



**OTIF**

ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR LES  
TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES

ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN  
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBahnVERKEHR

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR  
INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL

---

# WG TECH

## 23<sup>rd</sup> Session

### Minutes

Deleted: Provisional

---

**Bern, 10-11.09.2014**

**AGENDA**

1. Approval of the agenda
2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. Election of chairman
4. Approval of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of WG TECH  
Document: [Provisional minutes](#) Draft provisional minutes, with delegates' corrections
5. Review and analysis of the letter from CER following the workshop in Bonn on 6.2.2014  
Document: [A 94-03/7.2014 version1](#) Exchangeable passenger coaches
6. UTP NOI revision  
Documents: [A 94-04/1.2014 version1](#) Draft UTP NOI
7. Cross-reference document EU/OTIF regulations → new format  
Document: [A 92-00/2.2014](#) Cross reference table of OTIF and EU regulations
8. Development of UTP application guides
9. Analysis of future tasks in relation to the revision of ATMF  
Document: [A 93-00/5.2015 version1](#) Inventory of safety management provisions
10. Next session
11. Any other business

## DISCUSSIONS

### Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers (head of OTIF's technical section) welcomed the participants and opened the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of WG TECH.

#### 1. Approval of the agenda

The **Secretariat** explained that the provisional agenda had been sent to participants with the invitation on 11 July 2014 (circular [A 92-03/503.2014](#)). Secretariat received a request from CER and UIP as to whether items 5 and 6 could be discussed on the second day. Since there were no objections, the agenda was adopted accordingly.

**Conclusion:** WG TECH approved the amended agenda for the 23<sup>rd</sup> session.

#### 2. General information from the Secretariat

The **Secretariat** summarised the achievements of the last 4 years. It was highlighted that the introduction of the freight package (in 2010) and the passenger package (expected from 01.01.2015), are important milestones for cross-border traffic, as they support international traffic within the UTP/TSI framework.

In connection with the developments that took place after the 22<sup>nd</sup> WG TECH, the Secretariat informed WG TECH about the results of CTE 7 and the 25<sup>th</sup> Revision Committee.

As the chairman of CTE 7, Mr Roland Bacher gave a overview of the challenges for the next period. These challenges include:

- Maintaining the established equivalence between **OTIF and** EU rules
- Continuing and, where possible, increasing the involvement of non-EU Contracting States in developing specifications
- Setting the right priorities for future tasks.

The **Secretariat** supported Mr Bacher's view and stressed that rather than just being copies of EU regulations, OTIF's regulations are the results of the very good cooperation that has been established between the non-EU Contracting States, ERA (EC) and OTIF.

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH about the results of the 25<sup>th</sup> Revision Committee. The revision of ATMF took into account the recommendations of the ad-hoc safety subgroup and included safety management for train composition and operation (new Art. 15a) and updated the definitions (Art. 2). In addition, "other railway material" had been deleted, as the concept is redundant. The Revision Committee also deleted/reworded some parts of ATMF which concerns development (e.g. Art. 7a, derogations) and made some editorial modifications.

The **Secretariat** introduced a new template for UTPs. In addition, the WG was informed about a new system for the UTP reference; for example, rather than reference number A93-02/1.2014 to describe the UTP for people with reduced mobility, it will be referred to as "UTP PRM 2015".

The **Secretariat** also informed WG TECH about improvements to the OTIF Register web page (VKM, ECM and NVR), which was the result of merging the ERA and OTIF registers. The section on the OTIF website relating to registers was now available and up-to-date in all three languages (EN, DE and FR).

Comment [d1]: CH Suggestion

Deleted: and OTIF

With reference to the invitation to technical experts to attend the RID working group on derailment detection (Rome, 13-15 October 2014), **the Secretariat** recommended that delegates who attended CTE or WG TECH meetings should attend the Rome working group. The meeting will discuss vehicle-related derailment detection measures for freight wagons used for the transport of dangerous goods.

Under the standing agenda item “General information from the Secretariat”, the current geographical scope of COTIF and its Appendices was presented.

