



Organisation intergouvernementale
pour les transports internationaux
ferroviaires (OTIF)

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation
für den internationalen
Eisenbahnverkehr (OTIF)

Intergovernmental Organisation
for International Carriage
by Rail (OTIF)

WG TECH

22nd Session

Final Minutes

Bonn, 05.02.2014

Table of contents

	Page
AGENDA	3
DISCUSSIONS	4
1. Approval of the agenda	4
2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat	4
3. Election of chairman	5
4. Approval of the minutes of the 21 st session of WG TECH	5
5. Report from the ATMF “ad-hoc” working group and discussion	5
6. Preparation of the 7 th session of the Committee of Technical Experts	9
6.1 Transposition of LOC&PAS TSI into the draft UTP LOC&PAS	9
6.2 Transposition of PRM TSI into the draft UTP PRM	10
6.3 Coding/marketing of vehicles (UTP MARKING)	10
6.4 UTP GEN-A amendment	11
6.5 UTP GEN-C amendment	11
6.6 Provisional agenda for CTE 7	11
7. Cross reference document EU/OTIF regulations	12
8. Next session	12
9. Any other business	13
10. Closing remarks	13

Annex I

List of participants

AGENDA

1. Approval of the agenda
2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat and the EU
3. Election of chairman
4. Approval of the minutes of the 21st session of WG TECH
5. Report from the ATMF “ad-hoc” working group and discussion
 - Document: [A 92-03/1.2013 v.08](#) Draft proposal ATMF revision
6. Preparation of the 7th session of the Committee of Technical Experts
 - 6.1 Transposition of LOC&PAS TSI into the draft UTP LOC&PAS
 - Documents: [A 94-03/2.2013 ver.03](#) UTP LOC&PAS
 - 6.2 Transposition of PRM TSI into the draft UTP PRM
 - Documents: [A 94-05/1.2014 ver.01](#) UTP PRM
 - 6.3 Coding/marketing of vehicles (UTP MARKING)
 - Documents: UTP MARKING
 - 6.4 UTP GEN-A amendment
 - Documents: [A 94-01A/1.2011 ver.09](#) Draft proposal for UTP GEN-A amendment
 - 6.5 UTP GEN-C amendment
 - Document: [A 92-01C/1.2011 ver.08](#) Draft proposal for UTP GEN-C amendment
 - 6.6 Provisional agenda for CTE 7
7. Cross reference document EU/OTIF regulations
 - Document: [A 92-00/1.2013 ver.09](#) Cross reference table of OTIF and EU regulations
8. Next session
9. Any other business

DISCUSSIONS

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers welcomed the participants, particularly those attending the session for the first time: Mr Lavogiez (Head of Rolling Stock Sector) and Mr Schirmer (Head of Coordination Sector) from ERA, Mr Heid from Germany, Mr Batuk and Mr Baysal from Turkey, Mr Cammarata from Italy and Mr Giera from UNIFE.

Welcome by the host (EBA)

Mr Schweinsberg, vice president of EBA, indicated to WG TECH the importance of cross border traffic. International traffic does not stop at the EU borders and he emphasised the good cooperation between OTIF and the EU in previous years. With reference to the following day's workshop, Mr Schweinsberg wished all the participants success with their meetings.

1. Approval of the agenda

The OTIF **Secretariat** explained that the provisional agenda had been sent to participants with the invitation on 17 December 2013 (circular [A 92-03/508.2013](#)). It asked that the agenda be amended by adding a new item 6.3 UTP MARKING. In accordance with the decision of the last meeting, the **representative of the EU** had prepared a presentation on document DV29bis. It was agreed that the presentation should be given under item 5.

Conclusion: WG TECH approved the amended agenda for the 22nd session.

2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH that it had received the withdrawal of the declaration of non-application of the APTU Appendix from France.

In response, **IT** informed WG TECH that ratification of COTIF 1999 in Italy was in the final phase and would be finalised in a few months.

