



WAGON USERS Study Group

Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 10

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Xavier MERLEAU	20.03.2017	Chapter C	
		-	

Title:	Chapter C - Preventive maintenance
Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other:	SNCF
Proposed amendment concerns:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
Proposer:	Xavier MERLEAU
Location, date:	20.03.2017
Concise description:	Appendix 10, Chap. C - Align "Chapter C - Preventive maintenance" with (EU) Regulation 445/2011

1. Starting-point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
Chapter C (preventive maintenance) contains a number of provisions dating from before the publication of EU Regulation 445/2011. These provisions are no longer compliant with current rules.
1.2. Mode of operation
/
1.3. Anomaly / description of problem
EU Regulation 445/2011 states that the ECM is responsible for determining the rules and periodicities for preventive maintenance. The maximum period between such operations may not be mandated by the GCU.

1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> 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)
Align Appendix 10, Chapter C with EU Regulation 445/2011

3. Reason:

4. Assess potential positive/negative impacts
<i>Assess the possible positive and negative impacts (operations, costs, administration, interoperability, safety, competitiveness, etc.), using a scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high): Justify observations</i>
Positive/negative impacts: Operations: 2 Interoperability: 1 Safety: 2 Competitiveness: 1 Costs: 2

5. Proposed text:

Chapter C - PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

0 Principle

The keeper must ensure that wagons are restored to a condition making them fit for normal service in terms of load safety and conservation.

To do so, he has recourse to the services of an Entity in Charge of Maintenance, one of whose responsibilities (as set out in EU Regulation 445/2011 and the corresponding COTIF rules) is to define a preventive maintenance plan and instructions, which the keeper must apply.

1. Overhaul periodicity

- 1.1 The date of last overhaul and the overhaul periodicity stipulated by the ECM must be indicated on a maintenance plate as defined in Appendix 11.
- 1.2 A wagon's overhaul period may be extended by 3 months if the keeper so decides, in which case the wagon shall receive the "+3M" marking.
- 1.3 Specific provisions for tank wagons:
Tank wagons for which the date (end of month) of the next tank test has become due (Appendix 11, point 6.4) shall be handled in accordance with Appendix 9.

~~Chapter C - PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE~~

~~0 Principle~~

~~When overhauls are carried out, the keeper must ensure that wagons are restored to a condition making them fit for normal service, in terms of load safety and conservation, until the next scheduled overhaul.~~

~~This overhaul must form an integral part of a time-based or performance-based maintenance system.~~

~~1. Overhaul periodicity~~

~~1.1 In a time-based maintenance system, overhauls are carried out after a set period defined in UIC Leaflet 579-1. With this system, the period between overhauls corresponds to the validity period indicated on the maintenance plate. The maximum validity period on the maintenance plate must not exceed the value indicated in point 1.3.~~

~~1.2 In a performance-based maintenance system, overhauls are carried out when the wagon reaches a performance limit expressed in tonne-kilometres and defined in UIC Leaflet 579-1. The validity period on the maintenance plate must not exceed the value indicated in point 1.3.~~

~~1.3 The maximum validity period on the maintenance plate (Appendix 11, point 2.3) is as follows:~~

~~1.3.1 6 years, with a possible 3 month extension, for wagons meeting the following conditions:~~

~~= distributor type Bd, Ch, O, KE, WE, DK, WU, WA or MH;~~

~~= automatic brake-rigging adjustment facility;~~

~~= double-link suspension for axle wagons;~~

~~= bogies with leaf springs and link suspensions (by derogation, also the modernised "Niesky" bogies on DB wagons);~~

~~= bogies with helical springs and UIC damper or equivalent;~~

~~= buffers conforming to UIC Leaflets 526-1 or 526-2.~~

~~1.3.2 4 years, with a possible 3 month extension, for wagons that do not meet the conditions in point 1.3.1:~~

~~1.3.3 To be eligible for this 3 month extension, wagons must carry the marking "+3M" (Appendix 11, point 2.3). Wagons that are not marked "+3M" may obtain the marking at the keeper's request if the condition of the wagon permits.~~

~~1.4 However, the keeper must set a shorter validity period when necessitated by the type of wagon and the conditions of its operation.~~

~~Additionally, for SS1) braked wagons with a maintenance plate validity period of more than 3 years, the keeper shall organise an intermediate inspection.~~

~~This inspection may be confined to a random check if the results obtained are satisfactory.~~

~~1.5 Tank wagons for which the date (end of month) of the next tank test has become due (Appendix 11, point 6.4) shall be handled in accordance with Appendix 9.~~

6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

The safety appraisal should be removed since only known guidelines would be implemented.

Safety appraisal performed by:

6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason:	
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
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]