

Proposed amendment to to the GCU Signatories Portlet (on the GCU Bureau website)

Title	<i>GCU Signatories Portlet</i>
Reference	<i>AP-WDSG-2026-01</i>
Planned change date	<i>01/01/2027</i>
Topic proposal	<i>TP-WDSG-2026-01</i>
Proposer / working group	<i>SG WU - Wagon Damage Settlement Group</i>
Section of the GCU	<i>GCU Signatories Portlet on the GCU Bureau Website</i>
Concise description	<i>Correction of wording in GCU Signatories Portlet on the GCU Bureau website</i>

Record of amendments:

Status	Date	Comment
<i>Work order</i>	<i>15/05/2025</i>	<i>Meeting in Dresden</i>
<i>In creation</i>	<i>03/07/2025</i>	<i>First draft</i>
<i>Updates</i>	<i>17/09/2025</i>	<i>WU SG meeting in Paris</i>
<i>...</i>		
<i>Decision Working group</i>	<i>22-23/04/2026</i>	<i>Amended and approved by WDSG</i>
<i>Feedback loop WDSG after UIC WU SG, UIP et ERFA meetings</i>		<i>No change reported, approved by all</i>
<i>Decision GCU JC</i>	<i>23/06/2026</i>	<i>Approved by the GCU JC</i>

1. Subject matter and reason for the amendment:

- **Description of the current situation:**

The following discrepancies were noted during consultations of the GCU Signatories Portlet on the GCU Bureau website:

- (a) Point 2.2 is not the same in the German version as in the English and French versions.

There is in the German Version „Ersatz für Nutzungsausfall des Wagens (Artikel 13)“

It is required to „Schadenersatzansprüche für Schäden oder Nutzungsausfall“.

- (b) Clarification in point 3 “Keeper Responsibles ». Point 3.4 erroneously refers to Article 15. Moreover, this last point is redundant with point 3.5.

2. Description of the intended amendment and reason for implementing it in the GCU:

- **What is the proposed solution?**

1. Alignment of the wording in the German version of point 2.2 with the French and English versions.
2. Provide clarifications in the wording of point 3 “Keeper Responsibles »

- **Why should it be implemented in the GCU and not regulated outside?**

It concerns the GCU Signatories Portlet.

3. Is it reasonable to amend the contract?

- **Is the change critical to keep the GCU up to date?**

—

- **Is the implementation of the change urgent?**

—

- **What is the estimated scope of application of the amendment (e.g. number waggons affected, number of maintenance operations...)**

—

- **Consequences of not implementing the proposal**

—

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

- (a) *Point 2.2 is not the same in the German version as in the English and French versions.*

There is in the German Version „~~Ersatz für Nutzungsausfall des Wagens~~ (Artikel 13)“

*It is required to „**Schadenersatzansprüche für Schäden oder Nutzungsausfall** (Artikel 13)“.*

English Version:

2.2 Compensation claims for damage or loss of use (Article 13)

French Version:

2.2 Demandes d'indemnisation pour dommages ou perte d'usage (Article 13)

German Version:

2.2 ~~Ersatz für Nutzungsausfall des Wagens~~ **Schadenersatzansprüche für Schäden oder Nutzungsausfall** (Artikel 13)

- (b) *Clarification in point 3 “Keeper Responsibles ».*

The wording of articles 3.4 and 3.5 is identical in French and English and differs from the German version.

- *Point 3.4 is redundant with point 3.5 and should be deleted.*
 - *Point 3.4 erroneously refers to Article 15.*

English Version:

3.4 ~~Management of damage to wagons (Article 15)~~ **Reserved**

3.5 Management of damage to wagons (Chapters IV - VI)

French Version:

3.4 ~~Gestion des dommages causés aux wagons (article 15)~~ **Réservé**

3.5 Gestion des dommages causés aux wagons (chapitres IV à VI)

German Version:

3.4 ~~Schadwagenmanagement (Artikel 15)~~ **Bleibt frei**

3.5 Schadensabwicklung Wagen (Kapitel IV - VI)

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?	☒ No ☐ Yes
Justification:	
1.2. Is the proposed change significant?	☒ No ☐ Yes
Justification:	
1.3. Determining and classifying risk, if necessary	☐ 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: ☐ no ☐ yes (describe possible misuse):	
1.4. 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>	
1.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	☐ No ☐ Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body	[Appendix]