

## Amendment Proposal to GCU Appendix 9

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Charles-Antoine Alavoine	26/11/2020	Appendix 9, 2.5.6	Filing, introduction
Charles-Antoine Alavoine	20/01/2021	Appendix 9, 2.5.6	Presentation of point 2.5.6: fresh traces of bottoming, axle-box housing/bogie frame
TTI WG decision	23/03/2021	Appendix 9, 2.5.6	See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2021
WU SG decision	23/04/2021	Appendix 9, 2.5.6	See minutes of WU SG meeting of April 2021
GCU JC decision	14/06/2021	Appendix 9, 2.5.6	Approved

<b>Title:</b>	Modification of 2.5.6: fresh traces of bottoming, axle-box housing/bogie frame
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:</b>	Prepared par SNCF/AFWP Appendix 9 subgroup
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <span style="margin-left: 200px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11</span>
<b>Proposer:</b>	Charles-Antoine Alavoine - SNCF
<b>Location, date:</b>	Tergnier, 26/11/2020
<b>Concise description:</b>	Modification of code 2.5.6

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

Code 2.5.6, “fresh traces of bottoming between the axle-box housing and the bogie frame”, is not explicit or precise enough to describe the defect. The irregularity may have arisen following temporary overload of a wagon, but the wagon may also have been deformed.

Interpretation of the irregularity may differ from one inspector to the next, particular with regard to “fresh traces”.

The aim of this amendment is to enable better detection of the specific irregularity and standardise the action to be taken. It will also prevent disagreements with the keeper.

**1.2. Mode of operation**

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.

The text has a section dedicated to irregularities relating to wagon bogie suspension, which may be adapted. There may be confusion in relation to how to designate the irregularity. Detection quality is a requirement that must be met.

**1.3. Anomaly/description of problem**

The wording of code 2.5.6 suggests that any wagon with fresh traces of bottoming between the axle-box housing and the bogie frame should be withdrawn from service and that clearance of less than 8 mm be noted during the wagon inspection.

In some cases, however, recent traces are noted even though the clearance is within the acceptable limits (greater than 8 mm). This highlights the possibility of the wagon being overloaded or its load being distributed incorrectly.

The same reasoning applies to detection of the irregularity.

Irregularity = insufficient clearance (due to a problem with the suspension)

Detection criterion (or indication) = recent traces of contact between the axle-box housing and the bogie frame.

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

No  Yes (state which):

\* “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

### 2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)

Modify the wording of code 2.5.6 so that it describes insufficient spring clearance **in keeping with points 2.1.5 or 2.4.4** and delete the word “fresh”, to be replaced with “recent”, + delete the word “bottoming”, to be replaced with “contact”.

The benefits offered by this proposal are clarity and precision.

## 3. 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: (may be crossed out): text to be deleted

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Suspension system of Y 25 bogies or derived systems	2.5.6	<p>Insufficient spring clearance:</p> <p>Vertical distance between axle-box housing and bogie frame less than 8 mm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fresh Recent signs of <del>bottoming</del> contact between axle-box housing and bogie frame</li> <li>• <del>Clearance &lt; 8 mm</del></li> </ul>	Detach wagon	5

## 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*

A positive impact (3):

- on quality due to better and more accurate diagnosis of the damage
- on costs due to fewer unnecessary withdrawals from service

Positive impacts:

Operations, Interoperability, Safety, Competitiveness (value: 3)

## 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"/> 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 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</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]