



OTIF

**ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR LES
TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES**

**ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR
INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL**

WG TECH

25th Session

Minutes

Bern, 4-5.2.2015

DISCUSSIONS

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers (head of OTIF's technical section) welcomed the participants (list of participants in Annex I) and opened the 25th session of WG TECH in Bern.

1. Approval of the agenda

The **Secretariat** explained that the provisional agenda had been sent to participants with the invitation on 8th December 2014 (circular [A 92-03/505.2014](#)). 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 24th session ([Annex II](#)).

2. General information from the Secretariat

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH about the results of ERA's proposed amendments to the EU Regulation on the common safety method (CSM) for risk evaluation and assessment. Comments had only been received from CH. These had been forwarded to ERA and ERA had responded to them. With regard to the subject, the Secretariat once again highlighted the importance of maintaining full equivalence between UTP GEN-G and the EU CSM Regulation.

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH that non-EU Contracting States had been invited (circular letter A 94-04/1.2015, dated 14.01.2015) to analyse whether they might need to list specific cases in the revised UTP NOI and if so, to inform the OTIF Secretariat. The Contracting States had until 15 March 2015 to reply.

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that non-EU Contracting States had been invited (circular letter A 93-00/501.2015, dated 21.01.2015) to nominate experts for the training programme in 2015. The programme, which is very important for OTIF, focuses on the application of the technical appendices APTU and ATMF.

In connection with the current geographical scope of COTIF and its Appendices, the meeting was informed that CZ and SK had started procedures to withdraw their declarations.

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 24th session of WG TECH

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

On 15 January 2015, the OTIF **Secretariat** had sent the provisional minutes to delegates who had attended the 24th session of WG TECH (2-3 December 2014). It amended the provisional minutes in accordance with the corrections requested by ERA. During the meeting CER and

UNIFE requested some additional corrections. These amendments were shown on the screen and subsequently agreed.

Conclusion: The minutes of the 24th session of WG TECH were approved with these amendments.

It was agreed that the discussion initiated by CER about the possibility that some specifications for interchangeable coaches might come under the green layer (interoperability area), would be discussed under item 6 of the final agenda.

5. RID and ATMF: review of joint paper of the OTIF Secretariat and the European Commission

Document: [20141218_RID and ATMF final](#) RID and ATMF final

The **Secretariat** informed WG TECH briefly about the OTIF and EC joint paper and the next steps with regard to improving consistency between COTIF Appendices C and G. Once it had been translated into French and German, the document would be published for the attention of the CTE and the RID Committee of Experts and for the RISC and TDG Committees. OTIF and EC would jointly set up a common working group with the task of coordinating the work. To this end, OTIF and EC would draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the working group and submit them to all four committees. The new working group could also deal with including the Entity in Charge of Maintenance in RID, with the aim of resolving this question by the end of 2015 and of introducing solutions into the 2017 edition of RID.

The representative of the EU noted that the document submitted reflected the views of both OTIF and EC. She also informed WG TECH that at the first meeting of the working group the joint paper, together with the ToR, would be discussed.

CER was interested in the practical arrangements for coordinating the work within the working group. It also noted that, depending on possible changes in RID and/or ATMF, it might be necessary to determine a transitional period.

DE was of the opinion that 25th WG TECH should review the joint paper. DE made some general remarks, which in its view could improve work of the working group. This working group should not make a strict distinction between RID and CTE requirements. The necessary and appropriate expertise remained within the group, which already had the required competence. In other words, the RID experts should continue to be competent for discussions and decisions concerning technical requirements for dangerous goods vehicles. **DE** nevertheless supported setting up a working group for coordination, and at the same time highlighted the practical problems that could occur, i.e. in future some requirements would be defined either in APTU/ATMF or in RID.

CER proposed that the sector should also participate in the work of the working group.

The Chairman concluded item 5 as follows:

- The EC supported the OTIF-EC joint paper and the creation of a working group for coordination.
- The OTIF Secretary General and EC would coordinate the work of this working group.
- The ToR of the working group should provide an overview of the topics to be covered by the discussions.

