



**OTIF**

ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR LES  
TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES

ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN  
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR

INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR  
INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL

---

# **WG TECH**

## **24<sup>th</sup> Session**

## **Minutes**

---

**Lille, 2-3.12.2014**

## AGENDA

1. Approval of the agenda
2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. Election of chairman
4. Approval of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of WG TECH
 

Document: <a href="#">Provisional minutes</a>	Draft provisional minutes, with delegates' corrections
---	--
5. Interchangeable coaches:
  - Input from CER regarding the requirements
  - ERA information on the Working Party on "Unique authorisation"
  - Discussion and next steps
6. UTP NOI revision
 

Documents: <a href="#">A 94-04/1.2014 version5</a>	Draft UTP NOI
--	---------------
7. RID and ATMF: report on the results of the meeting on derailment detection devices in Rome on 13-15 October 2014
 

Documents: <a href="#">OTIF/RID/CE/GTDD/2014-A</a>	Report (2 <sup>nd</sup> draft) of the 1 <sup>st</sup> session of the working group on derailment detection
--	--
8. Amendment of Annex V to the ECM Uniform Rules (template for maintenance function certificates)
 

Documents: <a href="#">A 94-30/1.2014_version2</a>	Draft
--	-------
9. UTP application guides: discussion and validation
 

Documents: <a href="#">A 92-01/2.2015 version2</a>	Draft UTP LOC&PAS application guide
<a href="#">A 92-01/3.2015 version2</a>	Draft UTP NOI application guide
10. Presentation of matrix of responsibilities between entities in the railway sector (CER and UIP)
11. Next session
12. Any other business

## DISCUSSIONS

### Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers (head of OTIF's technical section) welcomed the participants and opened the 24<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH in Lille.

Mr Davenne, the Secretary General of OTIF, also welcomed the participants and wished them success with their meeting.

#### 1. Approval of the agenda

The **Secretariat** explained that the provisional agenda had been sent to participants with the invitation on 6 October 2014 (circular [A 92-05/504.2014](#)). It asked that the agenda be amended by adding new items as shown on the screen. Since there were no objections, the agenda was adopted accordingly.

**Conclusion:** WG TECH approved the amended agenda for the 24<sup>th</sup> session.

#### 2. General information from the Secretariat

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH that on 6 November, the OTIF Secretariat had attended the Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) meeting. The OTIF Secretariat had given two presentations at the Committee: interchangeable coaches and RID/ATMF harmonisation.

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH about the first conference on COTIF organised in Iran in coordination with ECO (Economic Cooperation Organization) and UIC. It was attended by high level railway officials from Iran and neighbouring States. For OTIF, this conference was a good opportunity to explain the principles of COTIF and its application.

The **Secretariat** reminded WG TECH that on 1 January 2015 the new OTIF Uniform Rules would come into force: UTP LOC&PAS 2015, UTP PRM 2015, UTP MARKING 2015, UTP GEN-A 2015 – essential requirements, UTP GEN-C 2015 – technical file, UTP WAG 2015 and NVR 2015.

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH that on 18 November 2014, the European Commission had adopted new/revised TSIs: LOC&PAS TSI, PRM TSI, SRT TSI, INF TSI and ENE TSI. References to the new/revised TSI would be added to the present equivalence table of EU/OTIF regulations.

In connection with the current geographical scope of COTIF and its Appendices, the meeting was informed that from 1 July 2015 FR would apply ATMF (revised) and that the Italian Parliament had ratified COTIF 1999. Italy's notification procedure to OTIF was ongoing.

The **Secretariat** reminded WG TECH that at the request of ERA, the non-EU Contracting States are consulted on ERA's proposed amendments to the EU Regulation on the common safety method (CSM) for risk evaluation and assessment. This document was equivalent to the UTP GEN-G and reactions were expected by 15 December.

