

Proposed amendment to to the GCU

| | |
|---|--|
| Title | <i>Explanation of symbols used in the working modules</i> |
| Nummer | <i>AP-MNT-2025-06</i> |
| Planned entry into force | <i>01.01.2026</i> |
| Related Topic proposal | <i>TP-MNT-2025-06 – Explaining the symbols used in the working modules</i> |
| Proposer / issuing working group | <i>WG MNT</i> |
| Section of the GCU | <i>GCU Appendix 10</i> |
| Concise description (Management Summary) | <i>Since version 2024 of Appendix 10 of the GCU, there has been a lack of legend for the meaning of the symbols used in the working modules. (i.e. envelope, sending arrow, etc...). We add a symbol legend to the main text of Appendix 10 “Principle”, Chapter A</i> |

Record of amendments:

| Status | Date | Comment |
|---|-------------------|--|
| <i>Work order</i> | <i>04/03/2025</i> | <i>During an online WG MNT meeting</i> |
| <i>In creation</i> | <i>04/03/2025</i> | <i>Created by the WG MNT</i> |
| <i>Update</i> | <i>04/03/2025</i> | <i>Updated during an online WG MNT meeting</i> |
| <i>...</i> | | |
| <i>Decision Working group</i> | <i>04/03/2025</i> | <i>Approved by the WG MNT</i> |
| <i>Feedback loop WG MNT after UIC WU SG, UIP et and ERFA meetings</i> | <i>12/05/2025</i> | <i>No change reported, approved by all</i> |
| <i>Decision GCU JC</i> | <i>12/06/2025</i> | <i>Approved by the GCU JC</i> |

1. Subject matter and reason for the amendment:

- Description of the current situation:
Since version 2024 of Appendix 10 of the GCU, there has been a lack of explanation/legend for the meaning of the symbols used in the working modules. (i.e. envelope, sending arrow, etc...)
- Reason for the planned change (trigger)
Queries from the workshops

2. Description of the intended amendment and reason to implement it in the GCU:

- What is the proposed solution?
We add a symbol legend to the main text of Appendix 10 "Principle", Chapter A
- Why should it be implemented in the GCU and not regulated outside?
Basically, this is an editorial clarification within Appendix 10

3. Is it reasonable to amend the contract?

- Is the change critical to keep the GCU up to date?
No.
- Is the implementation of the change urgent?
No.
- What is the estimated scope of application of the amendment (e.g. number waggons affected, number of maintenance operations...)
The amendment clarifies for all GCU workshops the exact meaning of the symbols used in the working modules
- Consequences of not implementing the proposal
Uncertainty among the GCU workshops as to what the symbols exactly mean

Proposed amendment to the GCU:

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

English:

0.11 In the work modules, special action requirements are indicated by symbols; the symbols mean



Workshop and wagon keeper establish contact (usually by e-mail).



Reference must be taken into account



Information, which has to be transmitted in addition to Annex 6 of Appendix 10 GCU to the wagon keeper

German:

0.11 In den Arbeitsmodulen sind besondere Handlungserfordernisse durch Symbole gekennzeichnet; Die Symbole bedeuten:



Werkstatt und Wagenhalter nehmen Kontakt auf (in der Regel per E-Mail)



Verweis ist zu berücksichtigen



Informationen, die zusätzlich zu Anhang 6 von Anlage 10 AVV dem Halter zu übermitteln sind

French:

0.11 Dans les modules de travail, les besoins d'action particuliers sont indiqués par des symboles. Les symboles signifient :



L'atelier et le détenteur prennent contact (en général par e-mail)



Référence à prendre en compte



Informations supplémentaires à l'appendice 6 de l'annexe 10 du CUU à transmettre au détenteur

Annex: Safety Assessment 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.

This Safety Assessment is created and released by the working group and validated by the vote of the GCU signatories

| | |
|--|---|
| 1.1. Does the proposed change have an impact on safety? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Justification: clarification of existing rules. | |
| 1.2. Is the proposed change significant? | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Justification: | |
| 1.3. Determining and classifying risk, if necessary | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 1.3.1. Effect of change in normal operation: 1.3.2. Effect of change in the event of disruption/deviation from normal operation: 1.3.3. Potential misuse of system: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse): | |
| 1.4. Have safety measures been applied? | <input 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"> <i>Code of practice</i> <i>Use of reference system</i> <i>Explicit risk assessment</i> | |
| 1.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body? | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body | [Appendix] |