

Proposed amendment to Appendix 9 to the GCU

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Jean-Marc Blondé	25/11/2021	App. 1 Chapt.1, 3, 5, 6	First draft
Jean-Marc Blondé	21/01/2022	App. 1 Chapt.1, 3, 5, 6	In accordance with TTI WG meeting of January 2022
Approved by TTI WG	22/03/2022	App. 1 Chapt.1, 3, 5, 6	Updated during the meeting in accordance with TTI WG meeting of March 2022
Approved by WU SG	05/04/2022	App. 1 Chapt.1, 3, 5, 6	In accordance with WU SG meeting of May 2022
For GCU JC decision	09/06/2022	App. 1 Chapt.1, 3, 5, 6	Approved

Title	Wagons equipped with various technical components
Proposed amendment made by RU/keeper/other:	SBB Cargo AG
Proposed amendment to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
Proposer:	SBB Cargo AG, Jean-Marc Blondé
Location, date:	Olten, 25/11/2021
Concise description:	Proposal to define new inspection criteria for the various components for the technical personnel called upon to record damage, as well as new damage codes.

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

In view of the planned deployment of digital automatic coupling in Europe, the increased use of on-board diagnostic equipment for wagons and the introduction of automatic brake tests, definition of generic damage codes in Appendix 9 is proposed as a first step.

1.2. Mode of operation

During technical wagon inspections, it is important that the functional suitability of the components be inspected in addition to the visible characteristics of the vehicle, and any faults notified to the keeper.

1.3. Anomaly/description of problem

In the current circumstances, RUs cannot notify the keeper of damage affecting these new components on the wagon. Thus, the proposal is to create new codes in Annex 1 for this new damage category.

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

No Yes (state which): Not relevant

* "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)**

Through this proposal, technical personnel will be prompted to detect malfunctions on new types of components and report them to the keeper by means of specific codes.

3. Amendments/additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 9):

Colour codes for amendment proposals:

Back: Current text, for info and remains unchanged

Red: New text

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

Annex 1

Chap. 1 Running gear

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Axle box	1.8			
	1.8.1.4	Mechanical damage to axle box cover (axial generator), see also codes 1.8.1.1, 1.8.1.2 and 1.8.1.3	M	3

Chap. 3 Brake

Brake	3			
Electrical part	3.6			
Automatic brake test	3.6.1*	Automatic brake test fault (observed and reported during performance of the brake test)	M	3

* Automatic brake test fault – observed separately to the technical inspection during a special inspection.

Chap. 5 Buffing and draw gear

Buffing and draw gear	5			
Automatic coupling	5.10			
	5.10.1*	Automatic coupling fault (observed and reported during performance of coupling)	Rectify, if not possible, detach wagon	4
	5.10.2	Coupler head damaged	M	3
	5.10.3	Uncoupling device damaged	M	3
	5.10.4	Support, draw bar damaged	M	3

* Automatic coupling fault – observed separately to the technical inspection during a special inspection.

Chap. 6 Wagon body

Wagon body	6			
Wagons equipped with various technical components	6.8			
	6.8.1	General equipment for fastening components - mechanical damage or loose	Rectify + M	3
Electrical components	6.8.2	Mechanical damage to box wagon, aerial	M	3
	6.8.3	Cable/plug - torn off or damaged	Rectify + M	3

4. Reason

The codes ensure that the notifications sent to keepers throughout Europe in relation to damage observed on the indicated components can be documented in a standardised manner.

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, administration (value: 3)

Safety (value: 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason:	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<i>For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:</i> <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]