



OTIF

**ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR LES
TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES**

**ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR
INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL**

Committee of Technical Experts

8th Session

Report

Bern, 10 June 2015

Contents

1.	Approval of the agenda	3
2.	Presence and quorum	3
3.	Election of chairman	4
4.	For information	4
4.1.	Report from the Committee of Technical Experts working group TECH (for information)	4
4.2.	Status of notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU	5
4.3.	ERA consultation of non-EU OTIF Member States (CSM RA)	6
4.4.	Status of the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States	6
5.	For adoption:	7
5.1.	UTP NOI revision	7
5.2.	ECM Rules amendment (addition of Annex V)	9
5.3.	UTP WAG, update of references in Appendices G and J to M	11
6.	For discussion:	12
6.1.	TAF TSI – study and next steps	12
6.2.	ATMF explanatory document	15
6.3.	RID/CTE coordination	18
6.4.	Interchangeable coaches	19
6.5.	Work programme of the CTE for 2015/2016 and beyond	20
6.6.	Any other business	22
6.7.	Next session	22
7.	Closing remarks	23
	List of participants Annex I	24
	Agenda Annex II	34

DISCUSSIONS

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers (head of OTIF's technology section) opened the 8th session of the Committee of Technical Experts' (CTE). He welcomed all the participants and interpreters. He informed participants that there would be simultaneous interpretation from and into English, French and German and that the session would also be recorded¹. The list of participants is attached to these minutes as [Annex 1](#).

The documents for this session were available in all three languages and had been uploaded onto the OTIF website two months before the meeting, in line with the CTE's Rules of Procedure.

The discussions on the substance of the documents had taken place in three working group (WG TECH) sessions held since the 7th session of the CTE.

1. Approval of the agenda

Mr Leermakers, on behalf of the **OTIF Secretariat** (hereinafter referred to as the **Secretariat**) explained that the provisional agenda and documents for the 8th session of the CTE had been sent to participants with a circular on 9 April 2015 (circular [A 92-03/507.2015](#)). As there were no requests to amend the agenda, it was adopted as the Secretariat had proposed to CTE 8.

Conclusion: CTE approved the agenda for the 8th session ([Annex II](#)).

In connection with developments that had taken place between the last two CTE meetings, the **Secretariat** informed CTE that Italy had ratified COTIF 1999 without reservations and that Norway had withdrawn its reservations. Furthermore, Azerbaijan was in the process of becoming the 50th OTIF Member State (which will only apply COTIF Appendices CIM and RID), France would apply ATMF from 1.7.2015 and Sweden was finalising the process of lifting its reservations.

2. Presence and quorum

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that members of the CTE are those Member States of OTIF that apply APTU or ATMF at the time of the session, i.e. 36 of the 50 OTIF Member States.

The **Secretariat** informed CTE that at the time of the session, two Contracting States had no voting rights according to Article 26 § 7 of the Convention, two Contracting States did not apply ATMF (they had no voting rights for item 5.2) and the EU would exercise the voting rights of all EU Member States who are also COTIF Contracting States for items 5.1 and 5.3 (representing 21 EU Member States with voting rights) and item 5.2 (representing 20 EU Member States with voting rights).

¹ Unfortunately, due to circumstances beyond the control of the OTIF Secretariat, the CTE 8 session was not recorded.

APTU. The quorum for adoption of the APTU regulation was **18** States (one half of 36 Contracting States with the right to vote). The **21** EU OTIF Contracting States and **4** non-EU OTIF Contracting States present or represented in the meeting meant that the number of States entitled to vote was 25:

There was therefore a quorum for decisions concerning APTU (exceeded by 7)

ATMF. The quorum for adoption of the ATMF regulation was **17** States (of 34 Contracting States with the right to vote). The **20** EU OTIF Contracting States and **4** non-EU OTIF Contracting States present or represented meant that the number of States entitled to vote was 24:

There was therefore a quorum for decisions concerning ATMF (exceeded by 7)

The **Secretariat** explained the process for adopting documents concerning item 5. All the documents subject to a vote had been uploaded onto the OTIF website two months before the session. After uploading these documents the Secretariat had received a number of comments from Member States aimed at improving the documents. The Secretariat had analysed these comments, translated them and documented them in a room document² which was made available to all delegates. These uploaded documents, together with the amendments noted in the room document, formed the proposal for adoption by CTE. To facilitate the decision-making process, prior to voting, all documents were shown on the screen in their consolidated versions, including all amendments.

The Secretariat proposed that CTE should vote simultaneously on all three language versions.

The process as described was tacitly agreed and the CTE continued on this basis.

3. Election of chairman

The **Secretariat** explained the procedure for the election of the chairman.

According to the procedure the **Secretariat** nominated Switzerland (Mr Bacher) to chair the session and asked if delegates wished to nominate other candidates. No other candidates were nominated. Mr Roland Bacher accepted the nomination and the **CTE** unanimously elected Switzerland, in the shape of Mr Roland Bacher, to chair this session.

The **Chairman** thanked the participants for the trust it had placed in him and hoped CTE would deal with all the agenda items in an atmosphere of cooperation.

4. For information

4.1. Report from the Committee of Technical Experts working group TECH (for information)

The **Secretariat** informed CTE about the results of Working Group TECH, in accordance with the decisions made at the previous CTE (June 2014). The Secretariat had drafted a report (document CTE8/4.1) and briefly presented the contents of the report.

² Excerpts of the room document are reproduced in this report.

The standing working group TECH held three meetings:

- September 2014 in Bern (WG TECH 23), to discuss:
 - UTP NOI revision
 - Development of UTP application guides
 - Annex V to the ECM Uniform Rules
 - Interchangeable coaches
 - TAF study
- December 2014 in Lille (WG TECH 24), to discuss/review:
 - Interchangeable coaches
 - UTP NOI revision (Document: CTE 8/5.1 UTP NOI)
 - RID and ATMF
 - Annex V to the ECM Uniform Rules (Document: CTE 8/5.2 ECM Annex A)
 - UTP LOC&PAS application guide
 - UTP NOI application guide
 - TAF study
- February 2015 in Bern (WG TECH 25), to discuss/review:
 - Interchangeable coaches
 - RID and ATMF
 - UTP PRM application guide
 - TAF study
 - Preparation of CTE 8 and approval of the provisional agenda for CTE 8

After opening the floor for questions or discussion, the **Chairman** concluded that the report of the standing WG TECH did not raise any questions and that the CTE took note of the report.

4.2. Status of notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU

The **Secretariat** reminded the Contracting States that national technical requirements only remain valid if notification is received by the Secretary General within 6 months of the day when the technical provision in question or the change to it entered into force. The **Secretariat** informed CTE about the status of notifications (reference on OTIF Website: www.otif.org/en/technology/regulations-in-force):

UTP	Reference	Enter into force	Deadline
WAG	UTP WAG	01.01.2014	01.07.2014
LOC&PAS	UTP LOC&PAS 2015	01.01.2015	01.07.2015
Noise	A 94-04/2.2012 v.03	01.12.2012	01.06.2013
Marking	UTP MARKING 2015	01.12.2012 for WAG	01.06.2013
		01.01.2015 for LOC&PAS	01.07.2015
PRM	UTP PRM 2015	01.01.2015	01.07.2015

CH informed CTE 8 that by the end of June, CH would notify OTIF and EU of its national technical requirements. Although now withdrawn, CH highlighted its specific case in UTP NOI and its importance in terms of its national regulations.

