

Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 9

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Lukas Halbig	03/03/2020	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	Draft
TTI WG decision	24/03/2020	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2020
WU SG decision	26/05/2020	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	See minutes of WU SG meeting of May 2020
Withdrawal of comments and approval by UIP		Appendix 9, 4.8.3	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of January 2021
Lukas Joa	02/2021	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	Updating the number of the amendment proposal
TTI WG decision	23/03/2021	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2021
WU SG decision	23/04/2021	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	See minutes of WU SG meeting of April 2021
GCU JC decision	14/06/2021	Appendix 9, 4.8.3	Approved

Title:	Supplement to the description of code 4.8.3
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body	DB Cargo
Proposed amendment concerns:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
Proposer:	Sven Seligmann
Location, date:	Mainz, 02/09/2019
Concise description:	Amendment of the description of code 4.8.3: side bearer fastening incomplete, loose

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
The irregularities/criteria/notes for code 4.8.3 are noted as “Side bearer fastening incomplete”.
1.2. Mode of operation
-
1.3. Anomaly / description of problem
Based on the current irregularities/criteria/notes in respect of code 4.8.1, wagons found to have loose side bearer fastenings may or may not be processed with a K label, depending on the inspection personnel’s interpretation of the situation.

1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes (state which) :
<p>* “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)</p> <p>"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)</p>

2. Target situation

2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)
The term “or loose” should be added to the irregularities/criteria/notes for code 4.8.3.

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 no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Component	Code no.
Side bearers and side bearer spring	4.8			
	4.8.1	Side bearer broken		
	4.8.1.1	- with no parts missing	K	4
	4.8.1.2	- with part(s) missing	Detach wagon	5
	4.8.2	Side bearer spring broken	Detach wagon	4
4.8.3	Incomplete or loose side bearer fastening	K	3	

4. Reason:

Broadening the description of irregularities will, in future, provide common criteria for processing of loose side bearer fastenings. This will preclude any possibility of interpretation.

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: 4

Interoperability: 1

Competitiveness: 1

Costs: 4 (exorbitant maintenance costs in the event of an overly severe assessment of damages)

Administration: 1

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).

Performance of risk analysis is unnecessary where only recognised standards are implemented.

Safety appraisal performed by:

6.1. Does the change have an impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: This amendment simply consists of an addition to the existing gaps/criteria/references.	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: see template. Attach the significant change test template	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk:	<input type="checkbox"/> deleted
<p>6.3.1. Effect of change in normal operation: Users will receive a more detailed description of irregularities so that they can be assessed more effectively.</p> <p>6.3.2. Effect of change in the event of disruption / deviation from normal operation: Users will receive a more detailed description of irregularities so that they can be assessed more effectively.</p> <p>6.3.3. Potential misuse of system:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse)</p>	
6.4. Have safety measures been implemented?	<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"> • <i>“Code of practice” (acknowledged technical rules)</i> • <i>Use of reference system</i> • <i>Explicit risk estimate</i> 	
6.5. Has the risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>Assessment body:</p> <p>Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:</p>	[appendix]