	---

37 TEN 82 <u>L</u> -CFLCA 4992 009-1 Sdggmrss	81 82 <u>L</u> -CFLCA 3513 156-7 Rbnpss
--	--

### 4. Reason:

These adaptations are necessary in order to meet the requirements of the TSI WAG 321/2013/EU.

### 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: 3

Safety: 4

## 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:

<b>6.1. Does the change make impact on safety?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: Yes, the provisions of the TSI WAG 321/2013/EU are only observed if these amendments are made.	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: see template. Attach the significant change test template	
<b>6.3. Determining and classifying risk:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse):	
<b>6.4. Have safety measures been applied?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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" (acknowledged technical rules)</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]