

## Proposed to amend GCU Appendix 10

### Record of amendment

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Marek Brunngräber, WG UIC Maintenance	16/03/2020	1.4 ChapA Pt1 App1	Development of proposal
WG UIC Maintenance	28/04/2020	1.4 ChapA Pt1 App1	Final Version
SG UIC WAGON USERS	26/05/2020	1.4 ChapA Pt1 App1	Approval
JC GCU	15/06/2020	1.4 ChapA Pt1 App1	Approval

<b>Title</b>	Adaptation of the limit values for the height of the flange to those appearing in the Usage guidelines for composite (LL) brake blocks – 10th edition
<b>Proposed amendment made by (RU / keeper / other body):</b>	DB CARGO AG
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
<b>Proposer:</b>	WG Maintenance, Marek Brunngräber
<b>Location, date:</b>	Mainz, 16/03/2020
<b>Concise description:</b>	After checking the limit values, a difference was found between those of the Usage guidelines for composite (LL) brake blocks – 10th edition, EN 15313 and those appearing in Appendix 10 GCU. The amendment proposal sheet solves these discrepancies.

## 1. Starting point (current situation):

### 1.1. Introduction

For the LL sole application and speed > 100 km / h, the current provisions of the GCU 1.4.1 code do not define any limit for the height of the flange. Reference is made to the general limit dimension of 36.0 mm

### 1.2. Mode of operation

-

### 1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:

Non-exhaustive consideration in Appendix 10 GCU of certain elements of the of the Usage guidelines for composite (LL) brake blocks – 10th edition, Part 2 Brake operation, monitoring and maintenance and Usage Guidelines for composite brake blocks (K) – 9th edition

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

No  Yes (state which): Usage guidelines for composite (LL) brake blocks – 10th edition, EN 15313 (extract of point 6.2.1.2)

#### 6.2.1.2 Flange height "h"

The limit values as a function of the diameter are specified in Table 1.

Tableau 1 — Flange height "h"

$d^a$	$d \leq 630$	$630 < d \leq 760$	$760 < d$
$h$ minimum	31,5	29,5	27,5
$h$ maximum	36,0		
<sup>a</sup> Wheel diameter (actual dimension)			

\* "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" (Source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – German Ministry of Justice)

## 2. Target situation

### 2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)

### 3. Additional text and/or change 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

#### 1. RUNNING GEAR

##### Minimum conditions and limit values for dimensions

##### Wheelsets

1.4 The height of the wheel flanges must be

- minimum 27.5 mm for wheels of a diameter greater than 760 mm,
- minimum 29.5 mm for wheels of a diameter greater than 630 mm, but less than or equal to 760 mm and
- minimum 31.5 mm for wheels of a diameter less than or equal to 630 mm

The height of the wheel flanges in relation to the measuring circle must be no more than 36 mm.

When using LL soles in wagons with a maximum speed greater than 100 km / h and a wheel diameter **greater than 760 mm**, the limit value for the height of the flange from 27.5 to 32.0 mm must be respected.

These values do not apply to wheelsets with tapered flanges (e.g. certain bogies with three or more axles).

#### 4. Reasoning:

##### 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:

Impact on costs (-2), administration (-2), interoperability, safety (+3), competitiveness:

## 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 have an 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"/> 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 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]