- The ToR would be distributed to all interested parties, i.e. committees, WG TECH, sector, etc. WG TECH participants would be asked to comment on the ToR.
- The working group's first meeting:
 - a. At the first meeting of the working group, its scope of work (i.e. ToR) would be discussed
 - b. Invitation to the first meeting of the working group would only be sent out after the draft ToR document had been presented to all committees
 - c. The invitation to attend the working group meetings should be extended to the sector (CER, UIP and UNIFE as observers)
 - d. Draft ToR would be annexed to the invitation to the first meeting of the working group

6. Inter-vehicle interfaces: status of input received from CER; next steps

Jean-Baptiste **SIMONNET** gave a presentation on CER's progress report on the inter-vehicle interface. In its allocation process, CER had defined two groups of requirements: interoperability and interchangeability. Mr. **SIMONNET** explained that at the current stage of the analysis no additional requirements than those that had already been identified seem to be necessary for interchangeability and interoperability. It might still be necessary to develop additional requirements (e.g. for door control) within the 3rd layer (sector harmonisation layer). With regard to the train-wide information and control status, Mr. **SIMONNET** reminded that older vehicles are not fulfilling the new TSI functions¹: fire alarm, passenger alarm, door control and call for aid. In practical terms, the old coaches do not have the technical capability to connect to the new coaches, without loss of functionality of the new coaches. It would take a few more months to finalise requirements for the communication protocol. CER finally mentioned that in the long term wireless system could resolve the issue.

In response to CER's division of requirements within unique authorisation, the **Secretariat** highlighted that CER should make a clear distinction between its work and work within the ERA Working Party - Unique Authorisation (WP -UA). These two activities should not overlap and CER should concentrate on inter-vehicle interfaces only. If some interchangeability specifications belonged in the green layer (interoperability layer) it was obvious that the WP - UA should be involved.

DE shared the Secretariat's opinion and emphasised that WG TECH should avoid trying to define "go everywhere" requirements and save considerable time in WG TECH by avoiding the repetition of earlier discussions².

CER asked WG TECH about the level of detail needed to define requirements. From CER's point of view, some requirements could not be defined until June, which could result in some open points remaining. For example, the train-wide information system could not be resolved by June.

The Secretariat reminded the meeting that the task given to CER was to develop technical specifications for the inter-vehicle interfaces sufficient to design coaches suitable for exchange in international traffic. If open points remained in these requirements, these coaches would not be interchangeable in practice.

¹ TSI train level functions not being part of the technical RIC package

² See 18th and 19th WG TECH Minutes

DE was interested in whether it is possible to find a solution within the RIC agreement, which could be followed by appropriate requirements in UTP/TSI.

The Secretariat confirmed that the updated RIC agreement could be still used as a tool for cooperation between RU – as a technical/commercial agreement between companies. It also reminded the meeting that the RIC agreement could not be used for vehicle authorisation.

The **Chairman** summarised the problem and asked whether WG TECH would have specifications with open points by June or whether WG TECH should wait until the full list of requirements had been prepared.

CH preferred the option in which CER and UNIFE would prepare the specifications with the open points by June.

RS preferred the option where CER and UNIFE would prepare a train bus solution, after which CTE and/or WG would evaluate whether the solution is acceptable or needs further improvement.

UNIFE was of the view that all open points should be closed; otherwise WG TECH's task would not be achieved.

DE was against having open points, because this would mean that not all the requirements would be harmonised.

The Secretariat was of the opinion that if it were decided to publish specifications with open points, the consequences of this should be explained, i.e. what it would mean in practical terms if some requirements were not included.

The representative of the EU emphasised that WG TECH would only be able to assess specific proposals (requirements) once it had received them. The EC thought this could be done at the next WG TECH session in September.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and invited WG TECH members to provide the Secretariat in the next 2 weeks with their proposals on how to resolve open points.

CER asked WG TECH how to proceed if some specifications for interchangeable coaches were to belong in the green layer (interoperability area). In other words, the interchangeability annex would not be sufficient. Some of the requirements could be the result of operations themselves.

The representative of the EU emphasised that all the issues in connection with the interoperability area should be addressed to the ERA WP on Unique Authorisation.