The non-EU OTIF Member States had been consulted on the draft CCS TSI (Command and Control System), with a deadline of 9 December 2013. Comments had only been received from **CH**. These had been forwarded to ERA. ERA's reply was forwarded to CH on 17.12.2013.

The **representative of the EU** informed WG TECH about the results of the latest RISC 69 meeting:

- positive MSs' opinion about:
 - INF TSI and ENE TSI (both merged HS+CR and extended scope), and
 - PRM TSI (revised and extended scope),
 - Mandate for revision of CSM was approved
 - Amendments to Annexes V and VI of Directive 2008/57 (Interoperability Directive) and amendments to Recommendation 2011/271 (DV 29bis) were deferred to be discussed at the next RISC 70 meeting.
- TAF TSI, OPE TSI, Noise TSI, CCS TSI and the amendment of WAG TSI (CBB) will also be on the agenda of the next RISC 70 meeting.

3. Election of chairman

In reply to a request for nominations, **DE** proposed Mr Roland Bacher (Switzerland) to chair this session. Mr Bacher accepted the nomination. **WG TECH** unanimously elected Switzerland, in the shape of Mr Roland Bacher, to chair this session.

The **Chairman** thanked the working group for the trust it had placed in him and reminded it that the priorities for this meeting were the transposition of the TSIs into UTPs in order to ensure that the UTPs could be adopted at the June session of the Committee of Technical Experts (CTE). This should take priority over the discussions related to the revision of ATMF.

4. Approval of the minutes of the 21st session of WG TECH

Document: [Provisional minutes \(with delegates' corrections\)](#)

On 7 January 2014, the OTIF **Secretariat** had sent the provisional minutes to delegates who had attended the 21st WG TECH session (3 and 4 December 2013). It had amended the provisional minutes in accordance with the corrections requested by ERA/Commission and uploaded them on 29 January 2014 for the attention of WG TECH 22. At the meeting, CER requested corrections at the bottom of page 8: deletion of a footnote and the amendment of the text in the second bullet point. As it concerned a statement by the Secretariat, the Secretariat proposed to amend the text as follows:

“The complete vehicle, including all its parts, should comply with the essential requirements, including essential requirements which are not railway specific. The latter include elements of the vehicle which are not relevant to interoperability and which are not therefore covered by the UTPs.”. The footnote was deleted.

Conclusion: The minutes of the 21st session of WG TECH were approved with the corrections set out above.

5. Report from the ATMF “ad-hoc” working group and discussion

Document: [A 92-03/1.2013 v.08](#) Draft proposal ATMF revision

The OTIF **Secretariat** informed WG TECH about the composition of the ATMF “ad-hoc” working group: France, Germany, Serbia, Switzerland, EC, ERA, CER, UIP and the OTIF Secretariat. The “ad-hoc” working group had met on 18 October 2013 in Bern, 28 October 2013 in Brussels and 10 January 2014 in Bern. The “ad-hoc” working group had concluded its work and submitted document A 92-03/1.2013 v.08 to WG TECH 22: draft revision of Appendix G, as the proposal for the revision of Appendix G of COTIF 1999 ATMF. Before introducing the key issues of the draft text, WG TECH was reminded about the deadlines and procedure for approval of the ATMF document.

The key issues of the draft (compared to previous WG TECH) were:

- Update of the definition of a train (Art. 2 ee1))

- Vehicles to meet all applicable essential requirements (Art. 7§1)
- Infrastructure to meet all applicable essential requirements (Art. 8§1)
- Explicit reference to NVR, ECM register and VKM register (Art.13§1)
- IM to make INF characteristics available to RU operating on its network (Art. 15a § 4)
- Editorial modifications.

On behalf of WG TECH, the **Chairman** thanked the ATMF “ad-hoc” working group, chaired by Michael Schmitz (DE), for its work.

The **Secretariat** had received explanations from ERA regarding the maintenance file and the technical file, which confirmed that in their view these subjects were correctly covered in draft version 08.

New comments from FR, CER and DE were also received.