Conclusion:

CTE noted the information from the Secretariat without further comment.

4.3. ERA consultation of non-EU OTIF Member States (CSM RA)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that since the 7th session of CTE only one consultation had taken place, which concerned ERA's draft proposed amendments to the Common Safety Methods for risk evaluation and assessment, EU Commission Regulation (EU) No. 402/2013.

The process of consulting the non-EU OTIF Contracting States had been carried out on the basis of an ERA working document. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that since 1 January 2014, there had been full equivalence between OTIF UTP GEN-G (document A 94-01G/1.2012 v.03) and Commission Regulation (EU) No. 402/2013 and that this full equivalence should be maintained.

The **representative of the EU** informed the meeting about the status of developments regarding CSM amendments. One of the main changes concerned different terminology in CSM, i.e. instead of "Harmonised risk acceptance criteria (RAC)", "CSM design targets (DT) for technical systems" would be used. The amendments to CSM had been discussed and voted on in the EU at RISC 73, held on 4 June 2015. Following this decision, the European Commission had started the process to enact the legislation. It was anticipated that the CSM amendment would enter into force by the end of 2015.

The **Chairman** reminded the meeting of the following: CTE worked in such a way that the process of development within OTIF follows changes within the EU, involving OTIF Secretariat in the EU developing process. Although all non-EU Contracting States had been asked to comment on the CSM amendments, comments had only been received from one of them. In view of the importance of the consultation for developing international rail legislation and in view of the fact that at the consultation stage, the non-EU OTIF Contracting States could propose amendments to the draft of the revised legislation, CTE 8 encouraged participants to make use of this opportunity. The Chairman also highlighted the importance of coordinating the legislative development processes between the EU and OTIF.

Conclusion:

CTE 8 noted the amendments to CSM in the EU and asked WG TECH to deal with these changes for the purpose of maintaining equivalence between OTIF and EU CSM rules.

4.4. Status of the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee about the status of the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States as of 5.5.2015. The information was based on the ECVVR 1.5 in operation, which was available to OTIF Member States from November 2014. The Secretariat received information from both EU and non-EU Contracting States:

- **22 EU OTIF Member States, and Norway**, have their NVR connected to ECVVR: Austria, Belgium, Croatia^{3*}, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany*, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden;
- **3 non-EU OTIF Member States** have their NVR connected to ECVVR: Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Serbia and Switzerland;
- **2 non-EU OTIF Member States**: NVR at advanced stage of development: Montenegro and Turkey.

Conclusion:

CTE noted the information from the Secretariat without further comment.

5. For adoption:

5.1. UTP NOI revision

Document: [CTE 8/5.1 UTP NOI](#)

The **Secretariat** had prepared for adoption document CTE 8/5.1 UTP NOI, which had been submitted to CTE two months before the session. The document was prepared in accordance with a decision taken at CTE 7, which mandated WG TECH to develop the draft UTP NOI revision. The document was based on the European Union's Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1304/2014. This revised UTP NOI would repeal the existing UTP NOI, which entered into force on 1.12.2012. However, the version that entered into force on 1.12.2012 could continue to be applied in accordance with the provisions set out in Chapter 7 of the revised UTP NOI.

The revision comprised the following main changes:

- Requirements cover not only conventional, but also high-speed rolling stock
- Applicable to all vehicles in the scope of the UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS
- Additional limit values introduced for intermittent (main air compressor) and impulsive (air exhaust valve) noise
- References to EN/ISO 3095, which replaces prEN content in the Appendix.

The first draft was submitted to WG TECH 23. At WG TECH 24, UTP NOI revision was validated for submission to the CTE and non-EU Contracting States were asked to inform the Secretariat if they had any specific cases. In addition to the TSI, the UTP NOI revision proposal included a specific case for Switzerland. On 11.5.2015, the Secretariat received information from Switzerland that it would withdraw its request for a specific case. This withdrawal had been reflected in the meeting room document:

³ (*) Technically connected but without data exposed to VVR

Amendment number	Language version	Point as it is now (section and page)	Amendment proposal	Justification/comment
1a	EN	7.3.2.2. (Page 23)	7.3.2.2 Limits for pass-by noise (4.2.3.) Specific Case Switzerland (“P”) Freight wagons moving on the Swiss normal gauge network have to comply with the limit values for pass by noise according to item 4.2.3. of this UTP as of 1 January 2020.	CH withdrew proposal
1b	DE	7.3.2.2 Seite 23	7.3.2.2 Grenzwerte für das Vorbeifahrgeräusch (4.2.3.) Sonderfall Schweiz (“P”) Auf dem Schweizer Normalspurnetz verkehrende Güterwagen müssen den Emissionsgrenzwert für das Vorbeifahrgeräusch gemäß Ziffer 4.2.3 dieser ETV ab dem 1. Januar 2020 einhalten.	CH hat den Vorschlag zurückgezogen
1c	FR	7.3.2.2. Page 24	7.3.2.2 Valeurs limites pour le bruit au passage (point 4.2.3.) Cas spécifique de la Suisse («P») À compter du 1^{er} janvier 2020, les wagons de marchandises circulant sur le réseau d'écartement normal suisse doivent respecter les valeurs limites pour le bruit au passage fixées au point 4.2.3 de la présente PTU. Freight wagons moving on the Swiss normal gauge network have to comply with the limit values for pass by noise according to item 4.2.3. of this UTP as of 1 January 2020.	CH a retiré sa proposition. Dans la version française, le texte anglais avait malencontreusement été ajouté au texte français. Ils sont tous deux supprimés.

The **Chairman** noted that the document was ready to vote on.

Vote:

The result of the vote concerning the revision of the UTP NOI – document CTE 8/5.1 UTP NOI, including the amendment listed above, was: 25 votes in favour (unanimous).

Decision:

CTE 8 adopted the UTP NOI revision as proposed, with the amendments set out in the meeting room document prepared for CTE 8.

5.2. ECM Rules amendment (addition of Annex V)

Document: [CTE 8/5.2 ECM Annex A](#)

The Secretariat had prepared for adoption document CTE 8/5.2 ECM Annex A, which had been submitted to CTE two months before the session. The first draft was submitted to WG TECH 23 and discussed at the 23rd, 24th and 25th WG TECH meetings. WG TECH 25 validated the document for submission to CTE 8 for a vote.

The ECM Rules amendment (addition of Annex V) comprised the following changes:

- New Maintenance Functions Certificate template added to Annex V, which is equivalent to the EU certificate
- Editorial alignments with recent UTPs, including a new front page
- A new layout of the definitions in section 3, points h) to m), was moved to the left-hand column instead of full width text, as this part corresponds to EU Commission Regulation 2009/352/EC Article 3, point 1-6.

