

Amendment proposal Appendix 10 to the GCU

Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Bernhard Schlor	15/9/2017		
Bernhard Schlor	4/4/2018		Adaptation according to the proposal of the SG WU
Maintenance WG	18/4/2018		Final version

Title	Update of Appendix 10, Chapter A - CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE - Subchapter 1 RUNNING GEAR
Proposed amendment made by: RU/keeper/other:	ÖBB
Proposed amendment to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 10
Proposer:	Bernhard Schlor
Location, date:	15/9/2017
Concise description:	Introduction of axle generators and pumps to be mounted onto components' axles, establishing a connection with the vehicle underframe. The new point aims to describe the mode of operation to be used for such axles.

1. Starting point (current situation)

Introduction
Given that there is generally no transfer of energy between wagons and the traction unit, generators (electrical energy) and/or axle pumps (hydraulic or pneumatic energy) may be used to produce the energy required to perform the necessary functions on the vehicle. It must be possible for the energy to be transferred to a battery fitted to the vehicle, or to consumers.
Mode of operation
-
Anomaly/description of problem
Handing of this new connection between the vehicle underframe and the wheelset is not standardised; rather, it is configured differently depending on the type of energy. Workshop staff cannot see whether connections between the wheelset and the chassis have been disabled or whether special precautions are required.

Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which):
<small>* "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)</small>
<small>"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)</small>

2. Target situation

Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)

3. Additional texts and/or modifications relating only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 10

Amendment colour code:
 Black: Current text, for info and remains unchanged
 Blue: new text
 Blue if crossed out: text to be deleted

Appendix 10, chapter A - CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE

Subchapter 1 RUNNING GEAR

Indications – Acceptable and prohibited practices:

1.36 If the workshop identifies connections between the wheelset and the underframe or the bogie (electrical, hydraulic, pneumatic, etc..., other than grounding cables), it cannot disconnect them without having received instructions for dismantling or assembly from the keeper.

4. Reason:

Workshop staff cannot tell whether connections between the wheelset and the chassis have been disabled or whether special precautions are required. Handling errors may result in damage to the components.

5. Assess potential positive/negative impacts
Impact on costs/administration/interoperability/safety/competitiveness: Costs: 2 (application of keepers' instructions will help to prevent damage to the wagon and to wheelsets, as well as contamination of the workshop) Administration: 4 (the required information must be requested, and instruction provided to the workforce accordingly) Interoperability: 1 (no impact) Safety: 2 (the workshop performs the work according to the instructions provided by the manufacturer or the keeper) Competitiveness: 2 (innovations are protected by law)

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 made impact on safety?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: No change to state; improved safety of work practices in the workshop due to the creation of instructions for new parts.	
1.1. Is the change significant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: Clarification of mode of operation No modifications to existing instructions	
Determining and classifying risk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<p>6.3.1. Effet de la modification en exploitation normale :</p> <p>6.3.2. Effet de la modification en cas d'anomalies/écarts par rapport à l'exploitation normale :</p> <p>6.3.3. Utilisation abusive du système possible :</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (describe possible misuse):</p>	
Have safety measures been applied?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>For each type of risk, one of the following risk acceptance criteria is to be selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code of practice • Use of reference system • Explicit risk assessment 	
Has a risk analysis been submitted to the assessment body?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>Assessment body:</p> <p>Attach the verdict reached by the assessment body</p>	[Appendix]