Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 9

Record of amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amended by</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romain MOULIN</td>
<td>05/05/2019</td>
<td>Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1</td>
<td>Drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain MOULIN</td>
<td>14/04/2020</td>
<td>Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1</td>
<td>Text modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romain MOULIN</td>
<td>12/10/2020</td>
<td>Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1</td>
<td>Text modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTI WG decision</td>
<td>23/03/2021</td>
<td>Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1</td>
<td>See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WU SG decision</td>
<td>23/04/2021</td>
<td>Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1</td>
<td>See minutes of WU SG meeting of April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCU JC decision</td>
<td>14/06/2021</td>
<td>Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Proposal to amend Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1 - Housing

Proposed amendment made by: ATIR-RAIL, VTG, UIP

Proposed amendment concerns: 
- Appendix 9
- Appendix 11

Proposer: Romain MOULIN

Location, date: 05/05/2019

Concise description: Proposal to amend Appendix 9, Annex 1, Code 1.8.1.1 - Housing
1. **Starting point (current situation):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUs reported missing axle box cover (code 1.8.1.1) for wheelsets that do not have cover due to their design and wagon withdrawal. As these types of boxes do not have cover, text should be clarified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2. Mode of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrongly detached wagon due to a wrong implementation of the current GCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3. Anomaly / description of problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCU does not specify that some types of boxes do not have a cover. It should be added to Appendix 9, Annex 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ No ☐ Yes (state which):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of additional information will prevent wagon withdrawal (from service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Photos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Code no.</th>
<th>Irregularities/Criteria/Notes</th>
<th>Action to be taken</th>
<th>Irregularity class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axle box</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Detach wagon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8.1</td>
<td>Housing not watertight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8.1.1</td>
<td>Defect allowing water or dust to enter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– cracked or broken housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– missing plug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NB: the loss of the protective cover of the centring cone is permissible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– except housing types without cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Reason:

This clarification would make it possible to raise the awareness of the responsible wagon experts on this topic
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations:</th>
<th>Positive impacts: reducing of detached wagons number without motivation</th>
<th>Negative impacts: none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs:</td>
<td>Positive impacts: reducing of downtime leading to loss of use</td>
<td>Negative impacts: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness:</td>
<td>Positive impacts: none or see above</td>
<td>Negative impacts: none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 made impact on safety? | ☒ No ☐ Yes |
| Reason: |

| 6.2. Is the change significant? | ☒ No ☐ Yes |
| Reason: see template. |
| Attach the significant change test template |

| 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: |
| “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: |
| Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body: | [appendix] |