Mr Jan Hampl, a “young expert” in the Secretariat, reported on a study he had carried out on behalf of the **Secretariat** on the TAF TSI, including an analysis of whether or not to transpose the TAF TSI into OTIF’s regulations. The main conclusion was that it is not necessary to transpose the TAF TSI into an OTIF regulation. The main arguments for arriving at that conclusion were:

- The TAF TSI is an open source specification, which is publicly available. This means that not only EU MS, but also non-EU States can implement it on a voluntary basis.
- Even today, some non-EU States have implemented parts of the TAF TSI, apparently because they see a positive business case for doing so.
- For EU MSs, implementation of the TAF TSI is mandatory, but a scheme of subsidies is available to provide financial support for implementation. No such subsidy scheme is available under COTIF.

At the same time, OTIF should promote voluntary implementation of the TAF TSI.

**RS** was interested in the possibility of transposing TAF TSI into UTP, as Telematics application have been foreseen by the Convention. However, taking into account the conclusions of Mr Hampl’s study, RS proposed its application voluntary. As this proposal differed from the conclusion of Mr Hampl’s study, the Secretariat proposed that RS could contact OTIF in the next period to discuss the matter.

**Deleted:** but making

**Comment [d2]: RS**

Reason for the proposal is based on APTU Article 8 §2 and UTP GEN-B. Telematics applications have been foreseen by the Convention and there is obligation of CTE to adopt ALL relevant UTPs, including TAF and TAP. On the other hand, taking into account the conclusions of Mr Hampl’s study, RS proposed application of TAF UTP on the voluntary basis.

### **3. Election of chairman**

The **Secretariat** nominated Switzerland (Mr Roland Bacher) to chair the session. Mr Roland Bacher accepted the nomination and WG TECH unanimously elected CH, in the shape of Mr Roland Bacher, to chair this session.

The Chairman thanked the participants for the confidence it had placed in him.

### **4. Approval of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of WG TECH**

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

On 25 February 2014, the OTIF **Secretariat** had sent the provisional minutes to delegates who had attended the 22<sup>nd</sup> WG TECH session (5 February 2014). It had amended the provisional minutes in accordance with the corrections requested by DE and by ERA (supported by the European Commission) and uploaded them on 11.08.2014 for the attention of WG TECH 23<sup>rd</sup>. These amendments were shown on the screen and subsequently agreed upon.

**Conclusion:** The minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of WG TECH were approved with the corrections set out above.

## 5. Review and analysis of the letter from CER following the workshop in Bonn on 6.2.2014

Document: [A 94-03/7.2014 version1](#) Exchangeable passenger coaches

The **Secretariat** introduced this document, the purpose of which was to highlight the importance of the principle of “free circulation” when coaches meet certain defined conditions, i.e. the same conditions as RIC coaches have met for many decades.

With the introduction of APTU and ATMF, states (rather than railway companies) agree on minimum requirements for rolling stock interoperability. All these minimum requirements are prescribed in UTPs/TSIs. However, the UTPs/TSIs do not define exhaustively all the inter-vehicle interfaces that would be necessary to ensure compatibility between coaches.

For this purpose, two layers of objectives to enable the exchange of coaches in international traffic must be met. The first layer is the unique admission of the vehicle, where the vehicle must not be subject to specific cases or open points and must be compatible with the infrastructure. The second layer sets out the specifications for harmonised inter-vehicle interfaces.

In its document, the Secretariat divided the second layer of inter-vehicle interfaces into three categories of specifications. The first category concerns a selection of technical solutions provided in UTP/TSI. The second category concerns harmonised technical solutions to implement functional UTP/TSI requirements. The third category consists of additional harmonisation to meet non-UTP/TSI related requirements needed for the exchange of coaches between RUs.

Although the market for passenger coaches in the EU may be marginal in terms of the entire rolling stock market, the Secretariat reminded the meeting that OTIF dealt only with international traffic and that international passenger traffic still relies heavily on the exchange of passenger coaches. This is particularly true outside the EU. For this reason, passenger coaches and their exchange in international traffic are very important for OTIF.

The **Secretariat** proposed the development of a new UTP, voluntary in its application and dealing with all three categories of specifications, according to which coaches can be marked as being exchangeable.

The **Chairman** proposed that this subject should be developed gradually, i.e. in three stages:

1. establish whether there the sector requires such specifications,
2. agree the principles in terms of how the work should be carried out, and
3. determine the verification process for drafting new specifications and to ensure that they are implemented correctly.