The Chairman concluded item 6 as follows:

- The Chairman noted the progress report presented by CER
- CER would prepare specifications by June, together with open points if needed. These open points would be followed by a clear explanation of the consequences if applied (train-wide information and requirements for the communication protocol)
- In cases where the interoperability area is concerned, CER would address issues to ERA's Working Party on Unique Authorisation
- If necessary, CER would propose requirements within the RIC agreement, which could be followed by appropriate requirements in UTP or TSI

- In the next two weeks, WG TECH members would prepare proposals on how to resolve open points and forward them to the OTIF Secretariat.

7. UTP PRM application guide: discussion and validation

Document: [A_92-01/1.2015_version1](#)

Guide for the application of the UTP PRM

The **Secretariat** presented the draft UTP PRM application guide which corresponds to the PRM TSI application guide. The information relevant to the application of the OTIF UTP was highlighted in blue rectangles. It was also pointed out that this application guide refers only to rolling stock. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that once WG TECH had approved the application guide, OTIF would publish it on its website. The Secretariat also presented an overview of the status of application guides that had already been published.

DE commented in general that non-EU OTIF countries could be faced with the obligation of applying the infrastructure requirements as well, but only for infrastructure that was open to international traffic (local and regional networks would be exempt).

CH proposed that the reference to the Swiss standard on page 42 of the guide should either be deleted or amended.

The **Secretariat** suggested that for the purpose of preserving consistency between OTIF and EU documents, this change should be carried out simultaneously and in cooperation with ERA.

Conclusions on item 7: The Secretariat and ERA would check whether the reference to the Swiss standard on page 42 could be deleted or amended. WG TECH approved the UTP PRM application guide and instructed the Secretariat to publish it in all three languages.

8. ERA activities and developments which relate to the activities of OTIF

CSM amendments and its implications for UTP GEN-G

Christoph **KAUPAT** of **ERA** informed the meeting of recent developments concerning consultations on the proposed amendments to the EU Regulation on the common safety method for risk evaluation and assessment. It was planned to present the results at the next RISC meeting. ERA's final recommendation would be submitted to the EC by the end of February 2015. The final text would be adopted by June 2015 and would subsequently be published in the EU Official Journal.

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that the process of consulting the non-EU OTIF CS had been carried out on the basis of an ERA working document and not on the basis of the document subject to review by RISC. Comments had only been received from **CH**. These had been forwarded to ERA. ERA had replied directly to CH on 30.1.2015. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that since 1 January 2014, there had been full equivalence between OTIF UTP GEN-G (document A 94-01G/1.2012 v.03) and Commission Regulation (EU) No 402/2013 and that this equivalence should be maintained. Proposals relating to legislation development processes within the EU should be coordinated in order to ensure that the amended Commission Regulation would enter into force simultaneously with the amended UTP GEN-G. In practical terms, ERA, in coordination with the EC, should bring the amendment proposals and related developments to the attention of WG TECH, with a view to introducing similar amendment proposals for the UTPs. This had not happened so far and there was therefore a risk of losing

equivalence. The Secretariat suggested that the EU could prepare a document for the attention of the CTE, in which it explained and justified the proposed amendments to UTP GEN-G. It could then present and discuss the proposals in CTE 8. Subsequently, the Secretariat could ask the Contracting States to adopt the amended UTP GEN-G in a written procedure in the course of 2015.

DE reminded the meeting that a few years ago, OTIF and EC had defined a coordination process on the development of regulations. In its opinion, consultation within OTIF was necessary in order to avoid objections from the non-EU OTIF CS.

The representative of the EU pointed out that the OTIF and EU processes regarding the adoption of regulations differ³. The EU proposed that the OTIF Secretariat and the EU should exchange information about legislation development processes and investigate whether there are any opportunities for improvements. For the CTE 8, the EU would prepare information about developments regarding CSM amendments.

