

## Proposed amendment to GCU Appendix 9

### Record of amendments

Amended by	Date	Paragraph	Amendment
Claude Weis	27/12/2019		See minutes of TTI WG meeting of Oct 2019
TTI WG decision	24/03/2020		See minutes of TTI WG meeting of March 2020
Approved by SG WU	26/05/2020		See minutes of WU SG meeting of May 2020
Approved by JC GCU	15/06/2020		

<b>Title:</b>	Amendment of codes 6.5.2.1 and 7.6.2.1
<b>Proposed amendment made by: RU / keeper / other body</b>	CFL Cargo
<b>Proposed amendment concerns:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appendix 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Appendix 11
<b>Proposer:</b>	Claude Weis
<b>Location, date:</b>	Dudelange, 27/12/2019
<b>Concise description:</b>	Proposal from UIC's RID Group of Experts to amend codes 6.5.2.1 and 7.6.2.1

**1. Starting point (current situation):**

<b>1.1. Introduction</b>
Addition of screening indicators and actions to be taken for codes 6.5.2.1 and 7.6.2.1.
<b>1.2. Mode of operation</b>
-
<b>1.3. Anomaly / description of problem</b>
UIC's RID Group of Experts has proposed amending these codes so that they align more closely with the RID.

<b>1.4. Does this concern a recognised code of practice* (e.g. DIN, EN)?</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (state which): RID
<p>* "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)</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" (translation/source: BMJ Handbuch der Rechtsförmlichkeit – German Ministry of Justice)</p>

**2. Target situation**

<b>2.1. Elimination of anomaly/problem (goal)</b>
Addition of indicators for detection of irregularities under the "Irregularities/Criteria/Notes" column and amendment of the "Actions to be taken" in order to align with the RID.

### 3. Additional text and/or change relates only to proposed amendments to GCU Appendix 9:

Amendment colour code:

Black: Current text, for info and remains unchanged

Red: new text

Blue: (if crossed out): text to be deleted

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Tank	6.5.2			
	6.5.2.1	Not sealed: leaks or risk of loss of load <small>wyciek lub ryzyko utraty ładunku</small> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Odours <small>zapach</small></li> <li>• Traces of recent or persistent leakage</li> </ul> <small>Ślady niedawnego lub trwałego wycieku</small>	Have sealed + K. <b>For RID: to have cleaned by qualified personnel.</b> If not possible, detach wagon	5

Component	Code no.	Irregularities/Criteria/Notes	Action to be taken	Irregularity class
Tank <sup>11</sup> <small>for ILU tank - International loading units</small>	7.6.2			
	7.6.2.1	Not tight: leaks or loss of load <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Odours</li> <li>• Traces of recent or persistent leakage</li> </ul>	Have sealed. <b>For RID: to have cleaned by qualified personnel.</b> If not possible, detach wagon	5

The screening indicator is the same as for codes 6.5.6.1 et 7.6.5.1.

#### 4. Reason:

According to the UIC group of experts, the same screening indicators as those for codes 6.5.6.1 and 7.6.5.1 need to be provided to be able to detect irregularities and carry out cleaning. Otherwise, Article 4.3.2.4.1 of the RID is not observed.

RID 4.3.2.4.1.: No dangerous residue of the filling substance shall adhere to the outside of the tank during carriage.

#### 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*

Impacts:

Operations, interoperability, safety, competitiveness: (4)

Safety: (5)

## 6. Safety appraisal of proposed amendment

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

*The risk study becomes obsolete insofar as only the known repositories are implemented*

Safety study conducted by:

<b>6.1. Does the change made impact on safety?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: This amendment aligns Appendix 9 with the RID, with no risk to personnel or the environment.	
<b>6.2. Is the change significant?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Reason: see template. Attach the significant change test template	
<b>6.3. Determining and classifying risk:</b>	<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):	
<b>6.4. Have safety measures been applied?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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>• <i>“Code of practice” (acknowledged technical rules)</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of reference system</i></li> <li>• <i>Explicit risk estimate</i></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]