The WG tacitly agreed to these three stages, after which the **Chairman** opened the discussion.

**DE** explained that most vehicles authorised by EBA were trainsets, some were locomotives and there were also a small number of sleeping coaches. This illustrated that DE saw no clear requirement for specifications for exchangeable coaches. However, DE said that WG TECH should accept and support the sector when it expressed a clear requirement. DE added that it was up to the market (railway sector), rather than administrations, to define its requirements. Apart from the sector’s requirements, DE was interested to hear whether anyone other than the railway sector was interested in exchangeable coaches, particularly CS.

**Comment [SMA(3):** I think that the aim of the discussion was not only the requirements set out in a new UTP but the 3 categories of requirements

**Deleted:** a UTP

**FR** supported DE's position, so that if a clear requirement from the sector was demonstrated, WG TECH should support the request.

**RS** pointed out that these proposed new specifications were of great importance for RS. International passenger traffic between non-EU CS was only organised in this way. In addition, these coaches may also operate across the EU's outer borders, so there should also be an interest for the EU.

**CH** supported RS's view.

**Mrs DIMITROVA**, speaking on a personal note, confirmed that in her experience, a number of international passenger trains between Bulgaria and non-EU OTIF CS are organised in the way RS had explained.

**CER** stressed that the exchange of coaches was of great importance to its members. A framework of requirements to define the exchangeability of coaches was needed. CER informed WG TECH that the exchange of coaches existed not only outside the EU, but also within the EU, i.e. between AT and SK, CZ and SK, etc. CER also highlighted that introducing exchangeability would add value to coaches, in the sense that these coaches would retain much of their value for the future. This was particularly important for (private) investors seeking to secure the long-term value of their assets. This was a very important subject, because several CER members were planning huge investments in rolling stock for the next period. At least 10 CER members had reported that they were interested in buying/upgrading exchangeable passenger coaches in the next few years. CER was of the view that the UTP LOC&PAS and the LOC&PAS TSI should be amended to include a voluntary appendix for exchangeable passenger coaches. The principles of such an appendix should be similar to Appendix C of the WAG TSI.

**DE** raised a question about the applicability of RIC following the introduction of UTP LOC&PAS. Bearing in mind that the introduction of UTP WAG meant that RIV was no longer applicable, what would be the status of RIC when the UTP LOC&PAS entered into force? Since RIC was a sector agreement, it did not apply to NSAs. It may be that additional steps, other than drafting a new UTP, would also be needed.

**The Secretariat** explained that according to APTU Article 11, the UTP LOC&PAS takes precedence over the RIC. In some OTIF Member States RIC may still be recognised in national law. However, RIC still existed, and could be considered as an agreement between the RUs which apply RIC. UIP informed WG TECH that the last revision of the RIC entered into force on 01.01.2014.

**UNIFE** still needed to investigate the marketing potential for exchangeable coaches in the future. It did not yet have a clear position on whether or not a regulation was needed. Nevertheless, UNIFE was interested in participating in the technical discussions and the possible drafting of specifications.

**The representative of the European Commission** said that EU railway regulations focussed on interoperability but that the exchangeability of coaches is also an issue. She noted the OTIF Secretariat's suggestion to develop a UTP for exchangeable coaches and the interest of the representatives of the stakeholder and Member States. The Commission needed to study the proposal in more detail and in particular the possibilities and consequences of a UTP that would not have its equivalence in EU law (i.e. without an equivalent TSI). In particular, it would need to investigate whether and how such UTP would apply in the EU Member States.

**Comment [DD (ERA)4]:**

**Deleted:** most countries in the Balkan Region operate international traffic in the way RS had explained

**Deleted:** and that

**Deleted:** was

**Deleted:** separate

**IT** supported the Secretariat's proposal to draft a new UTP. To justify this, IT related its experience with RIC coaches that were not in accordance with TSI or with standards applicable in IT. That problem was solved for time being, but it also proved the need for additional regulations on this matter.

The **Chairman** also suggested that representatives inform their ministries about WG TECH plans to develop a UTP for exchangeable passenger coaches.