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that at its 122<sup>nd</sup> session, the Administrative Committee had noted the commencement of the training programme for technical experts from non-EU Member States' competent authorities. This was a programme in which national experts would

receive training in the OTIF Secretariat over an extended period. During this period, national experts would take part in the daily activities of OTIF's technical department and receive dedicated explanations and training on COTIF's technical Appendices. The Member States would receive notification of this programme.

### **OTIF presentation to RISC: EC and OTIF on RID and OTIF technical regulations**

The **Secretary General** of OTIF gave WG TECH a presentation he had already given at the RISC meeting and RID Committee of Experts. The same presentation would also be given at the EU committee for the transport of dangerous goods (TDG).

WG TECH was informed about overlaps between RID and ATMF in the field of technical requirements and operational provisions. In present circumstances the two different approaches (of RID and ATMF) should be consistent and aligned. The OTIF Secretariat proposed a possible coordination scenario in which the working group, comprised of experts from CTE and the RID Committee of Experts, would analyse inconsistencies and/or overlaps between RID and ATMF and on the basis of the working group's results, a policy discussion would take place. A common paper from the OTIF Secretariat and the European Commission summarising this approach would be published at OTIF level, for the attention of the CTE and RID Committee of Experts and at EU level for the attention of the RISC and TDG Committees.

### **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 23<sup>rd</sup> session of WG TECH**

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

On 3 October 2014, the OTIF **Secretariat** had sent the provisional minutes to delegates who had attended the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of WG TECH (10-11 September 2014). It amended the provisional minutes in accordance with the corrections requested by CH, DE, ERA, EC (DG MOVE) and RS and uploaded them on 3 November 2014 for the attention of the 24<sup>th</sup> WG TECH. These amendments were shown on the screen and subsequently agreed.

**Conclusion:** The minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> session of WG TECH were approved with these amendments.

### **5. Interchangeable coaches:**

#### **OTIF presentation to RISC: interchangeable vehicles**

The **Secretariat** gave WG TECH the same presentation as had been given at the RISC meeting. WG TECH was reminded about the two concepts for organising international passenger traffic, i.e. the exchange of vehicles and interoperability. The Secretariat once again highlighted the importance of interchangeable coaches for OTIF, following the conclusions of WG TECH at its

23<sup>rd</sup> session. The Secretariat highlighted a problem where the interchangeability of coaches<sup>1</sup> could not be ensured only by applying the core UTPs and TSIs. This meant that a passenger coach that meets all the legal requirements does not necessarily have the inter-vehicle interfaces that make it suitable for exchange in international traffic. The Secretariat proposed the following for discussion:

- The creation of a new UTP or UTP Appendix for interchangeable passenger coaches.
- To adopt the same principles as for Appendix C of the WAG TSI: in other words, application is voluntary, but when applied, verification becomes part of the TSI/UTP conformity assessment and should be carried out by an assessing entity/notified body.
- When applied, a coach may be marked with specific marking, indicating that it is interchangeable
- In addition to the UTP specifications, some additional sector specifications/standardisation will remain necessary, e.g. in an updated RIC agreement.
- A new UTP such as this would help RU in the international exchange of vehicles, but would not limit the responsibilities of RU.

In practical terms, OTIF proposed a three layer model for interchangeable coaches: interoperability layer (train level - shown in the presentation as **Green Layer 1**), which is covered by a unique authorisation on the basis of TSIs and UTPs, the vehicle interchangeability layer (inter-vehicle level - **Orange Layer 2**), dealing with inter-vehicle interfaces, and a sector harmonisation layer (**Red Layer 3**), dealing with all other items the railway sector wishes to harmonise on a voluntary basis.

The Secretariat stressed the principle agreed at the workshop held in Bonn on 6 February 2014 that CER would need to list all the requirements needed for interchangeable vehicles. Only after the full specification list was acknowledged would WG TECH discuss where the requirements would appear, e.g. in a legal part (UTP/TSI) or in the sector agreement.

