

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

Background

| Amended by | Date | Paragraph | Amendment |
|--------------------|------------|------------|--|
| Luca Mandelli ERFA | 01/12/2023 | Code 7.8.1 | Drafted |
| Luca Mandelli ERFA | 16/01/2024 | Code 7.8.1 | Updated according to TTI WG meeting of January 2024 |
| TTI WG decision | 19/03/2024 | Code 7.8.1 | Validated in accordance with TTI WG minutes of the meeting of March 2024 |
| WU SG decision | 14/05/2024 | Code 7.8.1 | Approved by WU SG |
| GCU JC decision | 04/06/2024 | Code 7.8.1 | Approved by GCU JC |

| | |
|---|--|
| Title | Addition to code 7.8.1: Coding |
| Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other: | ERFA |
| Proposed amendment to: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11 |
| Proposer: | Luca Mandelli, ERFA |
| Location, date: | Chiasso, 01/12/2023 |
| Concise description: | Addition to/clarification of code 7.8.1 Coding |

Starting point (current situation):

| |
|--|
| Introduction |
| Code 7.8.1, valid coding missing or illegible, should make it possible to distinguish whether this is absent on one or both sides. |
| Mode of operation |
| - |
| Anomaly/description of problem |
| Sometimes the wagon is detached, even if the codification plate is only missing on one side (but is present and legible on the other). Annex 5, Catalogue of inspections in accordance with Annex 1, already gives this difference: <i>7.8.1 / Markings, coding for combined traffic / At least one plate present and legible / VC / 5</i> |

| |
|--|
| Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which): |
| <p>* "a written set of rules that, when correctly applied, can be used to control one or more specific hazards." (source: Regulation EC 402/2013, Article 3)</p> <p>"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)</p> |

Target situation

| |
|--|
| Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal) |
| Clarification of the text for code 7.8.1 |

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

Amendment colour code:

Black: Current text, for info and remains unchanged

Red: new text

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

| Component | Code no. | Irregularities/Criteria/Notes | Action to be taken | Irregularity class |
|---------------------------------------|----------|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| Markings, coding for combined traffic | 7.8 | | | |
| | 7.8.1 | Valid Codings missing or illegible on both sides | Detach wagon | 5 |

2. Reason

This addition is necessary to avoid the unnecessary detachment of wagons (due to a single missing plate).

3. Assess potential positive/negative impacts

Assess the possible positive and negative impacts (operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc.), using a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high): Justify observations

Impacts:

Operations (Value: 3)

Interoperability (Value: 3)

Competitiveness (Value: 5)

Costs (Value: 1)

Administration (Value: 1)

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).

Safety appraisal done by:

| | |
|---|---|
| 6.1 Does the change have an impact on safety? | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Reason: The proposal specifies the exchange of information between the RU and the keeper | |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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] |