The **Secretary General of OTIF** stressed that OTIF was very interested in resolving this problem, because a significant part of international passenger traffic was operated by the exchange of vehicles. Although not many vehicles were exchanged in the EU CS, for other CS such a system was essential.

The **Secretariat** explained the roadmap for preparing the new UTP. As a first step, the sector (e.g. led by CER and/or by UIC) should collect and define a comprehensive set of specifications. Only when the first step is completed could these technical solutions be implemented in the legal framework as a second step. The Secretariat stressed that WG TECH should not discuss technical details in specifications. After the sector had defined its requirements, WG TECH would discuss where to put them in the legal framework.

With reference to the letter it had submitted, CER inquired about the WG's opinion on their proposal to draft an annex to the LOC & PAS TSI, similar to Annex C of WAG TSI.

The **representative of the EU** stated that it was premature to discuss where specifications should appear until they were all available.

**RS** proposed that these additional requirements should be a part of UTP LOC&PAS, not a separate document. Later it will be decided will it be in form of annex to UTP or in some additional section of the UTP.

The **Chairman** noted that the WG accepted OTIF's roadmap and asked whether CER could take the lead in preparing these specifications.

**CER** agreed to prepare all these specifications and the referenced standards.

**UNIFE** offered to hold a joint meeting with CER to coordinate mutual activities on these specifications, which CER accepted.

The **Chairman** noted that CER would prepare all the specifications and referenced standards for passenger coaches and submit them to the next WG meeting, and opened the last discussion item concerning the verification process and deadlines.

The **Chairman** stressed that although no specifications were yet listed, WG TECH should consider where to put the specifications once CER had submitted them.

The **OTIF Secretariat** would support any solution which WG TECH agreed upon. With regard to this issue, OTIF could provide a legal context. The OTIF Secretariat also informed WG TECH that if everything went according to plan, the document could be prepared for the middle of 2016, i.e. for the CTE in 2016. WG TECH should also be aware that the roadmap was very dependent upon other aspects, especially discussions with the EU, without whose consent specifications could not be implemented in OTIF. For the purpose of clarification, the OTIF Secretariat reminded the meeting that UTP could allocate some operational interfaces, as introduced in the new Article 15a of ATMF, where the scope of ATMF was extended to cover

**Comment [d5]: RS**

Not quite correct. RS proposed that these additional requirements should be a part of UTP LOC&PAS, not a separate document. Will it be in form of annex to UTP or some additional section, we'll see.

**Deleted:** supported the EU's statement

certain responsibilities for the composition and operation of trains. However, that only covered part of the EU SMS regulations, so it could give a false impression.

**The representative of the EU** stated the process would go through RISC, where the Member States would be informed about the level of cooperation achieved with OTIF and about the latest developments.

**Deleted:** that the EC would have to organise internal processes in coordination with ERA. It was clear that

The **Chairman** summarised this part of the discussion, saying that CER would submit the first draft of specifications to the next WG TECH, but without any forecasts in terms of the form of the future text or a preferred solution.

### **Conclusions on item 5:**

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion, saying that the WG had carefully considered and discussed the Secretariat's proposal and that the need for technical requirement for interchangeable coaches was clearly demonstrated:

**Deleted:** requirement

1. for the railway sector, as expressed by CER. The representatives of EU States (DE, FR and IT) recognised that the sector was in the best position to analyse its own needs
2. for the non-EU Contracting States, as the exchange of coaches was for many the only way of organising international passenger traffic.

**Deleted:** The requirement of

**Deleted:** The requirement for

The **Chairman** noted that in coordination with UNIFE, CER would submit preliminary draft specifications to the next session of WG TECH.

## **6. UTP NOI revision**

Documents: [A 94-04/1.2014 version1](#) Draft UTP NOI

**The Secretariat** presented a draft of the new UTP NOI, based on the final draft NOI TSI (2014) adopted by RISC70 in June 2014. This new 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 may continue to be applied in accordance with the provisions set out in Chapter 7 of the new UTP NOI. The Secretariat also informed WG TECH that the non-EU CS would be sent a letter asking them to identify specific cases.