Comments that the Secretariat had received on CTE 8/5.2 ECM Annex A prior to the session had been taken into account in the meeting room document:

Amendment number	Language version	Point as it is now (section and page)	Amendment proposal	Justification/comment
1	EN, DE, FR	3.2, page 4	<p>h) “risk” means the rate frequency of occurrence of accidents and incidents resulting in harm (caused by a hazard) and the degree of severity of that harm;</p> <p>j) “risk evaluation” means a procedure based on the risk analysis to determine whether the an acceptable level of risk has been achieved;</p> <p>l) “risk control” (also called “risk management”) – means the systematic application of management policies, procedures and practices to the tasks of analysing, evaluating and controlling risks;</p>	Correct reference to EU Regulation 402/2013

2	DE	3.2, Seite 4	<p>(h) „Risiko“: die Kombination der Wahrscheinlichkeit Häufigkeit des Eintretens von (durch Gefährdungen verursachten) Unfällen und Zwischenfällen, die zu einem Schaden führen, verbinden mit den und des Ausmaßes dieses Schadens;</p> <p>(i) „Risikoanalyse“: die systematische Auswertung aller verfügbaren Informationen zur Identifizierung Ermittlung von Gefährdungen und Abschätzung von Risiken;</p> <p>(k) „Risikobewertung“: der den aus Risikoanalyse und Risikoevaluierung bestehenden Gesamtprozess;</p> <p>(l) „Risikomanagement“: die systematische Anwendung von Managementstrategien, -verfahren und -praktiken bei der Analyse, Evaluierung und Kontrolle Beherrschung von Risiken;</p> <p>(m) „Sicherheit“: die Abwesenheit das Nichtvorhandensein von unvertretbaren Schadensrisiken;</p>	Korrektur Verweis auf die EU-Verordnung 402/2013
3	FR	3.2, page 4	<p>h) « risque », le taux la fréquence d'occurrence d'accidents et d'incidents causant un dommage (dû à un danger) et le degré de gravité de ce dommage ;</p> <p>k) « appréciation des risques », le processus global comprenant une analyse de risque et une évaluation de des risques ;</p> <p>l) « gestion des risques », l'application systématique de politiques, procédures et pratiques méthodes de gestion aux tâches d'analyse, d'évaluation et de contrôle maîtrise des risques ;</p>	Correction de la référence au règlement n° 402/2013 de l'UE
4a	EN, DE, FR	Footnote 4, page 4	⁴ EU Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2009/352/EC No 402/2013 Article 3, point 1-6	Reference update
4b	DE	Fußnote 4, Seite 4	⁴ Durchführungsverordnung (EGEU) Nr. 2009/352/402/2013 der Kommission, Artikel 3, Punkt 1-6	Aktualisierung des Verweises
4c	FR	Note de bas de page 5, page 4	⁴ Règlement d'exécution (UE) n° 402/2013 de la Commission européenne n° 2009/352/CE, article 3, points 1 à 6.	Mise à jour de la référence

5a	EN, DE, FR	Annex V “Maintenance Functions certificate”	ECM Identification Number *: __ / __ / __ __ / ____ ECM Identification Number of the previous certificate: *: __ / __ / __ __ / ____	The number does not refer to an ECM identification number, but to a maintenance function certificate.
5b	DE	Anlage V „Instandhaltungsfunktionsbescheinigung“	ECM Kennnummer *: __ / __ / ____ / __ -- ECM Kennnummer der vorherigen Bescheinigung *: __ / __ / ____ / __ --	Die Nummer bezieht sich nicht auf eine ECM-Kennnummer, sondern auf eine Instandhaltungsfunktionsbescheinigung.
5c	FR	Annexe V « Certificat de fonction de maintenance »	Numéro d’identification de l’ECE *: __ / __ / ____ / ____ Numéro d’identification du certificat antérieur de l’ECE * : __ / __ / ____ / -----	Le numéro ne renvoie pas à un numéro d’identification d’ECE, mais à un certificat de fonction de maintenance.

The **Chairman** noted that the document was ready to vote on.

Vote:

The result of the vote concerning the amendment of ATMF Annex A – CTE 8/5.2 ECM Annex A, including all the amendments listed above, was: 24 votes in favour (unanimous).

Decision:

CTE 8 adopted the ECM Rules amendment (addition of Annex V), with the amendment noted in the meeting room document prepared for CTE 8.

5.3. UTP WAG, update of references in Appendices G and J to M

Document: [CTE 8/5.3 UTP WAG - Appendix G and J to M](#)

The **Secretariat** had prepared for adoption document CTE 8/5.3 UTP WAG - appendix G and J to M. The update, following similar updates in the EU legislation, comprised the following changes:

- Update of the reference to the most recent list of fully approved composite brake blocks for international transport in Appendix G to UTP WAG and WAG TSI
- Update of the reference to the updated version of the ERA technical document “ERA/TD/2012-04/INT version 1.3”, where the update relates to the correction of editorial mistakes, in particular in Figure 7: position of shunter handrails: the dimension ≥ 210 mm was wrong, and should instead read ≤ 210 mm.

In addition, the amendment also concerned the deletion of the letter K as it highlights only one of the types of the composite brake blocks. This amendment, which was only required in the English language version, had been taken into account in the meeting room document:

Amendment number	Language version	Point as it is now (section and page)	Amendment proposal	Justification/comment
1	EN	2.1, page 1	“This Appendix is the “List of fully approved K -composite brake blocks for international transport”, reference: ERA/TD/2009-02/INT version 14.0 of 20 January 2015.”	The list comprises K and LL-type brake blocks. The French and German text did not make reference to “K-blocks” and therefore need not to be amended.

The **Chairman** noted that the document was ready to vote on.

Vote:

The result of the vote concerning the update of references in Appendices G and J to M – document CTE 8/5.3 UTP WAG - Appendix G and J to M, including the amendment listed above, was: 25 votes in favour (unanimous).

Decision:

- CTE 8 adopted the amendments to Appendices G and J to M as set out in point 2 of document CTE8/5.3 (dated 5.3.2015), with the amendment noted in the meeting room document prepared for CTE 8
- The Secretariat will publish the amendments to UTP WAG 2015 on the OTIF website in the same place as UTP WAG 2015 itself.

6. For discussion:

6.1. TAF TSI – study and next steps

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting about the development process of the TAF TSI study and its results. The initial results of the study were presented at WG TECH 23 and discussed at the 23rd, 24th and 25th WG TECH meetings. WG TECH 25 noted that these results would be discussed as the first step at the conceptual level that precedes the UTP TAF. Taking into consideration comments received from ERA, the European Commission, CER, UIP and RNE, the Secretariat had prepared a final version of the study, which envisaged two scenarios, with associated sub-scenarios, on how to deal with this matter further:

- Do not transpose TAF TSI:
 - Do nothing within OTIF
 - Promote the use of TAF TSI solution on a voluntary basis
 - Voluntary scheme and application guide issued by OTIF
- Transpose TAF TSI into OTIF regulation

- Full transposition of the TAF TSI into OTIF law (UTP TAF, including the technical appendices)
- Partial transposition (UTP TAF with reference to the technical appendices on the ERA website)

Bearing in mind the results of the WG TECH discussions, the Secretariat reminded the meeting that CTE 8 should provide guidance on how OTIF should proceed with TAF TSI and in this regard, the Secretariat suggested the following approach:

- Transpose TAF TSI into UTP:
 - Transposition of core TSI into UTP TAF and reference to the technical appendices on the ERA website.
 - Transposition of TAF TSI in such a way that the requirements are voluntary in non-EU OTIF CS.
 - TAF TSI technical appendices are available as open source documents on the ERA website and those who would like to use the UTP TAF could also use the technical appendices.

