

WAGON USERS Study Group

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 2 and 11

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Stefan Zebracki	01/04/2015		Drafted as per TI WG of February 2015
Jean-Marc Blondé	19/05/2015		Amended as per TI WG meeting of May 2015
Jean-Marc Blondé	28/01/2016		Amended as per TI WG meeting of January 2016
Decision of WG TI	31/03/2016		Amended as per minutes of TI WG meeting of March 2016
Decision of SG WU	24/05/2016		In the meeting

Title:	Delete "Remark 2" in point 4.2 Add definition of the term "tare" to Appendix 2
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body	CFL Cargo
Proposed amendment concerns:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
Proposer:	Claude Weis and Ramon Lambert, CFL Cargo
Location, date:	Mainz, 1/4/2015
Concise description:	In Appendix 11 point 4.2, a measure is provided for under Remark 2. This remark can be deleted from Appendix 11 because Appendix 11 contains a description of the markings and signs on wagons, not actions to be taken.

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction

Point 4.2 contains a "Remark 2" with a description of measures which should not appear in Appendix 11.

1.2. Mode of operation

1.3. Anomaly / description of problem

Handling of wagons is described in Appendix 9 or 10 but not in Appendix 11

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

No Yes (state which): criteria established by ÖBB's ECM 2.

* "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)

"Remark 2" of point 4.2. in Appendix 11 can be deleted. Then description in "Figure 1" of point 4.2. will be completed.

A definition of the term "tare" will be added to Appendix 2, including the permitted deviation of up to 100 kg per wheelset.

Additional text to GCU Appendix 2:

WAGON TARE

Total mass of the unloaded wagon, expressed in kilograms and marked on each side of the wagon (for marking rules, see Appendix 11). The marked tare must not differ from the actual observed mass of the wagon by more than 100 kilograms (heavier/lighter) per wheelset on the wagon.

4. Reason:

In Appendix 11, point 4.2 a measure is foreseen under Remark 2. This remark can be removed from Appendix 11, because Appendix 11 contains a description of markings and signs on wagon, not the actions to be taken. These are described in GCU Appendices 9 and 10.

A definition of the term "tare" will be added to Appendix 2.

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

Competitiveness

Impacts on administration and costs are very low (1)

Update of Appendix 11 has no direct impact on wagon handling that's why this amendment has low impacts

6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

Description of actual/target system, and scope of change to be made (see points 1 and 2).

A risk analysis is not necessary. Appendix 11 describes markings and signs on wagons. Handling of wagons is described in GCU Appendix 9 or 10.

Safety appraisal performed by:

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reasoning:	
6.2. Is the change significant?	<input 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
For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of practice • Use of reference system • Explicit risk estimate 	
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]