

Proposal to amend Appendix 10 to the GCU

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
B. Schlor, WG UIC Maintenance	21/11/2019	App10 Ann6	Development of the proposal
B. Schlor, WG UIC Maintenance	28/04/2020	App10 Ann6	Integration of WG Maintenance results
SG UIC WAGON USERS	26/05/2020	App10 Ann6	Approval
JC GCU	15/06/2020	App10 Ann6	Approval

Title	Updating Appendix 10 GCU, Annex 6: code CU 10150 and only in FR and DE versions, adaptation of 10152 and deletion of footnote
Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:	ÖBB-TS
Proposed amendment to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
Proposer:	WG Maintenance, B. Schlor
Location, date:	28/04/2020
Concise description:	Deletion of additional information to be transmitted with code CU 10150. Adaptation of code CU 10152 and deletion of the footnote referring to the past (only for FR and DE versions)

1. Starting point (current situation):**1.1. Introduction**

In Appendix 10, Annex 6, code CU 10150, the keeper has to be informed of any EVIC inspections conducted on axles. As EVIC (GUU Appendix 10, Annex 3) does not provide for recording of the status (classification), the additional information on the “axle number” can be dispensed with.

The command label with the H^R model of the intervention code CU 10152 differs from the other command labels of the H^R model

Footnote CU 10150 and CU 10152 refer to the past (exists only in FR and DE versions).

1.2. Mode of operation

-

1.3. Anomaly/description of problem

The work of the ERA taskforce having concluded, it is no longer necessary to record the various EVIC statuses: “OK”, “A”, “B” or “C”.

There is no added value for the keeper in identification of axles that have been inspected because the keeper has to know the numbers of the relevant axles. For all axles not ordered with the label HR, the fact that the inspection has been carried out implies that the status was OK.

Recording and transmission of axle numbers represents additional workload for the workshop.

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

No Yes (state which):

* “a written set of rules that, when correctly applied, can be used to control one or more specific hazards.” (Source: Regulation (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 – guide published by German Ministry of Justice)

2. Target situation**2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (solution sought)**

Deletion of additional information “axle number” for code CU 10150. Adaptation of code CU 10152 and deletion of the footnote referring to the past (only for FR and DE versions)

3. Additional and/or amended text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10):

Amendment colour code:

Black: Current text, for info and remains unchanged

Red: new text

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

GCU intervention code	Intervention(s)	Any additional information necessary	Inspection as per Appendix 9	Rules as per Appendix 10
CU10150	Check against EVIC	Axle number		1.15.2
CU10152	Replace wheelset following EVIC inspection	Axle number, Form H ^R		1.15.2

4. Reason:

Recording and transmission of axle numbers represents additional workload for the workshop, without offering added value for the keeper.

5. Assessment of 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):

Reasoning behind amendment:

Impact on costs/administration/interoperability/safety/competitiveness:

Costs: 2 (reduction of inspection costs)

Administration: 3 (no additional information transmitted)

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 study becomes obsolete insofar as only the known repositories are implemented

Safety study conducted by:

6.1. Does the change have an impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No intervention on the wagon	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No intervention on the wagon	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk	<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):	
6.4. Have safety measures been applied?	<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"> • Code of practice • Use of reference system • Explicit risk assessment 	
6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body	[Appendix]