The draft version of UTP NOI had been amended in accordance with the corrections requested by ERA. Because the amendments were implemented differently than what was proposed by ERA, OTIF and ERA would work together to reconcile any differences and submit a new draft to the next session of WG TECH.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion that followed about cases where NOI TSI requirements and OTIF regulations differed. In those cases where the additional UTP NOI explanation note was needed, this should be mentioned in the footnote, rather than in the left-hand (OTIF) column of the UTP NOI.

**Conclusion on item 6:** OTIF and ERA would communicate directly to reconcile any differences and propose the final draft text to the next session of WG TECH.

## **7. Cross-reference document EU/OTIF regulations → new format**



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

**The Secretariat** presented a new format for the cross-reference table of EU/OTIF regulations, which was intended to make it easier to understand equivalence between OTIF and EU legal acts. The table was developed in cooperation with ERA and should aid understanding of the equivalence between EU and OTIF rules.

**DE** was of the opinion that the purpose of the table was to indicate to the sector what was applicable, what was transposed, and what the sector could make use of to meet its requirements. DE asked for some additional clarification on when application dates in the EU and OTIF countries differ.

**CER** was of the view that the table should not be an instrument for clarifying regulations. If the regulations were not clear, they should be made clear, rather than trying to provide interpretation via a table. CER noted that this table could also be useful in terms of indicating what should be changed or adjusted. CER was of the view that this table should not remain at WG TECH level.

**The Chairman** summarised the discussion and noted that firstly, WG TECH had to establish the purpose of the table, and then decide how it was to be applied. If the purpose of the table was just to inform WG TECH or to provide guidance to the competent authorities of the non EU CS, it was sufficient. Otherwise, if the sector intended to use the table for its business needs, than CTE would have to approve it.

**ERA** explained the history of the table, its chronology and how to ensure that equivalence between EU and OTIF regulations was achieved. The value of the table could already be seen in practice for UTP NOI, which would enter into force later than the NOI TSI. The table explained transitional periods in both NOI TSI and UTP NOI. It was easy to see where there were differences and how to act accordingly.

**UNIFE** said it would be useful to have a table showing the regulations in force, with an explanation of (OTIF/EU) equivalence. For this reason, UNIFE supported the concept of an equivalence table. With regard to the discussion, UNIFE said it could not offer a specific opinion on the table because it was possible that there might be further requests concerning the content of the table. UNIFE would submit its opinion to the next session of WG TECH.

**RS** was of the view that the table is not legally binding, although it is regularly updated and offers very useful information. If it were decided to publish the table on the website, it would have to be improved.

The **Secretariat** explained that the table should be considered only as a WG TECH working document providing guidance and explanations written only in English. As the table only gives an overview of the applicable regulations and the equivalence between EU and OTIF rules, CTE did not need to approve it. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that an equivalence table with a previous layout had been available on OTIF's website as a WG TECH working document for a long time.

The **Chairman** commented that it was unrealistic to expect identical (OTIF and EU) legal documents, because changes in the EU regulations could occur more often than in those of OTIF. The Chairman also summarised the discussion, saying that the WG TECH had carefully considered the table and that it was an internal document for the OTIF Secretariat, ERA, EC and this WG to keep a check on equivalence. If the sector confirmed that this table was necessary,

WG TECH would start the procedure to publish it on the OTIF website. Further steps would be agreed at CTE 8.

**Conclusion:** WG TECH took note of this document. OTIF and ERA (EU) will continue to cooperate and regularly update the cross-reference table of EU/OTIF regulations.

## 8. Development of UTP application guides

As mandated by CTE 7, the **Secretariat** provided a chronological list of activities in connection with developing the UTP application guides up to 1 January 2015. The Secretariat stressed that application guides are not legally binding documents, and their purpose is to make the UTPs easier to understand. It was also explained that future application guides would follow the structure of the UTP WAG application guide. Once WG TECH had approved them, OTIF would publish application guides on OTIF's website - technology section, on the page for Guidance and Explanatory Documents.

**Conclusion on item 8:** WG TECH took note of the development of UTP application guides.

## 9. Analysis of future tasks in relation to the revision of ATMF

The **Secretariat** reminded WG TECH about changes to UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS, which included tasks and responsibilities for train composition. ATMF had been revised and the new Article 15a defined the responsibilities for the operation of trains. The Secretariat also reminded the meeting that the Explanatory Report to COTIF would explain the scope and interaction of ATMF with the EU rules on the safety certification of RUs. In this way, it would become clearer that safety certification is outside the scope of COTIF.