OPE TSI Revision

Christoph **KAUPAT** presented the main elements of ERA's recommendations on TSI OPE, which RISC had approved at its 71st session. Mr. KAUPAT explained that TSI OPE would be implemented through two documents: by a Regulation (directly applicable to all actors from 1 July 2015), and by a Directive (indirectly, where the MS are obliged to submit their national plans to the Commission on how they would implement requirements by 30 June 2017). The changes to TSI OPE concerned: development of the 14 operational principles, clarification of safety-related communications, listing the data elements that IMs have to provide to RUs and requirements relating to other train crew members. In reply to a question from the Secretariat, ERA would carry out some additional checks to find out whether the existing OTIF-EU equivalence of train preparation provisions was affected.

WAG TSI amendment on composite brake blocks

Christoph **KAUPAT** presented the main elements of the WAG TSI amendments, together with the time framework for their application. The EC would adopt the WAG TSI amendments in April/May 2015 and bring them into force from 1 July 2015. The amendments should close the open point referred to in Table A.1 of Appendix A - assessment by a notified body/assessing entity of composite brake blocks (CBB) in Appendix G. In other words, the amendments should define the specification of an interoperability constituent (IC) "friction element for wheel tread brakes" and the elaboration of the assessment methodology for the IC. Mr. KAUPAT also introduced the meeting to the 10 year validity of EC type or EC design examination certificates and the 10 year transition period from the date of application of the amended WAG TSI. The latter refers to the use of components manufactured (e.g. according to Notified National Technical Requirements) before the date of application of the amended WAG TSI and to the use of components corresponding to Appendix G, designed and manufactured before the expiry of their approval period. It was stated that after the date of application of the amended WAG TSI, no new CBB would be listed in Appendix G.

CER was of the view that a common assessment procedure for a different CBB should also be defined in WAG TSI [PM: ERA confirms that this is the case as of 1.7.2015]. CER also mentioned that since ECMs acquire CBBs free on the market the vehicles should be checked in addition.

³ The RISC meetings are held three times a year compared with the annual meetings of the CTE

The representative of the EU emphasised that RISC had given a positive opinion on the WAG TSI at its 70th session in November 2014. She reminded the meeting that although some problems would remain, MS, EC and ERA had decided to adopt ERA's recommendations. If necessary, further discussion should take place in the wagons TSI working group.

DE supported EU's statement and reminded the meeting that obligations in this respect are fully defined and should be complied with. In practical terms, the responsibility of the manufacturer is to produce the CBB and check whether it is safe, and this should be certified by an Assessing Entity.

The **Secretariat** again reminded the meeting about the necessity of maintaining the principle of equivalence between OTIF and the EU. According to ERA's statement, from 1 July 2015 there would be a process within the EU (i.e. different assessment method) which would not be recognised by the non-EU OTIF CS.

ERA application guide for the CSM Assessment Body

ERA informed the meeting of recent developments on the draft application guide for the CSM Assessment Body. OTIF, NSA and Representative Bodies had been consulted. It was planned to publish the application guide in February 2015.

DE informed the meeting about submitting their comments to both OTIF and ERA. DE asked ERA if this process could be delayed in order to give both non-EU and EU OTIF CS more time to submit additional comments.

The **Secretariat** once again invited WG TECH members to comment on the application guide and to send any comments to the OTIF Secretariat.

The Chairman thanked Mr Kaupat for the presentation and concluded item 8 as follows:

- WG TECH attached great importance to ensuring coordination of the work between OTIF and the EU, both in substance as well as in timing. This was a prerequisite for maintaining full equivalence between EU and OTIF rules.
- With regard to the coordination work, the OTIF Secretariat and the EC would investigate whether any improvements were possible.
- Amendments to the corresponding OTIF and EU legislation should enter into force simultaneously if full equivalence were to be maintained.
- ERA would check and inform the Secretariat whether the TSI OPE amendments would affect the existing equivalence between OTIF and the EU, i.e. in the annexes of UTP WAG and/or UTP LOC&PAS.
- For the CTE 8, the EU would prepare information about developments regarding CSM amendments.
- Non-EU OTIF CS should comment on the CSM application guide and submit their comments to the OTIF Secretariat. ERA would check whether publication of the CSM application guide could be postponed in order to provide more time for additional comments.