The **Chairman** thanked the Secretariat for its clear presentation and proposed that WG TECH should discuss further the concept of interchangeable coaches as presented by the Secretariat, i.e. the three layer concept.

**The representative of the EU** said that this concept provided a useful framework for further discussions and that the presentation itself was important in terms of helping him understand the situation. In addition, WG TECH was informed that the EU Member States had welcomed this initiative at the RISC meeting. Several MSs highlighted its importance and supported it and all the MSs that commented, as well as the EC, insisted on maintaining consistency between TSIs and UTPs. The EU reiterated its earlier position that it was premature to discuss where the specifications should appear until they were all available.

**DE** reminded the meeting that Appendix C of the WAG TSI should be applied in its entirety and not partially. The same should be the case for a possible Appendix related to interchangeable coaches. In other words, a coach should only receive a declaration or marking when the interchangeability requirements are fully met.

The Secretariat suggested that in addition to the commonalities, there was also a conceptual difference between Appendix C of the UTP/TSI WAG and the proposed specifications for interchangeability, in the sense that Appendix C for freight wagons describes many elements which go beyond inter-vehicle interfaces, such as for example lifting/jacking points,

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional (mainly) functional requirements that cover the technical details of the inter-vehicle interfaces.

compatibility with train detection systems, welding, etc. These elements would not be in the scope of interchangeability requirements.

**UNIFE** was of the opinion that the legal structure and purpose of the Interoperability Directive did not support the creation of the new UTP/TSI Appendix. However, UNIFE supported the initiative from a technical point of view.

In response to UNIFE, both DE and EC reminded the meeting that the concept of Appendix C of the WAG TSI was in line with the concept of interoperability as described in the Directive, otherwise it would not have been adopted as European law.

### **Input from CER regarding the requirements**

**CER** submitted to the OTIF Secretariat and ERA a document entitled “*First approach for UTP/TSI LOC&PAS RIC coaches*”, based on Chapter 7.1.2 and Appendix C of the UTP WAG. In addition to requirements listed in Appendix C, CER had added a new requirement, “*train-wide information and control*”, which would be discussed further with UNIFE. CER explained that this document represented a starting point for the discussion and required fine tuning. Bearing in mind the three layer model, CER would list proposed requirements in the first and second layer. CER also proposed that WG TECH set up a subgroup to deal with this matter.

To clarify matters the **Secretariat** made some general remarks on the CER document. The Secretariat was of the opinion that specification should only cover elements relevant to interchangeability; therefore, some of the requirements listed in the first part of the document could be omitted. For each specification it should be clear how an assessing entity<sup>2</sup> can verify conformity, after which its allocation in the legal framework would be possible and would be discussed further. The Secretariat was of the opinion that a discussion on whether or not to set up a subgroup would only be worthwhile once CER had submitted a full list of requirements and parameters for coaches. A subgroup might not be an efficient way of defining technical requirements, because it would require a significant amount of administrative and procedural work (invitations, working documents, minutes, etc).

**ERA** agreed with the Secretariat and was of the opinion that the document should not cover requirements that are already covered in existing UTP/TSI. **ERA** was of the view that CER should concentrate on technical requirements, which originally belonged to the second (orange) layer, and that instead of functional requirements, WG TECH should consider real technical solutions.

**CER** also informed WG TECH that an additional meeting with UNIFE was planned, at which the requirements would finally be set. However, CER did not expect any significant changes to the requirements submitted.

**UNIFE** supported the initiative to define the requirements clearly, but also noted that UNIFE was not yet in a position to support the output of CER’s work. UNIFE would nevertheless be pleased to work together with CER to improve the list of parameters.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion, noting that the first step had not yet been achieved and that OTIF and ERA would only join them once CER and UNIFE had completed their work. WG TECH would not set up a special subgroup for the purpose of defining technical requirements.