RS wanted to clarify the meaning of the changes in Article 6§3a) and the wording: “design operating state”. According to **RS**, the validity of the technical certificate should not be mixed up with proper usage of vehicle. Certificates would certainly be considered as inappropriate if the vehicle is not used correctly (i.e according to conditions defined in the certificate), and that situation was regulated in Article 10a - Rules for withdrawals or suspensions of technical certificates. **RS** proposed not to change anything in Article 6§3a).

CH and **DE** supported **RS**'s proposal. WG TECH was of the opinion that the changes to Article 6§3a) proposed in draft version 08 had not been accepted; the existing wording, without reference to the “design operating state” would be kept.

RS was of the view that Article 10a§5 of draft version 08: “*This withdrawal from service shall be notified to the competent authority of the Contracting State where the vehicle is registered.*” was unnecessary. Mixing up rules for withdrawals or suspensions of technical certificates with rules for registers should be avoided. Issues concerning registers were quite clearly covered by Article 13. **RS** proposed not to change anything in Article 10a§5.

CER did not support **RS**'s remark, emphasising that it was very important to notify entities for keeping registers, especially in case of withdrawal of the authorisation for placing in service.

The **Chairman** asked whether the sector had any problems with withdrawals. **UIP** replied that this was not the case.

DE supported **RS**'s remark.

The **representative of the EU** considered that not only the competent authority, but the whole railway sector should be informed about the change, and that could easily be done through registers.

WG TECH concluded that the suggestion from RS not to change anything in Article 10a§5 was partially accepted, it should read: “*This withdrawal from service shall be notified in accordance with Article 13§4.*”

The **Chairman** opened the discussion concerning a meeting room document prepared by the Secretariat, which described a question from the CUV WG to WG TECH. The meeting room document included a proposal by the Secretariat to amend Article 15§1 by adding a new sentence at the end: “*It shall be the responsibility of the keeper to designate an ECM for this purpose.*”

The **representative of the EU** considered that although ATMF and CUV have different scopes of application, their meaning should be uniform, and therefore supported the principle of the proposal. However, in the EU the keeper does not have the explicit responsibility to designate an ECM. The representative of the EU made a reservation on this text. Since such a provision will have an impact on EU legislation, it is necessary to coordinate a common position with EU Member States and to have an approval by the Council.

CH shared the EU opinion that regulations must be the same, with the addition that in Switzerland, the keeper was already considered as an ECM, unless otherwise specified.

The **CER** and **UIP** supported the proposal from the **Secretariat**, bearing in mind that this proposal clarified mutual obligations and the relationship between the ECM and the RU.

DE considered that the discussion should be concluded in the CUV WG. **DE** supported the Secretariat’s proposal to amend ATMF Article 15§1.

WG TECH decided to amend Article 15 § 1 by adding the sentence: “It shall be the responsibility of the keeper to designate an ECM for this purpose.”, taking note of the considerations listed above.

FR wanted to specify in Article 15§3 the method used by the ECM to inform operating railway undertakings about maintenance.

ERA commented on draft ATMF Article 15§4 and proposed to add in the second sentence the underlined text: “... *The ECM shall upon request inform the keeper of updates to the Maintenance Record File.*” According to **ERA**, this proposal was in line with the EU regulations. WG TECH accepted only the second addition of this suggestion.

DE added that it was not easy to put the obligations and duties for the keeper and the ECM in one single picture when they are defined at different levels and in different (types of) legislation. To avoid having different rules at various levels, mutual obligations and duties for keepers and ECMs could be set out in the NVR legislation.

UIP objected to **DE**’s proposal, explaining that the keeper had to be informed; any other solution could create problems in practice.

Owing to the limited time available, the **Chairman** stopped further discussions on Article 15 §3 and suggested that the discussion could be continued at CTE 7.

FR proposed to add a new §1bis to Article 13 on updating information in the NVR not linked to the ECVVR. A new obligation should be introduced in such cases to inform all other CSs. **FR** justified its proposal by saying that all NSAs needed to know about any restrictions.

The **Secretariat** responded that ATMF was a high level regulation, setting out principles. Dealing with specific situations, such as illustrated by FR, could be more appropriately dealt with in more detailed regulations, such as, in this case, the NVR Specification.