The **Chairman** thanked the Secretariat for its clear proposals. The Chairman also highlighted the importance of telematics technology in facilitating international freight transport and opened the discussion.

The **representative of the EU** gave a retrospective of the reasons which had led to the creation of the TAF TSI within the EU. One of the important things which TAF TSI had made possible was the creation of an interactive IT environment between freight forwarders, RUs and IMs, which had led to better quality data for IT applications, better quality of railway freight services and increased competitiveness. He also highlighted that based on TAF TSI and its open data protocol, discrimination is also avoided, despite the ownership structure of the RUs. In the EU's view, this data exchange system would be particularly important on corridors crossing the EU's outer borders. With regard to the transposition of TAF TSI into UTP TAF and its application on a voluntary basis, the representative of the EU was of the opinion that combining mandatory requirements together with recommendations within one regulation was not ideal from the legal perspective. With regard to OTIF's TAF TSI Study, the representative of the EU was of the opinion that further analysis of the impact of TAF was needed.

ERA was of the opinion that application of TAF TSI in the EU has improved the availability of railway products to customers. This was necessary in order to compete with road transport, where tracking and tracing was fully embedded. It also showed potential for further development and opened new markets for railways, for example by exchanging the electronic consignment note with CIM/SMGS data in accordance with the new TAF TSI⁴. It believed that TAF would support the development of intercontinental rail freight. With regard to the application of the TAF TSI on a voluntary basis, ERA was of the opinion that it should be further analysed, as this option could create an "IT Island"⁵ which could affect the functionality of other parts of the IT system. In terms of applying the TAF TSI, some of the processes and protocols for data exchange described in TAF TSI had already been implemented in some non-EU Contracting States⁶. All these processes were performed

⁴ Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1305/2014 in force since December 2014.

⁵ IT Island without any information, even without a location code for train movements

⁶ For example, non-EU RUs already use a path allocation process (TAF TSI - Path Request), train composition information exchange (TAF TSI Train Preparation), tracking the movement of the train (TAF TSI

between IMs and RUs regardless of their level of integration within a single company. In order to become more familiar with developments relating to TAF TSI, ERA invited the OTIF Secretariat to join ERA's Working Party on TAF TSI.

RS was of the opinion that CTE needed more information on how to implement TAF TSI and proposed that it should be further analysed at WG TECH and that feedback should be submitted before the next CTE.

The representative of the EU supported ERA's and RS's proposals. In addition, the EU proposed to make a presentation at the forthcoming WG TECH meeting concerning the development and status of implementation of TAF TSI. The EU was of the opinion that this topic could also be discussed within a dedicated workshop on TAF, in order to explain the principles and benefits of the TAF TSI to the non-EU OTIF Member States.

The **Secretariat** welcomed the suggestion of organising a workshop and commented that such a workshop would require support from ERA and the EU, as the OTIF Secretariat had limited knowledge of and experience with TAF. Such a workshop could take place in Turkey for example, or in the Balkan region because of its important rail connections with the EU.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that transposition of the TAF TSI into UTP TAF, with mandatory requirements, might also require mandatory investments in its application. The Secretariat believed that COTIF was not meant to impose financial investments on its Contracting States and therefore believed that application of the TAF TSI should be voluntary. With regard to the process of developing TAF requirements within OTIF, the Secretariat was of the opinion that this would require more discussion, with the significant involvement of TAF experts. This could be achieved either as an additional project or within a small expert subgroup with a mandate from CTE or WG TECH.

RS thought it might be premature to set up an ad-hoc working group, as such a group did not yet have clear terms of reference or any additional impact analysis for TAF for the non-EU OTIF Member States. **RS** supported the EU's proposal to organise a workshop on TAF. Feedback on the possible pros and cons of various TAF subjects could be sought.

The representative of the EU supported RS's point of view. The EU suggested that all the options described in OTIF's study should be assessed further. As an example, he mentioned the option of making the application of TAF specifications mandatory only in case of investment or renewal of telematic applications. The options could either be assessed in another sub-group or the assessment could be outsourced. Whatever was decided, in the EU's, CTE should await the results of the discussions at WG TECH.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and concluded as follows:

- CTE 8 mandated WG TECH to continue working on TAF and to identify all the options and corresponding proposals (scenarios) for making the TAF specifications available at OTIF level and to provide feedback by the next CTE meeting
- CTE 8 was of the opinion that it was premature to set up an ad-hoc working group dealing with TAF subjects, as there should first be a policy discussion at WG TECH level
- CTE 8 also suggested that in cooperation with ERA, the OTIF Secretariat should organise a workshop on TAF in order to explain the principles and benefits of the TAF TSI to non-EU Member States.

6.2. ATMF explanatory document

The **Secretariat** had prepared document CTE 8/6.2 - Explanatory document on ATMF 2015, which set out the general principles underpinning ATMF, in the version entering into force on 1 July 2015, and summarised the tasks and responsibilities of the different actors involved in the implementation of ATMF. Its aim was to help the reader understand ATMF. The Secretariat had received comments prior to the session which had been taken into account in the meeting room document:

Amendment number Änderungsnummer No. de la modification	Language version Sprachfassung Version linguistique	Point as it is now (section and page) Aktueller Punkt (Abschnitt und Seite) Point actuel (section et page)	Amendment proposal Änderungsvorschlag Proposition de modification	Justification/comment Begründung/Kommentar Motif/remarque
1	DE	Seite 3, Absätze 1 und 2	<p>“Des Weiteren muss es einen ZugTriebfahrzeugführer geben, der über die für den sicheren Betrieb des Zuges nötigen Informationen verfügt, und eine festgelegte Strecke für den Zug usw.</p> <p>Ein Zug ist eine betriebsfähige Zusammenstellung aus einem oder mehreren Fahrzeugen, einem ZugTriebfahrzeugführer und einer Strecke, die von einem Eisenbahnunternehmen betrieben (für den Betrieb vorbereitet) wird.</p>	Korrektore Begrifflichkeit im Deutschen
2	DE	Seite 5, Absatz 4	Güterwagen, die zur Beförderung gefährlicher Güter verwendet werden sollen, sollen müssen zusätzliche zu den ETV auch die entsprechenden Fahrzeuganforderungen des RID (Anhang C zum COTIF) erfüllen.	Von der EU geforderte Änderung, da besser an den Kontext angepasst.
3	DE	Seite 9, Absatz 2	Ein Eisenbahnunternehmen darf ein Fahrzeug nur nutzen, wenn ihm diesem eine ECM zugeteilt ist. Es kann der ECM die für den Betrieb des Fahrzeugs relevanten Informationen, einschließlich Kilometerstand und Unfälle/Zwischenfälle, entweder direkt oder über den Halter zukommen lassen.	Zur Klarstellung, dass die ECM dem Fahrzeug und nicht dem Eisenbahnunternehmen zugeteilt ist.

