

Study Group **WAGON USERS**

Proposed amendments to GCU Appendices 9 and 11: No. 5

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Stefan Zebracki	30.04.15		Entry
Stefan Zebracki	7-8.10.14		Modif. following to the WG TI held on 10/2014 in Paris
Decision of WG TI	7-8.10.14		Following to the minutes of WG TI held on 10/2014

Title:	Proposal for defining the point 2.3, Appendix 9 "Minimum required skills for inspectors"
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body	DB Schenker Rail Deutschland
Proposed amendment concerns:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> annexe 9 <input type="checkbox"/> annexe 11
Proposer:	Stefan Zebracki – technische Wagenbehandlung
Location, date:	Mainz, 30.04.2015
Concise description:	Proposal for defining the point 2.3, Appendix 9 "Minimum required skills for inspectors"

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
The German version of Appendix 9, point 2.3, in particular concerning "skills dispensed through training in a mechanical or electrical trade", cannot be interpreted in the same way as the French text of Appendix 9.
1.2. Mode of operation
-

Study Group **WAGON USERS**

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

The minimum description of skills must be adapted on the basis of the following topics: The reference to jobs in metal industry and electricity is too unprecise to decide upon a basic training. Initial training configuration has evolved through the last years. The current description introduces entry frontiers of people working within the company, as far as they cannot acquire new qualifications. Besides, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the term of "visitor" is not used in a uniform way on Europe.

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 352/2009, 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)

See point 3

3. Additional text (relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 9):

~~2.3 Minimum requirements of inspectors~~

~~Inspectors must be conversant in:~~

- ~~-the knowledge dispensed though training in a mechanical or electrical trade,~~
- ~~-wagon maintenance,~~
- ~~-wagon design and operation,~~
- ~~-brake design and operation,~~
- ~~-the expert appraisal of damage and defects on wagons and loads as well as the implications for operations,~~
- ~~-the securing of loads, in accordance with the Loading Guidelines,~~
- ~~-the exchange of wagons between railway undertakings (RUs) and the agreements applicable to this exchange.~~

~~Inspectors should regularly be sent on further training courses.~~

Study Group **WAGON USERS**

2.3 Skills of staff performing technical transfer inspections

All safety-related examinations from appendix 9, annex 1 must be performed by properly qualified technical staff.

This staff must have the following minimum qualifications:

- General knowledge of rail vehicle maintenance,
- General knowledge of rail vehicle design and operation,
- General knowledge of brake design and operation,
- Ability to appraise technical damage and irregularities occurring on wagons and loads and their impact on operations,
- Knowledge of the UIC Loading Guidelines,
- Knowledge of regulatory documents concerning the exchange of vehicles between railway undertakings (RUs) and the related agreements in force.

The staff must receive training in order to acquire the above mentioned skills and must update said skills regularly.

The required skills include theoretical and practical knowledge.

4. Reason:

The German version of Appendix 9, at point 2.3, in particular concerning "the knowledge dispensed through training in a mechanical or electrical trade", does not interpret in the same way as the French text of Appendix 9.

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts
<p><i>E.g. on operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc., using a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Justify observations</i></p> <p>Positive impacts: Operations, Interoperability, Safety, competitiveness:(Value:3) Impact on costs & administration is very low:(Value:1)</p>

Study Group **WAGON USERS**

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: cancelled because adaptation is done following to the basis of mentioned standards

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: The German version of Appendix 9, point 2.3, in particular concerning "skills dispensed through training in a mechanical or electrical trade", cannot be interpreted in the same way as the French text of Appendix 9.	
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"/> deleted
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 checked="" 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 estimate</i> 	
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]