CH expressed concern about the proposal because existing obligations for competent authorities were already demanding. Any additional commitments would be very difficult to implement.

DE expressed doubts about the FR proposal, taking into account the experiences that had been gained 6 years after writing a similar text in Interoperability Directive 2008/57/EC (in Article 33 point 4.)

UIP had recently received a request from Spain to send all updates of NVR data to Spain. It commented that the reality differed from the regulations.

In view of the fact that the NVR Decision would soon be updated, the **representative of the EU** suggested that this proposal should be resolved in that context.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion, saying that the registration issue was very difficult and that in his opinion, this proposal should not be dealt with in the ATMF revision in 2014. Bearing in mind the fact that the NVR Decision would be soon updated, the proposal could be addressed in that context. **CH** and **FR** would together prepare a note about the updating process of NVR data (not in the scope of the ATMF revision, but for NVR).

FR proposed to add a new §1ter to Article 13 to require that a register of types of vehicles admitted to international traffic under particular conditions be set up and kept up to date.

The **Secretariat** said that a type register should not be a priority for OTIF. There were two reasons for this: firstly, outside the EU there was not yet a clear need for such a type register. Secondly, the OTIF Secretariat did not have the resources to implement the proposal. In addition, even without the suggested new §1ter, the CTE could at any time decide to create a type register, or any other database, as the competence for CTE to create new registers was set out in Article 13§3. Therefore, as soon as the need arose, CTE could decide to set up a type register within its competences, as set out in ATMF.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion indicating that a solution already existed in ATMF and there was no need for additional regulations.

FR informed WG TECH that for France, the current position according to Article 19§2 presented a problem in terms of the expiry dates for authorisation according to the RIV/RIC.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion, emphasising how important it was to formulate transitional periods better and more correctly. The **Chairman** invited WG TECH members to submit proposals to the OTIF Secretariat by the end of February.

The **Secretariat** will coordinate activities with the **EU** and **RS** by the end of February.

Conclusions on item 5:

1. WG TECH welcomed the conclusions of the ATMF “ad-hoc” working group, but made some modifications, as described above, to draft working document version 08.
2. WG TECH considered that with these modifications, the ATMF revision **document was ready for adoption** at CTE 7 and for submission to the Revision Committee.

6. Preparation of the 7th session of the Committee of Technical Experts

6.1 Transposition of LOC&PAS TSI into the draft UTP LOC&PAS

Documents: [A 94-03/2.2013 ver.03](#) UTP LOC&PAS

The **Secretariat** reminded WG TECH that according to the WG 21 decision a separate UTP PRM had been developed (A94-05/1.2014 v01). The draft version of UTP LOC&PAS had been amended in accordance with the corrections requested by **ERA**, **DE** and **CER**. The **Secretariat** had recently received comments from **FR** and additional comments from **ERA** and **CER**.

FR made comments on the Eddy current track brake in 4.2.4.8.3 (4) and Cross wind in 4.2.6.2.4 (3)

ERA made comments on:

1. points 2.3.3, 6.1.5 and 6.2.5 concerning innovative solutions;
2. point 4.1.4 (2) concerning compatibility between the category of the unit and its operation in tunnels;
3. point 4.2.8.2.5 (2) concerning limit values for overhead contact line of DC systems, and
4. Appendix L concerning front end of the train and train composition;

CER made comments on:

1. points 4.2.5.3.4 (3), 4.2.5.5.6 (2), 4.2.8.2.9.8 (5) and 4.2.10.4.2 (5) concerning references to the national regulations;
2. point 4.2.8.2.9.8 (3) concerning power supply and information which should be available to RU;
3. point 6.2.3.20 (1) regarding dynamic tests if pantograph is assessed separately.