4a	EN	Page 9, International agreements, first paragraph	<p>The text</p> <p>“If these sets of rules are complete, fully equivalent and do not contain open points, then a vehicle which meets the TSI requirements and is authorised in the EU will also be deemed to be authorised outside the EU and vice versa. The principle is illustrated in the diagram below.”</p> <p>Is replaced with:</p> <p>“If these sets of rules are complete and fully equivalent, then a vehicle which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets the TSI requirements and • is not subject to open points related to the technical compatibility with the network, and • is not subject to specific cases, and • is authorised in the EU, <p>will also be deemed to be authorised outside the EU and vice versa. The principle is illustrated in the following diagram.”</p>	The EU requested to include an exhaustive list of applicable conditions.
----	----	---	--	--

4b	DE	Seite 10, Internationale Abkommen, erster Absatz	<p>Der Text:</p> <p>„Wenn diese Regelwerke vollständig und äquivalent sind und keine offenen Punkte enthalten, dann gilt ein Fahrzeug, das alle TSI-Anforderungen erfüllt und in der EU eine Inbetriebnahmegenehmigung erhalten hat, auch außerhalb der EU als zugelassen und umgekehrt. Dieses Prinzip wird in folgendem Schaubild verdeutlicht.“</p> <p>wird ersetzt durch:</p> <p>„Wenn diese Regelwerke vollständig und äquivalent sind, dann gilt ein Fahrzeug,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • das alle TSI-Anforderungen erfüllt und • für das keine offenen Punkte in Bezug auf die technische Kompatibilität mit der Infrastruktur bestehen und • für das keine Sonderfälle gelten und • das in der EU eine Inbetriebnahmegenehmigung erhalten hat, <p>auch außerhalb der EU als zugelassen und umgekehrt. Dieses Prinzip wird in folgendem Schaubild verdeutlicht.“</p>	Von der EU geforderte Änderung, zur Vervollständigung der Liste anwendbarer Bedingungen.
4c	FR	Page 10, Accords internationaux, premier paragraphe	<p>« Lorsque ces règles sont complètes, pleinement équivalentes, et ne comportent pas de points ouverts, alors un véhicule satisfaisant aux prescriptions de la STI et autorisé en UE est également réputé autorisé en dehors de l'UE, et vice versa. Ce principe est illustré dans le diagramme ci-dessous. »</p> <p>est remplacé par :</p> <p>« Lorsque ces règles sont complètes et pleinement équivalentes, alors un véhicule :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • satisfaisant aux prescriptions de la STI, • ne faisant l'objet d'aucun point ouvert lié à la compatibilité technique du réseau, • ne faisant l'objet d'aucun cas spécifique, • et autorisé en UE, <p>est également réputé autorisé en dehors de l'UE, et vice versa. Ce principe est illustré dans le diagramme ci-après. »</p>	L'UE a demandé l'inclusion d'une liste exhaustive des conditions applicables.

Although it was not a regulation and did not therefore have to be formally adopted, the **Secretariat** explained that it wished CTE 8 to validate this document as it was thought to be important. After validation, the Secretariat intended to publish it on OTIF's website at the same time as the new version of ATMF entered into force, i.e. 1.7.2015.

The **EU** thanked the Secretariat for agreeing to introduce this proposal and, for reasons of clarification, the EU proposed that amendment number 4a should also be changed and should read:

“If these sets of rules are complete, fully equivalent and do not contain open points related to the technical compatibility with the network, then a vehicle which

- meets the TSI requirements and
- is not subject to specific cases, and
- is authorised in the EU,

will also be deemed to be authorised outside the EU and vice versa. The principle is illustrated in the following diagram.”

The **Chairman** reminded the meeting that the amended ATMF would enter into force on 1.7.2015 and noted that CTE 8 validated CTE 8/6.2 - Explanatory document on ATMF 2015 as proposed by the Secretariat, including the amendments set out in the meeting room document and the reworded amendment number 4a proposed by the EU, and instructed the Secretariat to publish it in OTIF's official languages on OTIF's website.

6.3. RID/CTE coordination

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting of the reasons which had led to the need to coordinate the work on improving consistency between COTIF Appendices C and G and informed the meeting about recent developments. A joint paper from the OTIF Secretariat and the European Commission summarising this approach was published on 18 December 2014 (document CTE 8/6.3⁷). The Secretariat informed CTE 8 that an identical presentation on general coordination between RID and ATMF had been given at EU level to the TDG and RISC Committees⁸ and at OTIF level to the RID Standing WG and WG TECH meetings. The Secretariat also informed the meeting that CTE 8 should decide whether or not it supported the proposal to set up a joint working group, as proposed in a joint paper.

The representative of the EU noted that the document reflected the views of both OTIF and the European Commission and informed the meeting about the coordinated approach within EU MS to support setting up this group. He also informed the meeting that the European Commission had received some comments which referred to the future Terms of Reference (ToR) of the joint working group. It was expected that, among other things, this joint working group would deal with including the ECMs in RID, an impact assessment of amendments to the legislation, risk analysis, clarification of the authorisation procedure, etc.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and concluded that CTE 8 noted the Secretariat's presentation of the document submitted jointly by the OTIF Secretariat and the European Commission on improving consistency between COTIF Appendices C and G (document CTE

⁷ Joint OTIF Secretariat and European Commission paper on Interaction between RID and ATMF to improve consistency between COTIF Appendices C and G

⁸ Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC), Transport of Dangerous Goods (TDG)

8/6.3) and supported the proposal to set up a common working group made up of RID experts and general railway regulation experts.

6.4. Interchangeable coaches

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting about the development process in connection with the interchangeability of passenger coaches, which had started with the workshop held in Bonn in February 2014, and reminded the meeting of the general principles for interchangeable coaches. It was pointed out that UTPs/TSIs defined the minimum requirements for interoperability for trains, which includes the technical specifications for interfaces with the (generic) network. However, UTPs/TSIs did not specify in technical terms the harmonised inter-vehicle interfaces on which the exchange of vehicles relies. Consequently, the interchangeability of passenger coaches cannot be ensured by applying UTPs/TSIs only.

Since 2014 work has been done to make available at international level the specification for inter-vehicle interfaces. Document CTE8/6.4 summarised this work.

With regard to the NoBo's assessment of interchangeable passenger coaches, **RS** expressed concern as to where these optional technical provisions for interchangeable coaches should appear. RS was of the view that this assessment should follow the principle for wagons, i.e. required specifications should be defined similarly to UTP WAG in Chapter 7.1.2 and Annex C.