9. Presentation by Germany on supervision in the scope of Article 9 of the ECM Regulation (Annex A to ATMF)

Michael **SCHMITZ** gave WG TECH a presentation on the Intermediate Report from the NSA Network Subgroup about their experience in the role of supervisors in the scope of Article 9 of the ECM Regulation. Mr **SCHMITZ** explained from the NSA (Competent Authority) perspective which measures should be applied and who should be informed in case when ECM does not comply within ECM requirements. It was highlighted that unlike certification bodies the NSAs do not directly supervise ECMs. The NSAs can make decisions against RUs and ECMs⁴. At the same time, the RUs are responsible for managing their subcontractors (which includes ECMs). With regard to the information flow in terms of measures that have been implemented, according to the NSA Network Subgroup and bearing in mind the sector's responsibility for disseminating information to all parties, it is sufficient that the NSA informs RU/keeper where the defect occurred.

CER replied that the NSA has to inform the keeper, not the RU. In fact, it is difficult for RUs to spread this information, because NRV has not yet been published by every Member State.

WG TECH was also introduced to the matrix where the safety risk of the defect was compared against the (re)action of the ECM/frequency of occurrence of the defect.

In addition to the presentation, Mr **SCHMITZ** informed the meeting about the process of publishing the Intermediate Report. After presenting the results to the NSA Network, the ECM application guide would be changed by adding a new chapter. The Final Report would be sent to the OTIF Secretariat for further evaluation. It was proposed that the OTIF Secretariat should evaluate how this supervisory function applies in the non-EU OTIF CS. This could provide material for the next WG TECH in September.

CER replied that in general terms, the vehicle maintenance contract is concluded between the keeper and the ECM (rather than between the RU and the ECM). This makes it practically impossible for RUs to manage ECMs or even to check the provisions of the contract between the keeper and the ECM. **CER** reminds that it is not a legal obligation for the RU to designate or supervise the ECM (except when the RU is at the same time also the keeper of a vehicle).

The **Chairman** thanked Mr Schmitz for the presentation. With regard to the RUs' responsibility for managing their subcontractors, it was noted that Article 4 of the Safety Directive had been challenged and that this sensitive process was ongoing within the EU.

10. EU - OTIF equivalence table

Documents: [A 92-00/2.2014](#)

Equivalence table

The **Secretariat** presented recent developments on both sides of the EU - OTIF equivalence table. The Secretariat also informed the meeting about the link to the OTIF website, where the reference table could be found:

(http://www.otif.org/fileadmin/user_upload/otif_verlinkte_files/06_tech_zulass/03_Doks_WG_T_ECH/03_2015_WG_TECH/A_92-00_2_2014_EU_OTIF_equivalence_table.pdf)

The **Chairman** asked WG TECH members to give the OTIF Secretariat an adequate and timely reaction, if necessary..

⁴ If in the same time NSA is the certification body, it supervise both RU and ECM

11. Next sessions

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

The 26th session of WG TECH will be held on 9 and 10 September 2015 in Paris.

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

12. Any other business

12.1 Provisional agenda CTE 8

The **Secretariat** submitted proposals to WG TECH for the agenda of CTE 8 ([Agenda proposals CTE 8, 10-11 June 2015, Bern](#) **Annex III**). It was emphasised that the proposed agenda might need to be harmonised with EU activities, as it was possible that some UTPs would need to be amended (GEN-G, WAG and LOC&PAS). The Secretariat suggested that the EU could prepare a document for the attention of the CTE to explain and justify the proposed amendments to the UTPs where equivalence with EU rules would be affected by developments in the EU. Such a document should be made available to the CTE 2 months before the meeting (i.e. 9 April). The Secretariat could then ask the Contracting States to adopt the amended rules in a written procedure in the course of 2015.

The representative of the EU said that she did not oppose the Secretariat's proposal. However, it should be noted that the development stage of the amendments in question differs and depends on the results of the RISC meeting in June 2015. CTE 8 would be informed of the results of that meeting.

Conclusion on item 12.1: The **Chairman** noted that coordination of OTIF and EU activities is very important and invited participants to submit their suggestions for the CTE 8 agenda to the Secretariat.

