

## Proposed amendment to Appendix 9 to the GCU

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Claude Weis	19/01/2022	7.7.3 – 6.7.5	First submission
Claude Weis	26/01/2022	7.7.3 – 6.7.5	Update and input of remarks from TTI WG 01-2022
TTI WG decision	22/03/2022	7.7.3 – 6.7.5	Update in the meeting and input of remarks from TTI WG 03-2022
WU SG decision	16/05/2022	7.7.3 – 6.7.5	In accordance with the WU SG minutes of May 2022
GCU JC decision	09/06/2022	7.7.3 – 6.7.5	Approved

<b>Title</b>	Locking retractable spigots in place
<b>Proposed amendment made by RU/keeper/other:</b>	Drafted by CFL Cargo S.A.
<b>Proposed amendment to:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Claude Weis
<b>Location, date:</b>	Dudelange, 19/01/2022
<b>Concise description:</b>	Code 7.7.3 deals with retractable spigots on container wagons. As chapter 7.x.x deals with loads, this code should be deleted and moved to the section for code 6.x.x.

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

Code 7.7.3 deals with retractable spigots on container wagons. As chapter 7.x.x deals with loads, this code should be deleted and moved to the section for code 6.x.x.

**1.2. Mode of operation**

Inspectors search for codes on the basis of damage categories. They will automatically search for damage relating to a container spigot under code 6.x.x, which deals with wagon damage.

**1.3. Anomaly/description of problem**

The inspector will not look for this type of damage in the 7.x.x code section.

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

No  Yes (state which):

\* "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)**

Code 7.7.3 should be deleted, and this type of damage should fall under code 6.x.x.  
This proposition assigns this damage type under code 6.7.5, which will be amended slightly.

### 3. Amendments/additional texts (relate only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 9):

Colour codes for changes:

**Black:** currently applicable text; provides information 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
	7.7.3	<del>Spigots of hinged support plates neither raised nor secured</del>  – Reserved –	Raise and secure. <del>If not possible, detach wagon</del>	5

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
	6.7.5	Moving parts <del>loose /unlocked not properly secured</del> (e.g., retractable spigots <del>not secured</del> , handrails for shunters <del>not secured</del> , etc.)		
	6.7.5.1	- no risk of fouling the gauge	Rectify. If not possible, secure provisionally	3
	6.7.5.2	- Risk of fouling the gauge	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon	5

### 4. Reason:

This amendment will make it easier for inspectors on the ground to find the correct code.

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts
<p>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:</p> <p>Impacts: Operations, interoperability, competitiveness, costs, administration (value: 2)</p> <p>Safety (value: 3)</p>

## 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 have an impact on safety?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: Yes, because a spigot that is not locked in place/secured may foul the gauge during the journey.	
<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 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 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]