

Amendment Proposal Appendix 7 to the GCU

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Burkhard Lerche	27/2/2017	Appendix 7, part B	
Bernhard Schlor	15/3/2017	Chapter 5	Amendment
Bernhard Schlor	14/3/2018	As a general rule	Integration of WG Maintenance conclusion on 14/2/2018
Maintenance WG Appendix 10	18/4/2018	Parts B and C	Final version

Title:	Update of Appendix 7 GCU, parts B and C
Proposed amendment made by RU/keeper/other:	ÖBB, DB Cargo
Proposed amendment to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 7
Proposer:	Bernhard Schlor, Burkhard Lerche
Location, date:	27/2/2017
Concise description:	Update of Appendix 7, parts B and C resulting in the removal of the obsolete term "U parts" from the appendix and the addition of a consolidated list of spare parts.

1. Starting point (current situation):

1.1. Introduction
1.2. Mode of operation
-
1.3. Anomaly/description of problem
The term "U part" dates from the era of the RIV and no longer has practical application in its original meaning.

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):
<p>* "a written set of rules that, when correctly applied, can be used to control one or more specific hazards." (Source: Regulation (source: Regulation EC 352/2009, Article 3)</p> <p>"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". (Source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – guide published by German Ministry of Justice)</p>

2. Target situation

2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (solution sought)

3. Additional text and/or modifications relates to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 7:

Amendment colour code:

Black: Current text, for info and remains unchanged

Blue: new text

Blue if crossed out: text to be deleted

Part B

Other ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts

4. Usage of ~~standard~~ spare parts of the user RU's

4.1 When wagon parts have been damaged, the user RU shall preferably replace them using ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts from its own stock. In principle, the spare parts should be of the same type as the removed parts or, if this is no longer available, as the other parts of the wagon. Mixing different designs is not permitted (unless stated otherwise in Appendix 10, e.g. brake blocks in accordance with 3.8.3).

The following are considered as ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts:

- Safety straps
- Cast iron brake blocks, as well as K and LL brake blocks, if marked on the wagon
- Brake couplings
- Spark arrestor plates
- Earthing braids. The earthing braids must comply with UIC Leaflet 533
- Screw couplers, factoring in breaking strength. The screw coupler must comply with EN 15566 and UIC Leaflet 520 respectively
- Screw coupler suspension hooks
- Guiding and locking elements
- Steps and handles. The newly built steps must be of the exact same model to ensure that they remain within the loading gauge. The step surface must comply with UIC Leaflet 535-2 and/or EN 16116-2.
- Label holders, inscription plate
- Ventilation flaps, control gear, shutter retaining bracket
- Stanchions in accordance with UIC Leaflet 578
- End boards, crossing gangways

4.2 The value of any such ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts shall be included in the cost of the repair operation.

4.3 When the user RU makes a cost estimation to the keeper, the keeper must indicate whether he wishes the damaged parts to be returned to him at his own expense. If the keeper does not specify the return of these parts, they shall remain with the user RU, together with the other spare parts removed from the wagon. There shall be no form of compensation for the value of these parts.

5. Exceptional order for ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts

5.1 Due to the lack of ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts of the same type in the workshop and if these parts cannot be obtained quickly, ~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts may be ordered from the keeper using an equivalent procedure to that in Part C (Form H).

5.2 This operation is coordinated exclusively through the logistics centres.

Part C

Other non-~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts

6. Request for other non-~~standard interchangeable~~ spare parts

6.1 ~~Non-standard~~ The other spare parts that are needed to repair a wagon and are not stocked by the user RU shall be ordered from the keeper's logistics centre using Form H.

6.2 For each request for spare parts using Form H, confirmation of receipt shall be sent without delay to the logistics centre making the request. When confirming receipt, the estimated delivery time of the spare parts shall be indicated. If the damaged parts are to be returned, this should also be specified. If the spare parts cannot be dispatched immediately, the requesting logistics centre shall be informed without delay.

7. Return of **other** damaged non-~~standard~~ **interchangeable** spare parts

7.1 Damaged parts with a low value (e.g. suspension rods and links, etc.) are not returned once removed. No compensation for their value shall take place.

7.2 Other damaged parts, once removed, shall only be returned at the keeper's request.

7.3 If the spare part does not arrive at its destination, the amount of compensation payable shall be subject to the provisions of the associated contract of carriage.

4. Reason:

As the GCU already regulates use of wheelsets, springs, buffers, etc. via the Form H' or H, Part B needs to be amended with the aim of providing better guidance for workshops to facilitate more effective planning.

The notion of "U" parts is removed from Appendix 7, parts B and C.

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts

Impact on costs/administration/interoperability/safety/competitiveness:

Costs: 2 (the keeper will have fewer parts to send)

Administration: 2 (the keeper will have fewer parts to send)

Interoperability: 2

Safety: 2 (workshops will become more aware of the parts they have to install)

Competitiveness: 2 (reduction of costs)

6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

Performance of risk analysis is unnecessary where only recognised standards are implemented.

Risk analysis conducted by:

6.1. Does the change have impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No change with regard to the target situation, improved management reliability for workshops due to a list of spare parts that they can take directly from their own stock for the purposes of installation/assembly.	
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"/> 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 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"> • Code of practice • Use of reference system • Explicit risk assessment 	
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]