---

<sup>2</sup> or Notified Body

## **ERA information on the Working Party on “Unique authorisation”**

**ERA** presented the subjects addressed to the WP on “Unique authorisation” and an appropriate work programme for 2014-2015. WG TECH was informed about the analysis that had been carried out on the impact of Specific Cases and Open Points in LOC&PAS TSI. The basic principle was that vehicles meeting the requirements of the TSIs and which also complied with (most) specific cases and were compatible with (most of) the existing networks would be eligible for a unique authorisation. The unique authorisation would be valid almost everywhere, with the exception of the few lines or networks for which the specific cases or compatibility would not be complied with.

If necessary, additional parameters would be added to the TSI. ERA also noted that LOC&PAS TSI would have fewer Open Points than WAG TSI. With regard to the process of amending the LOC&PAS TSI, ERA planned to send the EC a recommendation by the end of 2015, targeting the RISC meeting in 2016, where these amendments would be adopted.

## **Discussion and next steps**

The **Secretariat** referred to the CTE work programme for 2014 and beyond as adopted at CTE 7. The Secretariat reminded participants that interchangeable coach requirements could not be completed before the WP on “Unique authorisation” had completed its work, i.e. before the first (green) layer was finished.

The **Chairman** noted that CER and UNIFE would organise at least three meetings, the first of which would take place in January. The goal was to have the requirements defined and allocated by June 2015.

**CER** was of the opinion that at least four meetings would be needed. CER confirmed that all the requirements would be defined and allocated by June 2015. CER was of the opinion that the presence of OTIF and ERA representatives could help achieve the allocation of requirements.

**UNIFE** supported the plan proposed by the Chairman. UNIFE confirmed its readiness for the first meeting in January.

## **The Chairman concluded item 5 as follows:**

- WG TECH agreed on the concept of interchangeable coaches as presented by the Secretariat.
- WG TECH would not set up a special subgroup to define and allocate requirements.
- WG TECH agreed the next steps:
  - CER with the support of UNIFE committed itself to preparing requirements and allocating them to layers by June 2015.
  - CER and UNIFE would have 3 or 4 meetings to prepare and allocate the requirements.
  - CER would lead the work and be responsible for meeting the deadlines.
  - CER and UNIFE could set up informal group. If necessary, OTIF and ERA representatives could join the group in an advisory capacity. Depending on the complexity it would be decided whether it was necessary to attend a meeting or whether comments/responses to questions could be sent by e-mail.
  - CER would present progress to the 25<sup>th</sup> WG TECH, where further discussions would take place.

## 6. UTP NOI revision

Document: [A 94-04/1.2014 version5](#)

Draft UTP NOI

The **Secretariat** presented the new draft version of UTP NOI, which was the result of coordination work between the OTIF Secretariat and ERA. The amended document had been uploaded on 3 November 2014 for the attention of the 24<sup>th</sup> WG TECH. These amendments were shown on the screen and subsequently agreed. The Secretariat also informed WG TECH that the non-EU CS would be sent a letter asking them to identify specific cases.

**Conclusion on item 6:** the **Chairman** noted that apart from Section 7.3. Specific cases, the draft UTP NOI (A 94-04/1.2014 version 5) was ready to be submitted to CTE for a vote. However, it was also noted that the document was still open for comments. With regard to the letter to the non-EU CS relating to specific cases, as announced by the Secretariat, WG TECH recommended that the deadline for responses should not be less than two months.

## 7. RID and ATMF: report on the results of the meeting on derailment detection devices in Rome on 13-15 October 2014

Document: [OTIF/RID/CE/GTDD/2014-A](#)

Report (2<sup>nd</sup> draft) of the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the working group on derailment detection

In addition to the OTIF Secretary General's presentation and discussion that followed, the **Secretariat** informed WG TECH of the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> session of the RID Committee of Experts' working group on derailment detection devices (DDD) held in Rome. The document uploaded for the 24<sup>th</sup> WG TECH was a draft version which would have to be approved by the RID working group. The Secretariat also informed WG TECH that this was a sensitive issue, as it gave rise to very different opinions, and that the next working group meeting would be held on 24-26 February 2015, probably in Bern.