Conclusion: WG TECH considered that the **document is ready for adoption** at CTE 7, provided that the following points are dealt with:

1. **OTIF** and **ERA** should redraft points 4.1.4 (2), 4.2.8.2.5 (2) and Appendix L (ERA comments 2, 3 and 4). Deadline for **ERA** to submit comments to the OTIF Secretariat was set at 15 February 2014.
2. **OTIF** and **ERA**, because there is no UTP CCS, should check and if need be redraft particular elements in point 4.3. Deadline for **ERA** to submit comments to the OTIF Secretariat was set at 15 February 2014.
3. **OTIF** and **ERA** should check and if need be redraft requirements for pantographs. Deadline for **ERA** to submit comments to the OTIF Secretariat was set at 15 February 2014.
4. In cooperation with ERA and EC, the OTIF Secretariat should improve the wording of transitional periods to bridge the time from entry into force until the time that the UTP is applied to all new vehicles. These periods should be aligned with the UTP PRM.

6.2 Transposition of PRM TSI into the draft UTP PRM

Documents: [A 94-05/1.2014 ver.01](#) UTP PRM

The **Secretariat** presented a preliminary draft of the UTP PRM, based on the version of the PRM TSI submitted to RISC69 in January 2014. The **Secretariat** stressed that the application of infrastructure related parameters introduced in UTP PRM, in particular those for platforms and stations, was voluntary.

Conclusion:

1. In cooperation with ERA and EC, the OTIF Secretariat should improve the wording of transitional periods. These periods should be aligned with the LOC&PAS.
2. Deadline for submitting additional comments on the draft UTP PRM to the OTIF Secretariat was set at 15 February 2014.
3. Taking into account the above, WG TECH considered that the **document is ready for adoption** at CTE 7

6.3 Coding/marketing of vehicles (UTP MARKING)

Documents: UTP MARKING

The **Secretariat** set out the reasons for putting all requirements concerning coding/marketing together into a separate UTP MARKING. If it were decided not to draft such a new UTP Marking, the UTP LOC&PAS would have to duplicate most of UTP WAG appendix PP. The **Secretariat** therefore proposed that a separate UTP MARKING be developed. The introduction of separate UTP MARKING would also require editorial changes to UTP WAG and NVR Specification.

With regard to this proposal, **FR** said it could not give an opinion on UTP MARKING, because it had received the draft UTP MARKING too late, and it had not had sufficient time to establish an opinion. **FR's** views on a new UTP MARKING would be ready in the next few weeks.

Although CER thought this was a good idea, it also needed more time to examine the matter.

Conclusion:

1. Notwithstanding the reservation from France, WG TECH considered that a separate UTP Marking would be preferable to including requirements for marking in a new appendix to the UTP LOC&PAS.
2. The OTIF Secretariat prepared a draft document which was considered ready for adoption at CTE 7
3. Deadline for comments on the draft UTP MARKING to be sent to the OTIF Secretariat was set at 15 February 2014.

6.4 UTP GEN-A amendment (essential requirements)

Documents: [A 94-01A/1.2011 ver.09](#) Draft proposal for UTP GEN-A amendment

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH that modifications relating to the essential requirement ‘noise’ in section 1.4.4 had been carried out according to the information provided by the EU representative at WG TECH 21. **ERA** confirmed that the corresponding amendment of Annex III of the interoperability directive was voted favourably at RISC 68 in October 2013 and it was anticipated that the amendment would be adopted in June 2014..

Conclusion:

1. WG TECH considered that the document is ready for adoption at CTE 7

6.5 UTP GEN-C amendment (technical file)

Document: [A 92-01C/1.2011 ver.08](#) Draft proposal for UTP GEN-C amendment

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH about modifications related to the latest EU proposals for amendments to Annex VI of the interoperability directive. Representatives of the EU confirmed that amendments are on the RISC agenda on 11 and 12 June 2014. It should be noted that some modifications to the proposals may result from RISC on 11 and 12 June 2014.

At the request of the **representative of the EU**, the **Secretariat** confirmed that the current changes were in accordance with the latest comments from EC (dated December 2013).

As the RISC of 11 and 12 June was to take place just after the CTE of 4 and 5 June, the OTIF **Secretariat** and the **EC** should coordinate the process for the adoption of amendments to UTP GEN-C and Annex VI of Directive 2008/57/EC.