The **Chairman** proposed that WG TECH discuss the need to specify additional operational and safety provisions in the framework of OTIF.

**RS** was of the view that OTIF should not extend its operational and safety provisions, as ATMF prescribes procedure for admission to operation of railway vehicles.

**Comment [d6]: RS**  
Because the scope of ATMF is procedure for the admission to operation of railway vehicles, not the operation and safety.

**UIP** provided additional information regarding railway sector discussions at the Joint Network Secretariat (JNS)<sup>1</sup>, at EU level. The JNS had noted a number of gaps and had agreed on a matrix of responsibilities between entities in the railway sector. After receiving feedback from NSAs, the JNS would take a decision, as appropriate. The JNS's idea was not to create new legislation, but to facilitate the application of existing legislation. UIP was of the opinion that the results of JNS should be awaited before any additional operational and safety provisions were developed within OTIF.

**DE** clarified JNS's working process; JNS only organised discussions, addressed and resolved problems and put forward proposals (to higher levels). JNS did not make final decisions.

**DE** was of the view that WG TECH should concentrate on freight traffic rather than passenger traffic. For the latter, the roles and responsibilities of the different players could not be as visible as in freight traffic. DE proposed that **CER/UIP** should prepare a presentation about the matrix of responsibilities and present it at the next session of WG TECH. The same presentation had been prepared for NSAs.

**Deleted: JNS**

<sup>1</sup> The JNS consists of representatives of the railway sector (UIP, CER and UNIFE), National Safety Authorities (NSA) and ERA. The European Commission has observer status.

The **Secretary General of OTIF** stressed that the dissemination and application of legislation was very important to the OTIF non EU CS. It was also very important that OTIF non EU CS participate in forums where discussions on particular subjects are being initiated, especially with regard to ECM.

**DE** asked how a forum could be set up in which the competent authorities of OTIF non EU CS could join the discussions with NSAs.

The **representative of the EU** echoed the question raised by DE.

**Conclusion:** The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and concluded that 24<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH would continue the discussion on this subject after receiving input from **CER/UIP** and NSAs. If necessary, passenger traffic would be considered in a subsequent step. The 24<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH would also consider how the competent authorities of non EU CS could take part in the work of the JNS and NSAs.

Deleted: JNS

## 10. Next session

At the kind invitation of ERA, the 24<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH will be held in Lille on 2 and 3 December 2014.

The 25<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH will be held on 4 and 5 February 2015 in Bern.

The 8<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts will be held on 10 and 11 June 2015 in Bern.

## 11. Any other business

### 11.1 Amendment of Annex V of the ECM Uniform Rules

The **Secretariat** proposed an amendment to Annex V of the ECM UR, to include a new template for the Maintenance Functions Certificate in Annex V. Although Annex IV ECM UR envisaged two templates for application, Annex V prescribes a single ECM Certificate template. To avoid possible confusion between the ECM Certificate and the specific Maintenance Functions Certificate, the OTIF Secretariat proposed to add a new Certificate template in Annex V. This amendment would ensure full equivalence with EU Regulation 445/2011, Annex V.

**Conclusion:** WG TECH supported the amendment to Annex V of the ECM UR.

### 11.2 Suggestions for the agenda of CTE 8

The **Secretariat** made some suggestions for the agenda of CTE 8:

- UTP NOI revision
- UTP Marking
  - Sections 14-18 of UTP Marking / Parts 9-13 of appendix 6 to NVR Decision
- UTP WAG/TSI WAG
  - Appendix G to UTP WAG and TSI WAG. List of fully approved composite brake blocks for international transport;
  - Appendix J to UTP WAG / ERA/TD/2012-04/INT version 1.2 of 18.01.2013. Attachment devices for rear-end signals, clearance for draw hooks, space for shunting staff operations, footsteps and handrails;

- Appendix N to UTP WAG / ERA/TD/2012-05/INT version 1.0 of 04.06.2012. Specifications on slack adjusters;
- Appendix N to UTP WAG / ERA/TD/2013-01-INT version 1.0 of 11.02.2013. Specific procedures for running dynamics.
- UTP LOC&PAS
  - Appendix J2 to UTP and TSI LOC&PAS
  - Section 7.3.1 (1) SC cases for NO: update reference when EEA Join Committee Decision is adopted for 2014 TSI LOC&PAS. At present the reference is for SC in 2011 CR TSI LOC&PAS.
- NB: CCS TSI revision and amendments may affect UTP WAG UTP LOC&PAS.

