

WAGON USERS Study Group

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 10

Record of amendments

| Amended by | Date | Paragraph | Amendment |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------|-----------|
| René Harkema | 28/10/2015 | Ann. 3_Ch. B_2.1 | No.3_2017 |
| Geoffroy Maille | 8/3/2016 | Ann. 3_Ch. B_2.1 | No.3_2017 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: | Annex 3_Chapter B_2.1 – Traceability of EVIC inspection |
| Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body | UIP |
| Proposed amendment concerns: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10 |
| Proposer: | René Harkema |
| Location, date: | 28/10/2015 |
| Concise description: | Traceability of EVIC inspection |

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

Appendix 10, Annex 3 deals with EVIC. Chapter B contains the EVIC implementation guide, point 2 of which deals with mandating and invoicing the EVIC inspection, and with traceability.
The traceability provisions contained therein are not compatible with Annex 6, which already deals with the coding of work and with traceability.

1.2. Mode of operation

Poor alignment between the provisions of Annex 6 and Annex 3, point 2.1.

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

The traceability requirements are different. Annex 3 therefore needs to include a cross-reference to Annex 6 in order to clarify the arrangements for sending traceability sheets for EVIC inspections.

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)

Including a cross-reference to Annex 6 in Annex 3 will enable the text in Annex 3 to be simplified.

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

We request amendment of Appendix 10 in line with the text below:

The RU or its auxiliary must send the keeper the EVIC code for the operation performed on the wagon (as per Appendix 10, Annex 6) within one month of the wagon exiting the workshop ~~Workshops must give the keeper confirmation of the execution of the EVIC inspection (within one month maximum).~~

- ~~-with the corresponding invoice or~~
- ~~-with an intervention report~~

| GCU intervention code | Intervention(s) | Any additional information necessary | Inspection as per Appendix 9 | Rules as per Appendix 10 |
|-----------------------|--|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| CU10150 | Check against EVIC | Axle number diagnostics list as per EVIC, | | 1.15.2 |
| CU10152 | Replace wheelset following EVIC inspection | Axle number, Form H diagnostics list as per EVIC, | | 1.15.2 |

4. Reason:

Keepers want swift, harmonised confirmation that the EVIC inspection has been properly executed. Additionally, the outcome of the EVIC inspection no longer needs to be communicated. Keepers simply want traceability of the inspection and to be informed of the position of any axles to be removed following the EVIC inspection.

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts

*E.g. on operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc., using a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).
Justify observations*

Positive impacts:

Operations, Interoperability, Safety and Competitiveness: (Value: 1).

Costs: (Value: 2).

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 performed by:

| | |
|--|---|
| 6.1. Does the change made impact on safety? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Reasoning: The proposed amendment will improve safety by testing for an irregularity not presently covered by the text. | |
| 6.2. Is the change significant? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Reasoning: | |
| 6.3. Determining and classifying risk: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse): | |
| 6.4. 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 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] |