Following a request from the sector, **DE** was in favour of including something similar to Chapter 7.1.2 and Annex C of the WAG TSI in the TSI and UTP LOC&PAS. DE supported continuation of the joint work of CER and UNIFE which would assist CTE in reviewing all the advantages and disadvantages of the sector's request. DE said that if it was decided to apply a similar approach as for wagons, Chapter 7.1.2 and Annex C should be applied in its entirety and not partially, meaning that a coach should only receive a declaration or marking when all the interchangeability requirements are fully met.

Highlighting the similarities between UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS, **CER**, like DE, was of the view that passenger coaches should follow the same principle that applies to wagons. CER was of the view that the NoBo's assessment might be easier if all the requirements were prescribed in UTP LOC&PAS. CER noted that requirements for interchangeability would be applied voluntarily and would only be applied to particular vehicles at an RU's request, i.e. they would only be valid in cases where the RU decides that vehicles should be interchangeable.

The representative of the EU reiterated its earlier position that it was premature to discuss where the specifications should appear until they were all available. Although it was feasible for the specifications to be part of UTP LOC&PAS or to be defined in a standard, the EU was of the view that all solutions on the basis of private agreements should be analysed, i.e. within the framework of CUV UR or the GCU⁹ or else experience with standards that were already applied to the marking of containers should be taken into account. Only once an impact assessment of all these options was available could the CTE could take an appropriate decision.

In reply to the Chairman's question as to whether the CTE should take a decision on interchangeable requirements at CTE 9 (June 2016) or CTE 10 (June 2017), **the representative of the EU** noted that the EU's coordinated position on this topic would not be

⁹ Uniform Rules concerning Contracts of Use of Vehicles in International Rail Traffic (CUV UR) or General Contract of Use for Wagons (GCU)

ready before September 2016 at the earliest. He also reminded the meeting that the OTIF and EU processes regarding the adoption of regulations differ. One of these differences was that the RISC meetings are held three times a year compared with the annual meetings of the CTE.

UNIFE shared the EU's view that interchangeable requirements could not be finalised in 2016. In UNIFE's opinion not all the requirements had been fully developed, and even among those listed there were requirements which, preferably, should not be listed in standards. In connection with this, CTE should also take into consideration the duration of the CENELEC¹⁰ procedure for publishing standards. UNIFE was of the view that interchangeability requirements, should be dealt with as private law, rather than in public law, where there is no (legal) flexibility. Private law allowed more flexibility in direct contracts between operators (RUs) and manufacturers. With these flexible solutions, contracting parties could refer to standards that were already published. If the provisions ended up in a TSI/UTP, UNIFE stressed that NoBos should also be consulted about these requirements, as it should be ensured that all specifications are assessable.

CER was not in favour of private law, contractual or standardisation solutions. It insisted that the best solution would be an annex to the UTP/TSI. Contrary to UNIFE, CER was of the view that the necessary requirements had been prepared. CER thought that integrating the requirements in the TSI/UTP should start as soon as possible. In CER's opinion, the proposal for interchangeability requirements could already be prepared for the next CTE (CTE 9).

In order to remind delegates of the decision-making process within OTIF, the **Secretariat** informed the meeting that CTE had regular annual meetings, which could be held more than once per year if requested. This would, however, have repercussions for the budget, which the Administrative Committee would have to be involved in. On the other hand, the Chairman could also conduct a vote by written procedure, in accordance with the CTE's Rules of Procedure.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and concluded that CTE 8 noted the status of the project and supported its aims. CTE 8 also encouraged CER and UNIFE to work together to update a detailed list of requirements and send it to the OTIF Secretariat, ERA and the European Commission, after which WG TECH would analyse their integration into the regulatory system, i.e. as part of the legal provisions in the UTP/TSI, or as a standard, or as part of private agreements. CTE 8 also suggested that CER and UNIFE should identify how an assessment body can assess conformity of each of the requirements with the specifications. CTE 8 concluded that WG TECH would continue to work on this topic in close cooperation with ERA and that equivalent provisions should be adopted in OTIF and in the EU. The estimated earliest possible date for the adoption of these requirements: late 2016 in a written procedure, or 2017 at CTE 10.

6.5. Work programme of the CTE for 2015/2016 and beyond

The **Secretariat** explained that the aim of this item was to provide a comprehensive overview of the priorities and mandates for the next period, i.e. what WG TECH should work on in order to prepare the next CTE meeting. The Secretariat informed CTE about the following anticipated activities after the CTE 7:

1. Working together with RID experts to improve consistency between ATMF and RID
2. Requirements for a unique admission for passenger rolling stock

¹⁰ European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardisation

3. Definition of harmonised technical solutions for inter-vehicle interfaces for passenger coaches
4. Trainee programme
5. Instruments (e.g. guidance or regulations) covering responsibilities for the operational actors
6. Following the activities of the European Railway Agency
7. Development of explanatory documents
8. Dissemination, coordination and monitoring particularly of non EU OTIF Contracting States
9. TAF UTP developments

The **Secretariat** had prepared document CTE8/6.5 technology section – Strategy and work programme for the period 2015 and 2016, and proposed that OTIF’s technology section should focus its activities on the following priorities:

1. Developing additional requirements for a unique admission for passenger rolling stock within the framework of the ERA Working Party. The unique admission should be valid in all Contracting States. It is anticipated that the requirements will be annexed to both the UTP and the TSI LOC&PAS;
2. Making accessible at international level the definition of harmonised technical solutions for inter-vehicle interfaces for passenger coaches: the sector (e.g. led by CER and/or by UNIFE and UIC) should collect and define a comprehensive set of specifications required in addition to the UTP/TSI LOC&PAS. If these specifications are completed, WG TECH may analyse these technical solutions and how they could be integrated into the framework of vehicle requirements at the level of standardisation or optional (voluntary) regulation;
3. Developing appropriate instruments (e.g. guidance or regulations) covering responsibilities for the operational actors (i.e. RU, keeper, ECM) to clarify further the new ATMF Article 15a and with a view to developing a vision of interoperability outside the EU. The first objective would be to analyse the situation and identify the need and legal basis for further developments;
4. Working together with RID experts to improve consistency between ATMF and RID;
5. Developing legal drafting principles for the amendment or revision of UTPs and their subsequent publication;
6. Following the activities of the European Railway Agency, in particular in fields where OTIF and the EU have equivalent rules. Where necessary, and in cooperation with ERA, advise WG TECH on these regulatory developments and the steps OTIF should take;
7. The development of explanatory documents for:
 - APTU,
 - the Common Safety Methods on risk assessment and evaluation (UTP GEN-G) and
 - the conformity assessment procedures (UTP GEN-D).
8. Monitoring and dissemination activities, particularly with non-EU Member States.

The representative of the EU supported the paper. With reference to point 3 of the priorities for 2015/2016, the EU asked whether CTE could consider the development of harmonised

safety provisions in the scope of COTIF. Furthermore, the EU proposed to give a presentation at the next WG TECH to explain developments within the context of the 4th EU railway package in terms of operational responsibilities, i.e. an explanation of the EU regulatory framework.

