

Proposed amendment to the GCU Appendix 9

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Philippe BERRIO	13 January 2026	App1 6.5.5.7, 6.5.5.8, 6.5.5.9, 7.6.4.6, 7.6.4.7, 7.6.4.8	Drafting
TTI WG decision	10-11/03/2026	"	Modification and approval by the TTI WG
Feedback loop TTI WG after UIC WU SG, UIP and ERFA meetings		"	No change reported, approved by all
GCU JC decision	23/06/2026	"	Approved by the GCU JC

Title	Clarifications regarding irregularity codes 6.5.5.7, 6.5.5.8, 6.5.5.9, 7.6.4.6, 7.6.4.7, and 7.6.4.8 pertaining to the securing bolts of blind flanges.
Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:	Hexafret
Proposed amendment of:	☒ Appendix 9 GCU ☐ Appendix 11 GCU
Proposer:	Philippe BERRIO
Location, date:	13/01/2026 in Hendaye (France).
Concise description:	Taking the clarifications in IRS 40471-3 and its application guide into account.

1. Starting point (current situation):**1.1. Introduction**

Appendix 9 of the GCU (2026 edition), regarding securing bolts of blind flanges, irregularity codes 6.5.5.7, 6.5.5.8, 6.5.5.9, 7.6.4.6, 7.6.4.7, and 7.6.4.8, does not take into account the details regarding inspections included in the IRS 40471-3 application guide.

The purpose of this proposed amendment is to provide the necessary clarification.

1.2. Mode of operation

Provide additional clarification in the footnotes for irregularity codes 6.5.5.7, 6.5.5.8, 6.5.5.9, 7.6.4.6, 7.6.4.7, and 7.6.4.8.

1.3. Anomaly/description of problem

Inclusion in Appendix 9 of changes to existing provisions: IRS 40471-3 and its application guide.

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

☐ No ☒ Yes (state which):

* "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". (Source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – guide published by German Ministry of Justice)

2. Target situation**2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)**

Additional clarification provided in the footnotes for irregularity codes 6.5.5.7, 6.5.5.8, 6.5.5.9, 7.6.4.6, 7.6.4.7, and 7.6.4.8.

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	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Reinforcement, filling and emptying equipment, underneath	6.5.5.7	Securing bolt of the blind flange - RID load ⁽¹²⁾ one or more securing bolts missing or loose*	Detach wagon ^(D)	4
	6.5.5.8	- non-RID load, one securing bolt missing or loose*	Rectify. If not possible, K	3
	6.5.5.9	- non-RID load, several securing bolts missing*	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon ^(B A)	4

⁽¹²⁾ Clarification: pay attention to the hazard warning labels

* Ensure that at least two threads protrude beyond the nut; no contact must occur with the end of the securing bolt

Component	Code	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Reinforcement, filling and emptying equipment, underneath	7.6.4.6	Securing bolt of the blind flange -RID load ¹⁵ , one or more securing bolts missing or loose*	Detach wagon ^(B D)	4
	7.6.4.7	-non-RID load, one securing bolt missing or loose*	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon ^(B)	3
	7.6.4.8	-non-RID load, several securing bolts missing or loose* Bottom valve indicator device not in "closed" position on both sides	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon ^(B)	4

⁽¹⁵⁾ Clarification: pay attention to the hazard warning labels

* Ensure that at least two threads protrude beyond the nut; no contact must occur with the end of the securing bolt

4. Reason:

See points 1.3 and 2.1.

5. 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, interoperability, competitiveness, cost, management (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: N/A

6.1. Does the change have an impact on safety?	☒ No ☐ Yes
Reason:	
6.2. Is the change significant?	☒ No ☐ Yes
Reason: 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
<i>For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:</i> • <i>Code of practice</i> • <i>Use of reference system</i> • <i>Explicit risk assessment</i>	
6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	☒ No ☐ Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	