With reference to the Secretariat's recommendation from the last WG TECH meeting<sup>3</sup> the **Chairman** noted that technical experts had not been widely represented at the meeting in Rome. **DE** did not entirely share this view, as prior to the Rome meeting, DE had organised a coordination meeting for DE representatives at the RID Committee and WG TECH. DE had decided that the RID experts would express a single, coordinated DE standpoint.

The **Chairman** invited other delegates to clarify and compare the roles of this WG TECH with the mandate of the RID working group.

The **Secretariat** explained that the RID Committee of Experts defined the mandate of the RID working group on DDD.

**UIP** reminded WG TECH that DDD had first been introduced into RID in 2007 on a voluntary basis. In RID 2011, voluntary application had been postponed. The RID Committee of Experts would like to conclude this issue and that was why this RID working group had been set up. Depending on its findings, the RID working group would either propose to make derailment detectors mandatory in RID or make them one of the measures in a more global plan to prevent derailments in future.

---

<sup>3</sup> That delegates who attended CTE and WG TECH meetings should also attend the Rome working group meeting



The **Secretariat** encouraged WG TECH participants to become or remain involved in the RID working group meetings on DDD.

The **Chairman** was of the view that WG TECH experts should also be involved in specification processes for DDD, especially as safety issues were discussed.

**Conclusion on item 7:** WG TECH noted the draft report of the RID working group on DDD.

## 8. **Amendment of Annex V to the ECM Uniform Rules (template for maintenance function certificates)**

Document: [A 94-30/1.2014 version2](#) Draft

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 Secretariat proposed to add a new Certificate template in Annex V. This amendment would ensure full equivalence with EU Regulation 445/2011, Annex V.

**DE** noted some inconsistencies in both template Certificates in Annex V of the ECM UR compared to Annex V of EU Regulation 445/2011. The certificate information in point 3 of the ECM UR envisaged the ECM Identification Number and ECM Identification Number of the previous certificate. In the EU Regulation, only the latter existed.

**Conclusion:** the **Chairman** noted the differences and noted that the **Secretariat** should analyse and compare Annex V of both regulations and inform the 25<sup>th</sup> WG TECH of the results.

## 9. **UTP application guides: discussion and validation**

Documents: [A 92-01/2.2015 version2](#) Draft UTP LOC&PAS application guide  
[A 92-01/3.2015 version2](#) Draft UTP NOI application guide

The **Secretariat** presented the new draft versions of the application guides. The draft UTP LOC&PAS application guide A 92-01 2 2014 v0.4 was aligned with the latest ERA version of the application guide after ERA had clarified clause 4.2.8.2.7. After reviewing the draft UTP NOI application guide A 92-01 3 2014 v0.3, WG TECH made some minor linguistic amendments to the uploaded version. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that once WG TECH had approved them, OTIF would publish the application guides on its website. All the amendments were shown on the screen, together with additional changes noted during the meeting and subsequently agreed. The Secretariat also announced that the 25<sup>th</sup> WG TECH would review the draft UTP PRM application guide.

**Conclusion on item 9:** WG TECH approved both UTP application guides with the corrections set out above and instructed the Secretariat to publish them in all three languages.

