

## Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 9

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Emmanuel Labalette	11/02/2019	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	Drafting
Charles-Antoine Alavoine	12/03/2019	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	Modification
Romain Moulin	12/10/2020	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	Modification
TTI WG	19- 20/01/2021	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	Modification
TTI WG decision	23/03/2021	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2021
WU SG decision	23/04/2021	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	See minutes of WU SG meeting of April 2021
GCU JC decision	14/06/2021	Appendix 9 code 5.6.1	Approved

<b>Title:</b>	Screw coupling – amendment to code 5.6.1+ new codes 5.6.1.1 & 5.6.1.2
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body</b>	Written by SNCF / Sub-WG Appendix 9 AFWP
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Charles-Antoine Alavoine –SNCF / Emmanuel Labalette – Ermewa Group
<b>Location, date:</b>	Clichy, 11/02/2019
<b>Concise description:</b>	Amendment to code 5.6.1+ new codes 5.6.1.1 & 5.6.1.2

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

<b>1.1. Introduction</b>
Code for lack of lubrication for screw coupling is not provided and replaced by code for seizing
<b>1.2. Mode of operation</b>
The GCU represents the core basis for contractual relations between keepers and RUs. The text must be clear so that it can be applied by all parties in a simple, more specific and unequivocal manner. There is only a code 5.6.1 for missing, damaged or inoperative parts.
<b>1.3. Anomaly / description of problem</b>
There is only a code 5.6.1 for missing, damaged or inoperative parts. The problem should be solved by a simple action to limit withdrawals from service leading to immobilisation of wagons

<b>1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which):
<small>* "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)</small>

**2. Target situation**

<b>2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)</b>
Insertion of an additional control code relating to lubrication in order to anticipate withdrawals from service and eliminate the risk of detaching wagon

### 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	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Screw coupler	5.6			
	5.6.1	<del>Part missing, damaged or</del> Inoperative		
	5.6.1.1	Damaged or part missing	Rectify or use a different screw coupling + K <del>or</del> rectify, if not possible, detach wagon.	3
	5.6.1.2	Lack of lubricant and jammed	Rectify or use a different screw coupling + K, if not possible, detach wagon	3
	5.6.2	Hook for hanging coupler damaged, inoperative or missing	M	3
5.6.3	Coupler unhooked	Hook into position and tie up if necessary	3	

#### 4. Reason:

#### 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*

Positive impacts on

-costs (+5) because a non-lubricated coupling will at least be worn out prematurely

-safety (+4) because a traffic incident may occur due to this damage

Positives impacts:

Operations, interoperability, competitiveness (Valeur +3)

Sécurité: (Valeur +4)

## 6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

Description of actual/target system, and scope of change to be made (see points 1 and 2).

Safety appraisal performed by: not done, since adaptation results from the aforementioned standards.

<b>6.1. Does the change made 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: see template. Attach the significant change test template	
<b>6.3. Determining and classifying risk:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> 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: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse):	
<b>6.4. Have safety measures been applied?</b>	<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"> <li>• "Code of practice" (acknowledged technical rules)</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]