The **OTIF Secretariat** reminded the meeting that after adoption in the CTE, the Secretariat would notify all Member States of the decision, after which there would be a period of four months during which an objection to the CTE decision may be formulated. If one-quarter of the Member States objected, the modification would not enter into force. This principle might provide the EU with an argument allowing it first to agree on a modification in CTE and subsequently in RISC (instead of the other way around).

Conclusion:

1. Taking into consideration the above, WG TECH considered that the **document is ready for adoption** at CTE 7.

6.6 Provisional agenda for CTE 7

The **Secretariat** submitted to WG TECH the provisional agenda for CTE 7, with particular emphasis on two main objectives: the revision of ATMF and the adoption of the Uniform Technical Prescriptions.

The provisional agenda was amended according to WG TECH's comments as follows:

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Presence and quorum
3. Election of chairman
4. Report from the CTE working group TECH
5. Revision of ATMF
6. UTPs
 1. UTP LOC&PAS
 2. UTP PRM
 3. UTP Marking
 4. UTP GEN-A amendment
 5. UTP GEN-C amendment
 6. Update of UTP WAG
 7. Update of NVR Specification
7. Status of notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU
8. Consultation of non-EU OTIF MS on draft TSIs:
 1. TAF
 2. OPE
 3. CCS
9. Joint OTIF/ERA registers for VKM and ECM
10. Status of development of the NVRs in the Contracting States
11. Work programme of the CTE for 2014 and beyond
12. Any other business
13. Next session.

In addition to the work programme for 2014-2015, the **representative of the EU** was also interested in a long-term strategy. The Secretariat replied that it would prepare a document based on last year's model, which would include both the work programme for CTE and the strategy for the longer term.

7. Cross reference document EU/OTIF regulations

Document: [A 92-00/1.2013 ver.09](#) Cross reference table of OTIF and EU regulations

This was a recurrent agenda item for WG TECH. The document was prepared in cooperation with ERA and was intended to reflect the development of the EU and OTIF regulations.

WG TECH took note of this document.

8. Next session

The 7th session of the Committee of Technical Experts will be held on 4 and 5 June 2014 in Bern.

The 23rd session of WG TECH will be held on 10 and 11 September 2014. The meeting venue will be decided in due course.

The 24th session of WG TECH will be held on 2 and 3 December 2014. The meeting venue will be decided in due course.

9. Any other business

None.

10. Closing remarks


The **Chairman** thanked the participants for the productive discussion and thanked EBA for its excellent hosting, and closed the meeting.

I. Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

M./Hr./Mr. Michael **Schmitz**


Leiter Stabsstelle 92
Internationale Angelegenheiten
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Heinemannstrasse 6
DE-53175 Bonn

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

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

M./Hr./Mr. Heiko **Heid**


Stabstelle 92
Anerkennungsstelle, Internationale
Angelegenheiten
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Heinemannstrasse 6
DE-53175 Bonn

 +49 (228) 98 26 362
Fax +49 (228) 98 26 9362
E-mail heidh@eba.bund.de

**Bosnie-Herzégovine/Bosnien und
Herzegowina/Bosnia and Herzegovina**

M./Hr./Mr. **Mirko Vulic**

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

 +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


France/Frankreich/FranceM./Hr./Mr. Jérôme **Fedelich**

Chef de Division Système, interopérabilité et
interfaces (Direction référentiels)
Etablissement public de sécurité ferroviaires
(EPSF)
60 rue de la Vallée
CS 11758
FR-80017 Amiens Cedex 1

 +33 (3) 22 33 96 24
Fax +33 (3) 22 33 95 99
E-mail jerome.fedelich@securite-ferroviaire.fr

Italie/Italien/ItalyM./Hr./Mr. **Giuseppe Sciallis**

Head of Sector
Agenzia nazionale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie
(ANSF)
Piazza della Stazione, 45
IT-50123 Firenze