UNIFE proposed to CTE to initiate cooperation between NB Rail¹¹ and Non-EU Assessing Entities. UNIFE was of the view that discussions¹² between different EU Notified Bodies within NB Rail resulting in recommendations for use, guidelines and working documents could be useful for non-EU OTIF Member States.

With regard to the EU's proposal to develop operational responsibilities, the **Secretariat** reminded the meeting of Article 15a of ATMF and the appendices in UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS in which the preparation of trains and responsibilities for the correct use of vehicles were defined. The Secretariat was of the view that OTIF should attempt to agree as much common ground as possible in defining operational responsibilities, particularly in connection with the EU regulations. OTIF's main concern should be to provide a legal basis for interoperability between OTIF Contracting States in terms of common operational and safety aspects. The Secretariat also supported UNIFE's proposal to initiate cooperation between NoBos and non-EU Assessing Entities.

Conclusion:

The **Chairman** noted that the CTE 8 had discussed the work programme for 2015/2016 and beyond on the basis of a document prepared by the OTIF Secretariat. CTE 8 also noted that WG TECH should work on amending the Uniform Rules in order to ensure continued equivalence with EU rules. In addition to the ongoing work on interchangeable coaches, the coordination between CTE and RID and the telematic applications, it was suggested that WG TECH could further analyse the development of harmonised safety provisions in the scope of COTIF. WG TECH was also asked to follow EU regulatory developments in the context of the 4th railway package and to analyse whether any activities on the part of OTIF should follow. WG TECH was also requested to establish how experience and recommendations from EU Notified Bodies could be made available to Assessing Entities in non-EU OTIF Member States.

6.6. Any other business

The **Chairman** noted that there were no proposals to be discussed under this item.

6.7. Next session

The **Secretariat** proposed that the next (9th) session of CTE should take place on 7 and 8 June 2016 in Bern.

The **Secretariat** also proposed the following dates for the next sessions of the standing working group WG TECH:

- 26th session on 9 and 10 September 2015 in Amiens
- 27th session on 17 and 18 November 2015 in Bern
- 28th session on 17 and 18 February 2016 (venue to be decided)

¹¹ NB-RAIL – Coordination Group of Notified Bodies for Directive 2008/57/EC on Railway Interoperability

¹² About application of the relevant TSIs; procedures for the verification of subsystems or for assessing conformity; procedures for assessing conformity or suitability for use of Interoperability Constituents


The CTE agreed on these dates.

7. Closing remarks

The **Chairman** summed up by saying that CTE had worked very well, with the result that three documents had been adopted. He also thanked OTIF's technology section, which had prepared all the documents. He also thanked the observers, as they were in fact the users of the specifications that CTE adopted. He noted the cooperative working atmosphere between all main players. He also thanked the interpreters and closed the 8th session of CTE.


Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments**Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany**M./Hr./Mr. Michael **Schmitz**

Leiter Stabsstelle 92
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Annerkennungsstelle für Benannte Stellen,
internationale Angelegenheiten
Heinemannstrasse 6
DE-53175 Bonn

 +49 (228) 9826 160
Fax +49 (228) 9826 9160
E-mail SchmitzM@eba.bund.de


Bosnie-Herzégovine/Bosnien und Herzegowina/Bosnia and HerzegovinaM./Hr./Mr. Mirko **Vulić**

Senior Expert Associate
Railways Regulatory Board (Regulatorni Odbor
Željeznica)
Svetog Save bb
BA-74 000 Doboij

 +387 (53) 20 73 50
Fax +387 (53) 20 73 51
E-mail mirko.vulic@mkt.gov.ba


France/Frankreich/FranceM./Hr./Mr. Sébastien **Vignot**

Chargé d'affaire européenne
Etablissement public de sécurité ferroviaires (EPSF)
60 rue de la Vallée
CS 11758
FR-80017 Amiens Cedex 1

 +33 (03) 22 33 95 95
Fax +33 (03) 22 33 95 99
E-mail sebastien.vignot@securite-ferroviaire.fr


Grèce/Greichenland/GreeceM./Hr./Mr. Georgios **Vetsis**

Head of Interoperability Unit
Signalling Expert
Hellenic Railways (OSE)
Karolou 1-3 str.
GR-10437 Athens

 +30 (210) 529 75 18
Fax
E-mail g.vetsis@osenet.gr


Italie/Italien/ItalyM./Hr./Mr. **Rocco Cammarata**

Head of Technical Standards of Vehicles Office
 Agenzia Nazionale per la Sicurezza delle
 Ferrovie
 Piazza della Stazione 45
 IT-50123 Firenze

 +39 (055) 298 97 19
 Fax +39 (055) 238 25 09
 E-mail rocco.cammarata@ansf.it


Italie/Italien/ItalyM./Hr./Mr. **Giorgio Morandi**

Ministero delle Infrastrutture e dei Trasporti
 Direzione generale per il Trasporto Ferroviario - Div 5
 Interoperabilita trasporto merci pericolose-normativa
 Via Caraci 36
 IT-00157 Roma

 +39 (06) 415 835 41
 Fax +39 (06) 415 835 77
 E-mail giorgio.morandi@mit.gov.it


Norvège/Norwegen/NorwayMme/Fr/Ms **Elisabeth Classon**

Senior Legal Adviser
 Ministry of Transport and Communications
 Railway section
 PO Box 8010 Dep
 NO-0030 Oslo

 +47 (22) 24 82 19
 Fax +47 (22) 249 572
 E-mail elisabeth.classon@sd.dep.no

Roumanie/Rumänien/RomaniaM./Hr./Mr. **Mihail Nanu**

State Inspector
 Railway Safety Authority
 393 Calea Grivitei
 Sector Bucuresti
 RO- Bucarest

 +40 (2) 130 722 85
 Fax +40 (2) 130 779 76
 E-mail nanu.mihail@afer.ro

Roumanie/Rumänien/RomaniaMme/Fr./Ms **Paulina Miller**

Expert
 Railway Safety Authority
 393 Calea Grivitei
 Sector Bucuresti
 RO- Bucarest

☎ +40 (2) 130 722 05
 Fax +40 (2) 130 768 06
 E-mail carmen.miller@afer.ro

Serbie/Serbien/Serbia

M./Hr./Mr. Sinisa **Trkulja**

Assistant Director
 Direkcija za Železnice
 Nemanjina 6
 RS-1000 Beograd

☎ +381 (11) 265 65 18
 Fax +381 (11) 361 82 91
 E-mail sinisa.trkulja@raildir.gov.rs

Serbie/Serbien/Serbia

M./Hr./Mr. Milan **Popović**

Head of the department for regulations
 Directorate for Railways
 Direkcija za Železnice
 Nemanjina 6
 RS-11000 Beograd

☎ +381 (11) 361 67 96
 Fax +381 (11) 361 82 91
 E-mail milan.popovic@raildir.gov.rs

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

M./Hr./Mr. Roland **Bacher**

Stellvertretender Sektionschef
 Bundesamt für Verkehr
 Sektion Zulassungen + Regelwerke
 CH-3003 Bern

