Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

Background

Amendment made by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Luca Mandelli ERFA	01/12/2023	Code 4.10	Drafted
Luca Mandelli ERFA	19/01/2024	Code 4.10	Updated according to TTI WG meeting of January 2024
Decision by TTI WG	19/03/2024	Code 4.10	Validated in accordance with TTI WG meeting minutes of March 2024
Decision by WU SG	14/05/2024	Code 4.10	Approved by WU SG
Decision by GCU JC	04/06/2024	Code 4.10	Rejected proposal
TTI WG	22/01/2025	Code 4.10	Updated according to TTI WG meeting of January 2025
Decision TTI WG	19/03/2025	Code 4.10	Validated in accordance with TTI WG meeting minutes of March 2025
Feedback loop WG MNT after UIC WU SG, UIP and ERFA meetings	16/05/2025	Code 4.10	No changes reported, approved by all
GCU JC decision	12/06/2025	Code 4.10	Approved by the GCU JC

Title:	Introduction of a new damage code for centre joint components
Proposed amendment made by (RU/keeper/other body):	ERFA
Proposed amendment concerns:	☒ Appendix 9 ☐ Appendix 11
Proposer:	Luca Mandelli, ERFA
Location, date:	Chiasso, 01/12/2023
Concise description:	Introduction of a new damage code for central articulated joints (6-axle wagon, 3 bogies), not covered at present.

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

Central articulated joints (6-axle wagons, 3 bogies) are not mentioned in the current version of Appendix 9.

If one of these parts is damaged, there is no corresponding code.

Other codes must be entered with Appendix 4, but these are not correct.

1.2. Mode of operation

-

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem:

Appendix 9 and the wagon damage report have to specify/document this issue in more detail. This requires specific codes to be provided, and a corresponding code for the detected defect to be created.

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

☒No ☐ Yes (state which):

* “Code of practice: 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)

"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" (translation/source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – German Ministry of Justice)

2. Target situation

2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)

Introduction of a new damage code for centre joint components (6-axle wagon, 3 bogies)

3. 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
Central articulated joint connection	4.10			
	4.10.1	Connection with upper side bearer (joint side bearer)		
	4.10.1.1	- loose	K	3
	4.10.1.2	- missing	Detach wagon(A)	4
	4.10.2	Friction plate		
	4.10.2.1	- Friction plate broken, no missing parts	K	3
	4.10.2.2	- Friction plate broken, missing parts • in contact with metal	Detach wagon (A)	4

Footnote: (A): GCU fitness to run, (B): Rectify load, (C): Instructions from the keeper, (D): RID procedure

4. Reason:

For a proper technical transfer inspection and documentation via a wagon damage report, a code for the component needs to be inserted

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).
Justify observations

Impacts:
Operations (Value 3)
Interoperability (Value 3)
Competitiveness (Value 3)
Costs (Value: 2)
Administration (Value 3)
Safety (Value 4).

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:

6.1. Does the change have an impact on safety?	☐No ☒ Yes
Justification: Hazards can lead to derailment	
6.2. Is the change significant?	☒No ☐ Yes
Justification: see template Attach the "significant change" test template.	
6.3. Determining and classifying risk:	☒ 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: ☐ No ☐ Yes (describe possible misuse):	
6.4. Have safety measures been applied?	☐No ☒ Yes
For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected: • *Code of practice* • *Use of reference system* • *Explicit risk estimate*	
6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	☒No ☐ Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	[Appendix]