 +39 (55) 235 66 20
Fax +39 (55) 235 64 95
E-mail giuseppe.sciallis@ansf.it


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


Serbie/Serbien/SerbiaM./Hr./Mr. **Milan Popovic**

Head of the department for regulations
 Directorate for Railways
 Direkcija za zeleznice
 Nemanjina 6
 11000 Beograd
 Serbie

 +381 (11) 3616796
 Fax +381 (11) 361 82 91
 E-mail milan.popovic@raildir.gov.rs


Suisse/Schweiz/SwitzerlandM./Hr./Mr. **Roland Bacher**

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

 +41 31 324 12 12
 Fax +41 31 322 55 95
 E-mail roland.bacher@bav.admin.ch

Suisse/Schweiz/SwitzerlandM./Hr./Mr. **Marcel Hepp**

Jurist
 Bundesamt für Verkehr
 CH-3003 Bern

 +41 (31) 323 00 92
 Fax +41 (31) 322 58 11
 E-mail marcel.hepp@bav.admin.ch


Turquie/Türkei/TurkeyM./Hr./Mr. **Murat Safa**

Assistant Director of Traction Department
TC Devlet Demiryollari (TCDD)
İşletmesi Genel Müdürlüğü Cer Dairesi
Başkanlığı
TR-06330 Gar Ankara
Turquie

 +90 (505) 618 02 60
Fax +90 (312) 310 99 49
E-mail muratsafa@tcdd.gov.tr


Turquie/Türkei/TurkeyM./Hr./Mr. **Bedir Batuk**

Expert Technician
TC Devlet Demiryollari (TCDD)
Genel Müdürlüğü Cer Dairesi Başkanlığı
TR-06330 Gar Ankara

 +90 (541) 540 84 13
Fax
E-mail bedirbatuk@tccd.gov.tr

Turquie/Türkei/TurkeyM./Hr./Mr. **Sercan Baysal**

Office Worker
TC Devlet Demiryollari (TCDD)
Genel Müdürlüğü Cer Dairesi Başkanlığı
TR-06330 Gar Ankara


 +90 (532) 162 59 00
Fax
E-mail sercanbaysal@tccd.gov.tr

**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
B-1049 Brussels/Belgium


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

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

ERA

Mme/Fr./Ms Desislava **Dimitrova**

Project Officer
European Railway Agency (ERA)
Interoperability Unit
120 rue Marc Lefrancq
BP 20392
FR-59300 Valenciennes Cedex

 +33 (3) 27 09 65 81
Fax +33 (3) 27 09 66 81
E-mail desislava.dimitrova@era.europa.eu

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

ERA

M./Hr./Mr. Hubert **Lavogiez**

Head of Sector Rolling Stock
European Railway Agency (ERA)
120 rue Marc Lefrancq
BP 20392
FR-59300 Valenciennes Cedex



+33 (3) 27 09 65 46

Fax

E-mail hubert.lavogiez@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 Lefranq
BP 20932,
F-59300 Valenciennes Cedex



+33 (3) 27 09 67 89

Fax

+33 (3) 27 09 68 89


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

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

CER

M./Hr./Mr. Bernard **Alibert**

Director Interoperability & Standardization
SNCF
Siège SNCF
Place aux Etoiles 2
92633 La Plaine Saint-Denis
France

 +33 (1) 71 82 57 20

Fax

E-mail bernard.alibert@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

UIP

M./Hr./Mr. Gilles **Peterhans**

Secretary General
International Union of Wagon Keepers (UIP)
Av. Hermann-Debroux 15A
BE-1160 Bruxelles



+32 (2) 672 88 47

Fax +41 44 491 28 80 / +32 2 672 81 14

E-mail gilles.peterhans@uiprail.org

**III. Secrétariat
 Sekretariat
 Secretariat**

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

Head of Section

Tel.: +41 (0)31 359 10 25

E-Mail: bas.leermakers@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr. **Peter Sorger**

First Officer

Tel.: +41 (0)31 359 10 26

E-Mail: peter.sorger@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr. **Dragan Nesic**

First Officer

Tel.: +41 (0)31 359 10 24

E-Mail: dragan.nesic@otif.org