☎ +41 58 464 12 12
 Fax +41 58 462 55 95
 E-mail roland.bacher@bav.admin.ch

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

M./Hr./Mr. Marcel **Hepp**

Jurist
 Bundesamt für Verkehr
 CH-3003 Bern

☎ +41 58 463 00 92
 Fax +41 58 462 58 11
 E-mail marcel.hepp@bav.admin.ch

Turquie/Türkei/Turkey


S'est excusée.
 Hat sich entschuldigt.
 Sent apologies

**Union européenne/Europäische
Union/European Union**

**Commission européenne/Europäische
Kommission/European Commission**

M./Hr./Mr. **Patrizio Grillo**

Deputy Head of Unit, Single European Rail Area Unit
European Commission - DG MOVE
EC - DG MOVE - B2
DM28 4/51
BE-1049 Brussels

 +32 (2) 296 09 57
Fax +32 (2) 299 02 62
E-mail patrizio.grillo@ec.europa.eu

**Commission européenne/Europäische
Kommission/European Commission**

Mme/Fr./Ms **Ainhoa San Martin**

Policy Officer
European Commission
Rue de Mot 28
BE-1040 Brussels


 +32 (2) 229 862 60
Fax
E-mail ainhoa.san-martin@ec.europa.eu

**Commission européenne/Europäische
Kommission/European Commission**

ERA

M./Hr./Mr. **Christoph Kaupat**

ERA - European Railway Agency
Interoperability Unit
120 rue Marc Lefrancq
BP 20392
FR-59307 Valenciennes Cedex

 +33 (3) 27 09 67 90
Fax +33 (3) 27 09 68 90
E-mail Christoph.kaupat@era.europa.eu

**Union européenne/Europäische
Union/European Union
ERA**

M./Hr./Mr. **Andreas Schirmer**

Head of Coordination Sector
European Railway Agency (ERA)
Interoperability Unit
120 rue Marc Lefrancq
BP 20932
FR-59300 Valenciennes Cedex



+33 (3) 27 09 67 89

Fax +33 (3) 27 09 68 89


E-mail andreas.schirmer@era.europa.eu

Etats non-membres de l'OTIF
Nichtmitgliedstaaten der OTIF
Non Member States of OTIF

Azerbaïdjan/Aserbajdschan/Azerbaijan

M./Hr./Mr. **Aydin Suleymanli**


Head of Legal Department
Ministry of Transport
1054 Tbilisi Avenue
AZ-1122 Baku

 (+99412) 430 99 23
Fax (+99412) 431 85 94
E-mail a.suleymanli@mintrans.az

Azerbaïdjan/Aserbajdschan/Azerbaijan

M./Hr./Mr. **Hicran Valehov**

Advisor of Chairman of the Azerbaijan Railways
Azerbaijan Railways LTD
Dilara Aliyeva 230
AZ-1010 Baku
Republic of Azerbaijan

 (+99412) 499 44 99
Fax (+99412) 499 46 94
E-mail office@railway.gov.az

Organisations et associations internationales non-gouvernementales
Nichtstaatliche internationale Organisationen und Verbände
International non-governmental Organisations or Associations

CERM./Hr./Mr. Christian **Chavanel**

Interoperability & Standardization Director
 SNCF
 Campus Etoiles
 2 place des étoiles
 Bureau 5 C19
 FR-93633 La Plaine Saint Denis



Fax

E-mail christian.chavanel@sncf.fr**CER**M./Hr./Mr. Jean Baptiste **Simonnet**

Senior Adviser on ERA an Research-related Issues
 Community of European and Infrastructure Companies
 (CER) AISBL
 Avenue des Arts 53
 BE-1000 Brussels



Fax

E-mail jean-baptiste.simonnet@cer.be**UNIFE**M./Hr./Mr. Sebastian **Giera**

Legal Counsel CTO - Specialist Engineering
 Bombardier Transportation GmbH
 Schoeneberger Ufer 1-3
 DE-10785 Berlin



+49 (03) 98 607 19 79

Fax


E-mail

sebastian.giera@de.transport.bombardier.com

UNIFE

M./Hr./Mr. Christian **Zumpe**

Senior Engineer
Homologation Manager
SIEMENS AG
Mobility Division
MO MLT AR RA1
Werner-von-Siemens-Str.67
DE-91052 Erlangen

 +49 9131 7 26955

Fax

E-mail christian.zumpe@siemens.com

Secrétariat / Sekretariat / Secretariat

M./Hr./Mr. Bas **Leermakers**

Senior Officer

☎ +41 (31) 359 10 25
 Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
 E-mail bas.leermakers@otif.org

Mme/Fr./Ms Margarethe **Koschmider**

First Officer

☎ +41 (31) 359 10 26
 Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
 E-mail margarethe.koschmider@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr. Dragan **Nešić**

First Officer

☎ +41 (31) 359 10 24
 Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
 E-mail dragan.nesic@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr. Sinan **Oguz**

Training programme participant of
 The Ministry of Transport Maritime Affairs and
 Communication from Turkey

☎ +41 (31) 359 10 24
 Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
 E-mail sinan.oguz@otif.org

Interprètes / Dolmetscher / Interpreters

Mme/Fr./Ms Viviane **Vaucher**

Mme/Fr./Ms Dominique **Baz**

Mme/Fr./Ms Marlène **Mitzmacher**

M./Hr./Mr David **Ashman** OTIF

Mme/Fr./Ms Joana **Meenken** OTIF

Agenda**Annex II**

- 1. Approval of the agenda**
- 2. Presence and quorum**
- 3. Election of chairman**
- 4. For information:**
 - 4.1. Report from the Committee of Technical Experts working group TECH
Document: [CTE 8/4.1 report from the WG TECH](#)
 - 4.2. Status of notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU
no document
 - 4.3. ERA consultation of non-EU OTIF Member States (CSM RA)
no document
 - 4.4. Status of the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States
no document
- 5. For adoption:**
 - 5.1. UTP NOI revision
Document: [CTE 8/5.1 UTP NOI](#)
 - 5.2. ECM Rules amendment (addition of Annex V)
Document: [CTE 8/5.2 ECM Annex A](#)
 - 5.3. UTP WAG, update of references in Appendices G and J to M
Document: [CTE 8/5.3 UTP WAG - appendix G](#)
- 6. For discussion:**
 - 6.1. TAF TSI – study and next steps
Document: [CTE 8/6.1 TAF TSI study](#)
 - 6.2. ATMF explanatory document
Document: [CTE 8/6.2 ATMF explanatory document](#)
 - 6.3. RID/CTE coordination
Document: [CTE 8/6.3 RID/CTE coordination](#)
 - 6.4. Interchangeable coaches
Document: [CTE 8/6.4 interchangeable coaches](#)
 - 6.5. Work programme of the Committee of Technical Experts for 2015/2016 and beyond
Document: [CTE 8/6.5 CTE work programme 2015/16](#)
 - 6.6. Any other business
no document
 - 6.7. Next session

* * * * *