**Conclusion:** The **Chairman** noted that the proposed list of suggestions is not exhaustive and invited participants to submit their proposals for the agenda to the Secretariat.

## **12. Closing remarks**

As this was the last OTIF WG TECH meeting Ms Desislava Dimitrova would attend, Mr Bas Leermakers thanked her for her very helpful and productive cooperation.

The Chairman thanked the participants for the productive discussion and the OTIF Secretariat for its excellent preparation of the meeting, 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](mailto:SchmitzM@eba.bund.de)

M./Hr./Mr. Margarethe **Koschmider**

Referat 31, 3113 - elektr. Triebzüge des SNPV,  
Interoperabilität Fahrzeuge  
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt  
Heinemannstrasse 6  
DE-53175 Bonn

☎ +49 (228) 9826 325  
Fax +49 (228) 9826 9325  
E-mail [KoschmiderM@eba.bund.de](mailto:KoschmiderM@eba.bund.de)

### France/Frankreich/France

M./Hr./Mr. Anthony **Godart**

Chargé d'affaires européennes et internationales  
EPFS  
60 rue de la Vallé, CS 11758  
FR-80017 Amiens Cedex 1

☎ +33 (6) 45 71 97 73  
Fax +33 (3) 22 33 96 66  
E-mail [anthony.godart@securite-ferroviaire.fr](mailto:anthony.godart@securite-ferroviaire.fr)

M./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](mailto:sebastien.vignot@securite-ferroviaire.fr)

**Italie/Italien/Italy**M./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](mailto:giuseppe.sciallis@ansf.it)

M./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](mailto:rocco.cammarata@ansf.it)

**Serbie/Serbien/Serbia**M./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](mailto: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](mailto:roland.bacher@bav.admin.ch)

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

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

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

S'est excusé.  
Hat sich entschuldigt.  
Send apologies.

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](mailto:patrizio.grillo@ec.europa.eu)

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

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

☎ +32 (2) 298 62 61  
Fax +32 (2) 299 02 62  
E-mail [ainhoa.san-martin@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ainhoa.san-martin@ec.europa.eu)

**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](mailto:andreas.schirmer@era.europa.eu)

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](mailto:desislava.dimitrova@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. 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](mailto:christian.chavanel@sncf.fr)

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](mailto: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](mailto:gilles.peterhans@uiprail.org)

## UNIFE

M./Hr./Mr. Sebastian **Giera**

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

☎ +49 (561) 801 73 74  
 Fax +49 (561) 801 72 99  
 E-Mail:  
[sebastian.giera@de.transport.bombardier.com](mailto:sebastian.giera@de.transport.bombardier.com)

M./Hr./Mr. Jan **Anders**

Technical regulation and Standardisation  
 Manager,  
 Siemens AG, Rail Systems  
 Werner von Siemens strasse 67  
 DE-91052 Erlangen

☎ +49 (9131) 721 783  
 Fax  
 E-Mail: [anders.jan@siemens.com](mailto:anders.jan@siemens.com)

## III. Secrétariat Sekretariat Secretariat

M./Hr./Mr. François **Davenne**

Secretary General of OTIF  
 Tel.: + 41 (0)31 359 10 10  
 E-Mail:

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

Head of Section  
 Tel.: +41 (0)31 359 10 25  
 E-Mail: [bas.leermakers@otif.org](mailto:bas.leermakers@otif.org)

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

First Officer  
 Tel.: +41 (0)31 359 10 24  
 E-Mail: [dragan.nesic@otif.org](mailto:dragan.nesic@otif.org)

M./Hr./Mr. Jan **HAMPL**

Young expert  
 Tel: +41 (0)31 359 10 24  
 E-Mail: [jan.hampl@otif.org](mailto:jan.hampl@otif.org)