

## Proposed amendment to Appendix 10 to the GCU

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Module	Amendment
AG Neandertal	04/01/2023	M00.001	First draft
WG MNT decision	18/04/2023	M00.001	Update and approval (see minutes of the Maintenance WG meeting)
WU SG decision	23/05/2023	M00.001	WU SG approval
GCU JC decision	07/06/2023	M00.001	GCU JC approval

<b>Title</b>	M00.001: Keeper instructions to be obtained M00.001: Demander instructions au détenteur M00.001: Halteranweisung einholen
<b>Proposed amendment made by RU/keeper/other:</b>	AG Neandertal
<b>Proposed amendment to:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10 <input type="checkbox"/> Annex 6 (appendix 10)
<b>Proposer:</b>	
<b>Location, date:</b>	Mettmann, 04/01/2023
<b>Concise description:</b>	To restore the fitness to run, measures that not always precise can be described within the Appendix 10. In certain cases, it is necessary to ask the keeper how to proceed

## 1. Starting point (current situation):

<b>1.1. Introduction</b>
The task of the Working Group for the modularisation of Appendix 10 of the GCU is to describe new modules containing the measures to restore fitness to run and to create a link to the damage codes of Appendix 9 as well as to the coding of the works of Appendix 10 Annex 6
<b>1.2. Mode of operation</b>
The results of the working group are submitted as amendment to the Working Group Appendix 10 and so introduced in the regular process for validation of amendments
<b>1.3. Anomaly/description of problem</b>
Appendix 10 does not currently provide a comprehensive package of works to be carried out in order to restore the fitness to run. By introducing modularisation, this problem is solved. Modularisation supports the further digitalisation.
<b>1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. ISO, EN)?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which): <small>* "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)</small> <small>"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)</small>

## 2. Target situation

<b>2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (solution sought)</b>
<p>This measure restores the fitness to run after following damage codes Appendix 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1.1 Underframe warped vertically or horizontally (Buffer height out of tolerance range, visible distortion)</li> <li>• 4.1.2 Solebar, headstock stressed by coupler or intermediate crossbar exhibiting a fracture or crack.</li> <li>• 4.2.1 Axle guard distorted, safety hazard.</li> <li>• 4.2.2 Axle guard broken abnormal position.</li> <li>• 4.2.3.1 Axle guard fastening loose.</li> <li>• 4.2.4.1 Axle guard crack &gt; 1/4 of horizontal cross-section</li> <li>• 4.2.4.3 Axle guard crack close to or running towards a fastening point.</li> <li>• 4.4.1.2 More than one check plate per axle missing (bogie wagon)</li> <li>• 4.4.1.3 One check plate missing (axle wagon)</li> <li>• 4.4.2 Hard manganese wear plate on Y bogies displaced or missing.</li> <li>• 4.5.1 Suspension bracket (axle wagon) cracked, broken, or distorted (space between bracket and solebar, – half or more of the fastening elements missing or broken)</li> <li>• 4.6.1 Connection between bogie and underframe defective, connecting and fastening elements broken, missing or ineffective.</li> <li>• 4.7.1 Bogie frame cracked or visibly distorted.</li> <li>• 4.7.2 Bogie frame component broken.</li> <li>• 5.1.2 Buffer height exceeding tolerance range (h &lt; 940 mm or h &gt; 1065 mm) or significant difference in buffer height at coupled wagon ends</li> <li>• 5.9.1 Sliding element of the long-stroke damper not in mid position with respect to wagon underframe</li> </ul>

### 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

Symbols are used as follows:

→ Link to other section of the GCU

☑ Communication between keeper and workshop

📄 Documentation of the work acc. to app. 10 annex 6

Note: if changes of the annex 6 are required, they have to be named below.

#### EN

##### **M00.001 Keeper instructions to be obtained**

<b>Technical requirements:</b>	-
<b>Organisational preparations:</b>	-
<b>No.</b>	<b>Work tasks, technical target state and additional notes</b>
1.	Compile information on damage
2.	☑ Contact the keeper regarding further action and, if necessary, request replacement parts with → Form H in accordance with Appendix 7
📄	

#### FR

##### **M00.001 Demander instructions au détenteur**

<b>Conditions techniques :</b>	-
<b>Mesures préparatoires :</b>	-
<b>n°</b>	<b>Contenu de l'intervention, état technique théorique et autres indications</b>
1.	Rassembler les informations concernant le dommage
2.	☑ Contacter le détenteur pour déterminer la marche à suivre et demander, le cas échéant, les pièces de rechange à l'aide du → modèle H selon annexe 7
📄	

#### DE

##### **M00.001 Halteranweisung einholen**

<b>Technische Voraussetzungen:</b>	-
<b>Organisatorische Vorbereitungen:</b>	-
<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Arbeitsinhalt, technischer Sollzustand und sonstige Hinweise</b>
1.	Informationen zum Schaden zusammenstellen
2.	☑ Halter bezüglich des weiteren Vorgehens kontaktieren und ggf. Ersatzteile mit →Muster H nach Anlage 7 abfordern
📄	

**4. Reason:****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:*

This measure describes the good practice in maintenance and should not have a positive or negative effect on operations, costs, administration, interoperability, competitiveness, but presents an increase on safety.

## 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: No change in the process	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No change in the process	
<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]