

Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 9

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Claude Weis	27/12/2019	Appendix 9, Annex 9.4	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of October 2019
Claude Weis	06/01/2021	Appendix 9, Annex 9.4	Changes according minutes of TTI WG meeting of October 2020
Claude Weis	19/01/2021	Appendix 9, Annex 9.4	Changes according minutes of TTI WG meeting of January 2021
TTI WG decision	23/03/2021	Appendix 9, Annex 9.4	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2021
WU SG decision	23/04/2021	Appendix 9, Annex 9.4	See minutes of WU SG meeting of April 2021
GCU JC decision	14/06/2021	Appendix 9, Annex 9.4	Approved

Title	Amendment in Annex 9.4 Appendix 9
Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:	CFL Cargo
Proposed amendment to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
Proposer:	Claude Weis
Location, date:	Dudelange, 06/01/2021
Concise description:	Addition of wagon speed during a derailment in the checklist, Annex 9.4 of Appendix 9

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

According to point B-1 of GCU Appendix 10, removal of the derailed axle(s) is mandatory if the wagon speed derailment is greater than 10km/h. More and more keepers want to know the speed of derailment.

1.2. Mode of operation

-

1.3. Anomaly/description of problem

In Annex 9.4 (checklist) there is no place to indicate wagon speed when wagon derailed (if known), and that should be transmitted to the keeper

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

No Yes (state which): GCU Appendix 10(B-1) and EN 15313-2016 (Art. 9.6)

* "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 – guide published by German Ministry of Justice)

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

By adding in Annex 9.4 a new field with derailment speed

3. Amendments/additional text (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

1	2	3	4	5
Number	Question	Answer	Go to number	Comments
Provisions common to vehicles with individual axles and bogies				
1	Is the wagon marked with an interoperability sign conform to point 6.1.1.2 and 6.1.1.3 of Annex 1?	Yes No	2 13.2	
2	Is the loading gauge of the participating RUs respected?	Yes No	4/4.1 3 2.1	
2.1	Have the participating RUs agreed for the wagon to be handed over?	Yes No	4/4.1 3 13.2	
3	Has the wagon derailed?	Yes No	5 4	
4	Has the wagon sustained an abnormal buffering shock or an impermissible operating shock?	Yes No	6 15.1 13.1	
5	Is the derailment speed known?	Yes No	7 / 7.1 7 / 7.1	To document in km/h
6	Is the buffering speed known?	Yes No	7 / 7.1 7 / 7.1	To document in km/h
7 5	Does the wheel tyre thickness conform to the criteria of point 1.1.1 of Annex 1 or	Yes No	8 6 15.2 13.2	To measure
7.1 5.1	Does the groove marking the minimum thickness for one-piece wheels conform to the criteria of point 1.2.1 of Annex 1?	Yes No	8 6 15.2 13.2	
8 6	Do the values Sd, Sh, qR and E lie within the permissible limits?	Yes No	9 7 15.2 13.2	For value E, measure at three points.
9 7	Does the distance between active surfaces (SR) satisfy the following criteria: – no more than 1426 mm? – at least 1410 mm for a wheel diameter > 840 mm? – at least 1415 mm for a wheel diameter ≤ 840 mm?	Yes No	10 8 15.2 13.2	

10 8	Is the wagon clearly fitted with a uniform type of suspension springs?	Yes No	11 9 15.2 13.2	
11 9	Does the buffer height lie within the permissible tolerances?	Yes No	12 10 15.2 13.2	To measure
12 10	Does the wagon (or its load) have superstructures liable to rotate, be displaced or otherwise move during the journey?	Yes No	13 11 14 12	
13 11	Are there sufficient outwardly visible devices for securing moving superstructures (or their loads) and are they present and effective?	Yes No	13 12 15.2 13.2	
14 12	Is the wagon otherwise free of safety- critical damage or defects?	Yes No	15.1 13.1 15.2 13.2	
Results of the examination of fitness to run		Measures		
15.1 13.1	The wagon may continue to run at the marked speed as a special consignment.	Fill out the Label I, indicate wagon as fit to run.		
15.2 13.2	The wagon may not be included in trains in its present condition.	Do not fill out the Label I, indicate wagon as unfit to run, giving reasons.		

4. Reason:

More and more keepers want to know the wagon speed when it derailed. Annex 9.4 could then be used as a record of this speed if it is known.

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):

Reasoning behind amendment:

Positive impacts:

Operations, Interoperability, Safety, Competitiveness: (value: 4)

Safety (grade 4)

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.

Risk analysis conducted by:

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: According to GCU Appendix 10(B-1) and EN 15313-2016 (article 9.6) derailed axle(s) shall be removed from the wagon for bearing inspection.	
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 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 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"> • 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]