## **10. Presentation of matrix of responsibilities between entities in the railway sector (CER and UIP)**

On behalf of the Group of Representative Bodies (GRB)<sup>4</sup>, **UIP** gave an overview of JNS<sup>5</sup> and GRB activities within the NSA network. After receiving a contract from EU to complete the information on the responsibilities of all players in the railway transport chain in the European Union from a safety point of view, PWC<sup>6</sup> had issued a report with which GRB had not been satisfied. It lacked many elements, i.e. a precise description of the roles and activities as a basis for clarifying actors' tasks and duties. This was the reason why CER had addressed this question at JNS level. JNS initiated an analysis to clarify the roles and activities of all actors involved in freight rail transport, i.e. SNCF had three different roles; RU, keeper and ECM. To facilitate the work, the transport of dangerous goods was excluded from the analysis. The GRB prepared a Summary Report, the highlights of which were presented to WG TECH. GRB had developed a matrix providing an overview of the actors and their tasks, which also included contractual partners, such as consignors. The matrix showed the different actors in columns and the phases of the transport (planning) in rows. The cells contained the activities of each actor in each phase.

UIP envisaged the next steps as being: to identify control measures, especially at the interfaces between actors; to identify necessary information flows and consistency with legal requirements (e.g. by adding legal references). This could also lead to the identification of possible room for improvement in the legal framework.

The **Chairman** noted that safety starts with responsibilities. It is important part importing the OTIF legislation and ATMF 15 and 15a was also integrating them. Everyone (stakeholders) must recognise their responsibilities at the same way in all countries.

**CER** supported these steps and said that all stakeholders must be aware of their obligations.

**DE** supported the results of the matrix, but reminded the meeting that the RU is entirely responsible for the result of any outsourced activities. These outsourced activities should be covered by the RU's safety management system. DE said it would give a presentation at the next WG TECH on how NSA DE supervises ECM in accordance with Article 9 of the ECM regulations.

**UIP** had excluded sub-contracting aspects from the matrix, as the activities of subcontractors should be covered by the safety management system of the RU.

**Conclusion on item 10:** WG TECH noted the presentation and matrix. DE would describe to the next WG TECH meeting how NSA DE supervises ECM in accordance with Article 9 of the ECM regulations.

## **11. Next session**

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

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

---

<sup>4</sup> GRB includes CER, UIC, UIP, EIM, UNIFE, UITP, EPTTOLA and ERFA. The GRB itself is a grouping of railway associations in Europe with the role of supporting, transversally, the rail sector's input to the ERA work programme and its effect on safety and interoperability.

<sup>5</sup> Joint Network Secretariat, i.e. platform where the sector discusses and works together on different subjects.

<sup>6</sup> PricewaterhouseCoopers

The 26<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH will be held on 9 and 10 September 2015. The location is still to be decided and delegates are invited to suggest locations.

The 27<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH will be held in Bern on 17 and 18 November 2015.

## 12. Any other business

### 12.1 TAF next steps

The **Secretariat** reminded WG TECH of the results of the study on the TAF TSI, where an analysis had shown that it is not necessary to transpose the TAF TSI into a mandatory OTIF regulation. The Secretariat repeated the main arguments in support of this conclusion:

- 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.

**UIP** reminded WG TECH of TAF's scope of work. Following the work on TAF required a lot of resources, as meetings took place on an almost weekly basis and the appendices had to be updated regularly, etc. It might be the case that OTIF would not be able regularly to monitor changes to TAF (TAF CCM, TAF CCM board, etc). UIP noted that before the TAF TSI was transposed, WG TECH should have a road map setting out the consequences the transposition. This road map would also reveal whether the UTP TAF was necessary.

**ERA** supported UIP's position. ERA also explained that TAF implementation was mainly driven by business needs, as opposed to administrative needs. ERA confirmed that RS, BH and ME, as non-EU CS, already applied some parts of TAF TSI.

The **Secretariat** suggested that the conclusion of the report should be reworded so that that it would list the possible ways of dealing with the TAF TSI at OTIF level.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and noted that this discussion would be treated as the first step at the conceptual level that precedes the UTP TAF. He also noted that the OTIF Secretariat could be faced with intensive additional work if TAF TSI were to be transposed into UTP TAF. For the next WG TECH, the OTIF Secretariat would complement the study on the TAF TSI, listing the different options on how to proceed further.

