

Proposed amendment to Appendix 10 to the GCU

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
André Brozy (UIP)	08/02/2022	4.17	Expansion of the description of construction elements
MNT WG decision	29/03/2022	4.17	See minutes of Maintenance WG meeting of March 2022
WU SG decision	16/05/2022	4.17	See minutes of WU SG of May 2022
GCU JC decision	09/06/2022	4.17	Approved

Title	Expansion of the description of construction elements - Appendix 10, point 4.17
Proposed amendment made by RU/keeper/other:	Maintenance Working Group
Proposed amendment to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
Proposer:	André Brozy
Location, date:	Mettmann, 08/02/2022
Concise description:	At present, point 4.17 does not cover all the elements involved in checking the connection between the bogie and the underframe and should be extended to include these elements.

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
Following on from provisions for the detachment of wagons on the basis of Appendix 9 and transport to the workshop for repair, GCU Appendix 10 defines the criteria for returning the wagon concerned to a state in which it is fit to run.
1.2. Mode of operation
In accordance with Appendix 10 point 4.17, the workshop must inspect the centre casting kingpin during repairs. The inspection criteria are as follows: the centre casting kingpin must not be <u>missing</u> , <u>broken</u> or <u>ineffective</u> .
1.3. Anomaly/description of problem
The inspection criteria and the extent of the inspection as per point 4.17 are not sufficient to determine that the component is in suitable condition. Centre casting kingpins are usually secured by means of a crown nut and cotter pin lock or a locking mechanism and a nut/cotter pin lock once the connection between the underframe and the bogie has been made. The locking elements of the centre casting kingpin are not mentioned in point 4.1.7 of Appendix 10 and are therefore not subject to claims if they are missing, broken or ineffective.
1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which): * "a written set of rules that, when correctly applied, can be used to control one or more specific hazards." (Source: Regulation (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 (solution sought)
Expansion of inspection requirements in point 4.17 of GCU Appendix 10.

3. Additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10):

Colour codes for amendment proposals:

Black: Currently applicable text; provides information and remains unchanged

Red: New text

Blue: (may be crossed out): Text to be deleted

4.17 The centre casting kingpin **and its locking devices** must not be missing, broken or loose.

4. Reason:

This amendment will help to improve safety. In addition, the inspection point in Appendix 10 meets the criteria set out in Appendix 9 (codes 4.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.2).

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:

A positive impact on:

Operations: 1

Costs: 1

Administration: 1

Interoperability: 1

Safety: 4

Competitiveness: 1

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 have an impact on safety?	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: a missing locking device on the kingpin may result in an operating incident.	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: The Maintenance WG (GCU Appendix 10) has concluded that the change is not significant.	
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 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"> • 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]