

## Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 9

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Jean-Marc Blondé	08/03/2021	Appendix 9, 6.1.1.5	First draft
TTI WG decision	23/03/2021	Appendix 9, 6.1.1.5	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2021
WU SG decision	23/04/2021	Appendix 9, 6.1.1.5	See minutes of WU SG meeting of April 2021
GCU JC decision	14/06/2021	Appendix 9, 6.1.1.5	Approved

<b>Title</b>	Specification of holding force with code 6.1.1.5
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:</b>	SBB Cargo AG
<b>Proposed amendment to:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Jean-Marc Blondé
<b>Location, date:</b>	Olten, 08/03/2021
<b>Concise description:</b>	No dedicated code for missing holding force markings is provided in Appendix 9

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

Marking of holding force on wagons has been mandatory since 1 January 2021.

**1.2. Mode of operation**

The keeper is advised of the irregularity via the damage report.

**1.3. Anomaly/description of problem**

At present, only the braked weight of the hand brake can be documented using code 6.1.1.5. The braked weight of the hand brake should be replaced with the holding force of the hand brake under code 6.1.1.5.

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

No  Yes (state which): UIC Leaflet 545

\* "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)**

The weight of the hand brake under code 6.1.1.5 is changed to the holding force of the parking brake for irregularities.

### 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

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Wagon body	6			
Wagon body in general	6.1			
Markings on wagons	6.1.1	Missing, illegible or incomplete		
	6.1.1.1	- wagon number <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.2	“RIV” sign, “TEN” + “GE” or acceptance marking (“TEN” + “G1”, country acronym in approval plate) <sup>7)</sup> or	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.3	agreement plate (if showing exchange codes 41, 43, 45, 81, 83 or 85) <sup>7)</sup> or an acceptance marking (“TEN” + “CW” + country acronym in approval plate) <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.4	- tare weight <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.5	Holding force <del>braked-weight</del> of <del>hand parking</del> brake <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.6	- load limits <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.7	- capacity of tank wagons <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.8	both the VKM and full address of wagon keeper <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.9	length-over-buffers of wagon <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.10	“high voltage” warning sign on wagons with step or ladder access up to a height >2 m above rail level	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.11	indication of compatibility with ILUs on carrying wagon <sup>7)</sup>	Detach wagon	4
	6.1.1.12	– reserved –		
	6.1.1.13	– reserved –		

### 4. Reason:

Only holding force is taken into account for parking wagons.

### 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:

Impacts:

Operations, Interoperability, Competitiveness, Cost, Management: (value: 3)

Safety (grade 4)

<sup>7)</sup> If this irregularity is only found on one side of the wagon: affix K

## 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:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: Marking the holding force of the parking brake is necessary to secure trains or wagons. Conversion from t to kN is unnecessary.	
<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 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 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"> <li>• Code of practice</li> <li>• Use of reference system</li> <li>• Explicit risk assessment</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]