**Conclusion on item 12.1:** the Secretariat would complement the study on the TAF TSI for the next WG TECH meeting.

### 12.2 CSM Amendments: UTP GEN-G

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH about the consultation process that had been initiated to amend the UTP GEN-G (CSM rule)<sup>7</sup> in accordance with ERA's recommendation for

<sup>7</sup> Common Safety Method (CSM) on Risk Evaluation and Assessment (Document A 94-01G/1.2012 v.03, in force since 1.1.2014 and equivalent to Commission Regulation (EU) 402/2013)

amendments. The process would last until 15 December. WG TECH was asked whether the OTIF Secretariat should already prepare the draft, or whether it should wait until after the RISC (in June 2015). The entry into force of the amended UTP GEN-G would be coordinated between EU and OTIF. The Secretariat stressed the importance of the CSM Regulation revision process in order to maintain full equivalence between that UTP and the EU CSM Regulation.

In addition, **ERA** informed WG TECH that the Agency's final recommendation would be made to the European Commission by the end of February 2015.

**The representative of the EU** said that revision of CSM could be coordinated in the same way as the documents adopted at CTE 7<sup>8</sup>.

**Conclusion on item 12.2:** the **Chairman** noted that the Secretariat would start to prepare the draft UTP GEN-G amendments. The OTIF Secretariat would coordinate its activities with EC and ERA, in accordance with the Administrative Arrangements between OTIF, EC and ERA<sup>9</sup>.

### 12.3 Suggestions for the agenda of CTE 8

In addition to the provisional agenda for CTE 8, as submitted to the 23<sup>rd</sup> WG TECH, the **Secretariat** proposed two new suggestions:

- ECM Rules (addition of Annex V)
- UTP GEN-G amendments (CSM)

**Conclusion on item 12.3:** the **Chairman** invited participants to submit their suggestions for the agenda to the Secretariat.

### 12.4 ERA's update on work relating to the activities of OTIF

Andreas SCHIRMER presented the ERA's scope of work in general and of its interoperability unit in particular. The strategic priorities ERA contributes to are the removal of administrative and technical barriers, simplified access for customers and harmonisation of the technical and safety regulatory frameworks. OTIF is involved in these activities by taking part in the Working Parties and by being consulted on draft new regulations.

Peter MIHM presented the activities of the Cross Acceptance Unit. This Unit was set up to contribute to the removal of administrative and technical barriers, especially by facilitating the authorisation of railway vehicles in the Member States of the European Union. Mr Mihm explained the development of guidance documents (DV 29bis) for the harmonised application of the Interoperability Directive by the railway sector and NSAs, as well as the publication and categorisation of national technical requirements in the so-called Reference Document Database. With the development of TSIs, the number of national technical rules will be reduced.

Jean-Marie DECHAMPS presented the new structure of ERA's Safety Unit, which now has four "sectors". Activities relating to OTIF included matters in connection with RID, risk assessment and the safety of rail freight transport. One particularly interesting subject was ECM certification

<sup>8</sup> 22<sup>nd</sup> WG TECH final minutes, Conclusion on 6.5 UTP GEN-C amendment, page 11

<sup>9</sup> Signed in Brussels on 24 October 2013 and communicated to the OTIF Member States in circular letter A 57-21/501.2013 of 25.11.2013 ([http://www.otif.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/otif\\_verlinkte\\_files/08\\_Presse/Com\\_Presse/CP\\_2013/A\\_57-21\\_501\\_2013\\_25\\_11\\_2013\\_e\\_OTIF-EU-ERA\\_AA\\_Brussels\\_24\\_10\\_2013.pdf](http://www.otif.org/fileadmin/user_upload/otif_verlinkte_files/08_Presse/Com_Presse/CP_2013/A_57-21_501_2013_25_11_2013_e_OTIF-EU-ERA_AA_Brussels_24_10_2013.pdf)).

and cooperation between ECM certification bodies. Some non-EU certification bodies take part in this coordination. There are five non-EU states with ECM certification bodies (BH, CH, MN, RS, TR). On 18 June, a meeting of the ECM certification bodies will be hosted by OTIF in Berne.

