

Amendment proposal Appendix 10 to the GCU

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Burkhard Lerche	31/10/2022	Point 1.17 App. 10	Registration of request
Burkhard Lerche	29/11/2022	Point 1.17 App. 10	Discussion
WG MNT decision	31/01/2023	Point 1.17 App. 10	See minutes of Maintenance WG meeting of January
WU SG decision	28/02/2023	Point 1.17 App. 10	Approved, see minutes of WU SG of February 2023
GCU JC decision	07/06/2023	Point 1.17 App. 10	GCU JC approval

Title	Measuring equipment for checking the AR value
Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:	DB Cargo AG
Proposed amendment of:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
Proposer:	Burkhard Lerche
Location, date:	31 October 2022
Concise description:	Authorisation to use other measuring instruments

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
After the wagon has derailed, it is important to measure value E (value AR) of the derailed wheels.
1.2. Mode of operation
See Appendix 10 point 1.17
1.3. Anomaly/description of problem
Point 1.17 states: "If a check is required on the distance between the inner faces of the tyres or rims of monobloc wheels, then this distance shall be measured with a gauge at rail level in at least three points on the wheel, at 120° intervals." No modern electronic equipment can be used for this requirement.
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)
The text should be modified in order to allow the use of electronic equipment (e.g., the Calipri-Wheel)

3. Amendments/additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10):

Amendment colour code:

Black: text in force remains unchanged, for information.

Red: new text

Blue: (if crossed out): text to be deleted

“If a check is required on the distance between the inner faces of the tyres or rims of monobloc wheels, then this distance shall be measured ~~with a gauge~~ at rail level, **with an appropriate measuring device**, in at least three points on the wheel, at 120° intervals.

4. Reason:

In recent years, mechanical measuring instruments have been supplemented by electronic measuring instruments and approved by DB. Several mechanical devices have been combined within electronic axle measuring equipment. At the same time, the instrument has also had the documentation integrated into it. This new generation of measuring equipment should now be available for use in the GCU.

5. Evaluation of the possible positive and 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:

Positive effects:

Impact on costs/administration/interoperability/safety/competitiveness:

At DB Cargo AG, the axle profiles, and the value E (value AR) are measured as standard with the Calipri-Wheel measuring instrument.

Uniform operation of the workshops. After amendment, **one** procedure can be used for measurement in the workshops (+3)

More accurate than the calliper method (+4)

Improvement in documentation (+2)

Works regardless of weather and lighting conditions (+3)

Operation, interoperability, competitiveness (+3)

6. Risk analysis 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: No change in limit values and scope of application	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason:	
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]