

## Study Group **WAGON USERS**

### Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

#### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Stefan Zebracki	29/1/16		Drafted and inserted following TI WG meeting of Januar 2016
Approved by TI WG	31/3/16		See minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2016

<b>Title:</b>	Adjustment of codes 6.5.5.x and 7.6.4.x - blind flange "loose"
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body</b>	ZSSK Cargo
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Roman Sklenář
<b>Location, date:</b>	Mainz, 29/1/2016
<b>Concise description:</b>	Adjustment of codes 6.5.5.x and 7.6.4.x in line with UIC Leaflet 471-3

## 1. Starting-point (current situation):

### 1.1. Introduction

In order that it is more closely aligned with UIC Leaflet 471-3 Appendix E (5.8), which makes reference to loose securing bolts of the blind flange, Appendix 9 should mention not only missing securing bolts, but also loose securing bolts.

### 1.2. Mode of operation

### 1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

No reference is currently made to loose securing bolts in Appendix 9.

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

No  Yes (state which): UIC Leaflet 471-3, Appendix E

\* "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)

Include a reference to loose securing bolts of the blind flange: see 3.

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

6.5.5.6	Blind flange missing	Detach wagon	4
6.5.5.7	Securing bolt, blind flange: - RID load <sup>7)</sup> one or more securing bolts missing <b>or loose</b>	Detach wagon	4
6.5.5.8	- non-RID load, one securing bolt missing <b>or loose</b>	Rectify. If not possible, K	3
6.5.5.9	- non-RID load, several securing bolts missing <b>or loose</b>	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon	4
7.6.4.5	Blind flange missing	Detach wagon	4
7.6.4.6	Securing bolt, blind flange: - RID load <sup>10)</sup> , one or more securing bolts missing <b>or loose</b>	Detach wagon	4
7.6.4.7	- non-RID load, one securing bolt missing <b>or loose</b>	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon	3
7.6.4.8	- non-RID load, several securing bolts missing <b>or loose</b>	Rectify. If not possible, detach wagon	4

**4. Reason:**

UIC Leaflet 471-3, Appendix E (5.8) makes reference not only to missing securing bolts of the blind flange, but also to loose ones.

**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: 3).

Impact on costs & administration is very low: (Value: 1).

<sup>7)</sup> Clarification: pay attention to the hazard warning labels

<sup>10)</sup> Clarification: pay attention to the hazard warning labels

## 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:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning:	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning: see template Attach the "significant change" test template.	
<b>6.3. Determining and classifying risk:</b>	<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):	
<b>6.4. Have safety measures been applied?</b>	<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"> <li>• Code of practice</li> <li>• Use of reference system</li> <li>• Explicit risk estimate</li> </ul>	
<b>6.5. Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Assessment body: Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body:	[appendix]