Andreas SCHIRMER presented the main elements of the revised TSI NOI. High speed and conventional rail had been merged and the 1520mm networks had been included, with the exception of freight wagons. Intermittent and impulsive noise limits had been included. Squeal noise from brakes had not been included, as no harmonised parameters could be defined. EN ISO 3095 was now referred to. Continuous curves for limit values had been included.

Mr SCHIRMER also gave an update on the project entitled “Rationalisation of Vehicle Related Registers”. At the end of 2014, a draft intermediate report had been issued, which will be presented and discussed at RISC72 (February 2015). Depending on the outcome of the discussion at RISC72, the following steps and timetable will be decided.

### **13. Closing remarks**


The **Chairman** thanked the participants for the productive discussion, the OTIF Secretariat for preparing all the documents on time and ERA for its hospitality, and closed the 24<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH.

## 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)

### France/Frankreich/France


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

Chargé d'affaires européennes et internationales  
EPFS  
60 rue de la Vallée, 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. 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)

**Monténégro/Montenegro**

M./Hr./Mr. Zoran Vuković


Senior Advisor  
 Railway Directorate of Montenegro  
 Hercegovačka 75  
 ME-81000 Podgorica

 +382 (20) 23 21 27  
 Fax +382 (20) 23 21 28  
 E-mail [zoran.vukovic@dzzcg.me](mailto:zoran.vukovic@dzzcg.me)

**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**

Mme/Fr./Ms Ainhoa San Martin


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

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

**European Railway Agency (ERA)**

M./Hr./Mr. Andreas Schirmer

Head of Coordination Sector  
 Interoperability Unit  
 120 rue Marc Lefrancq  
 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)

M./Hr./Mr. Hubert Lavogiez

Head of Rolling Stock Sector  
 Interoperability Unit  
 120 rue Marc Lefrancq  
 BP 20392

FR-59300 Valenciennes Cedex



+33 (3) 27 09 65 46

Fax

E-mail [hubert.lavogiez@era.europa.eu](mailto:hubert.lavogiez@era.europa.eu)

M./Hr./Mr. Jean-Marie **Dechamps**

Head of Management System Sector  
Safety Unit  
120 Rue Marc Lefrancq  
BP 20392  
FR-59307 Valenciennes Cedex



Fax

E-mail [jean-marie.dechamps@era.europa.eu](mailto:jean-marie.dechamps@era.europa.eu)

M./Hr./Mr. Peter **Mihm**

Head of Evaluation Sector  
Cross Acceptance Unit  
120 Rue Marc Lefrancq  
BP 20392  
FR-59307 Valenciennes Cedex



Fax

E-mail [Peter.Mihm@era.europa.eu](mailto:Peter.Mihm@era.europa.eu)

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](mailto:Christoph.KAUPAT@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

 +33 (1) 85 07 81 28

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

 +32


Mobile +32 (491) 16 21 82

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 (03) 98 607 19 79

Fax

E-Mail:

[sebastian.giera@de.transport.bombardier.com](mailto:sebastian.giera@de.transport.bombardier.com)

M./Hr./Mr. Jan **Steinkohl**

UNIFE Public Affairs Manager,  
UNIFE, Avenue Louise 221,  
BE-1050 Brussels



+32 2621 269

Fax

E-Mail: [jan.steinkohl@unife.org](mailto:jan.steinkohl@unife.org)

### 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

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

First Officer  
 Tel.:            +41 (0)31 359 10 26  
 E-Mail:    margarethe.koschmider@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr.    Dragan **Nesic**

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

M./Hr./Mr.    Jan **Hampl**

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