12.2 Different templates used for ECM Certificate

Documents: [A 94-30/1.2015 version1](#) Document for discussion

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting about the results of the analysis of the different layouts in Annex V of the ECM UR and Annex V of EU Regulation 445/2011. Apparently, in their templates the certification bodies are using an internal reference number and the ECM identification number differently. It was also noted that the locations of the ECM identification number on the ECM certificate differ. Despite the differences, in the ERADIS database all certificates have a single ECM identification number in accordance with the correct structure, i.e. XY/31/abyy/nnnn. The Secretariat suggested that a solution could be found in two steps: firstly, by adding the maintenance function certificate template with a similar format as the existing OTIF ECM certificate (with room for the ECM certification number in box 3), and secondly, by changing the ECM UR in parallel with the revision process of the ECM regulation at EU level. The first step could be decided by CTE 8, the second step would depend on future developments in the EU.

DE was of the opinion that there should be full equivalence between OTIF and EU certificates.

The representative of the EU supported the Secretariat's suggestion.

Conclusion: The **Chairman** noted that WG TECH accepted the Secretariat's proposal, and the differences between the two templates would be resolved in parallel during the next revision of the ECM regulation at EU level.

12.3 TAF study

The **Secretariat** reminded WG TECH about the development process of the TAF TSI study and its results. It also reminded the meeting that after the consultation had been concluded, the study would be issued for the attention of CTE 8, which should reach a conclusion on how OTIF should proceed with TAF TSI. The Secretariat proposed two scenarios with associated sub-scenarios on how to deal with this matter:

- Do not transpose TAF TSI:
 - Do nothing within OTIF
 - Promote the use of TAF TSI solution on a voluntary basis
 - Voluntary scheme + application guide issued by OTIF
- Transpose TAF TSI into OTIF regulation
 - Full transposition of the TAF TSI into OTIF law (UTP TAF, including the technical appendices)
 - Partial transposition (UTP TAF with the reference to the technical appendices on the ERA webpage)

The **Chairman** thanked the Secretariat for its clear proposals and opened the discussion.

DE commented that in practical terms, TAF only worked if everyone took their own responsibility. If IMs do not use the TAF, there would be no benefits for RUs.

RS was of the opinion that application of TAF should be voluntary. Within closed markets (which might be the case in some OTIF CS), the practical benefits of applying TAF and TAP could be called into question. From RS's point of view, some priority in UTP's development should be given instead in functional areas to the structural areas, i.e. subsystems for energy, infrastructure, control-command and signalling, etc.

The representative of the EU was of the view that additional assumptions were needed. There should be a clear response as to what application of the TAF would actually improve in terms of railway operations between OTIF CS. WG TECH should focus on the relationship between RUs and IMs and what the impact would be for those RUs that operate between EU and non-EU MS.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and noted that it was still premature to take decisions, even within some EU MS. In his opinion, it was unrealistic to expect that a decision on TAF could be taken in June.

Conclusion on item 12.3: the Secretariat would prepare the study for the attention of CTE 8. CTE 8 should reach a conclusion on how OTIF should proceed with TAF TSI.

13. Closing remarks

The **Secretariat** thanked Mr Hampl for his contribution to the work of OTIF.

The **Chairman** once again underlined the political aim of equivalence, which was particularly evident in the joint paper of the OTIF Secretariat and the European Commission relating to the improvement of consistency between COTIF Appendices C and G. The great importance of aligning the mechanisms for adopting regulations within OTIF and EU was also noted. The Chairman thanked the participants for the productive discussion and valuable contributions, the OTIF Secretariat for preparing all the documents on time and closed the 25th WG TECH 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

Bosnie-Herzégovine/Bosnien-Herzegowina/Bosnia-Herzegovina

M./Hr./Mr. Mirko **Vulić**

Senior Expert Associate
Railway Regulatory Board
Svetog Save bb
DIH-74000 Dobož
☎ +49 (228) 9826 160
Fax +49 (228) 9826 9160
E-mail mirko.vulic@mkt.gov.ba

France/Frankreich/France

M./Hr./Mr. Sébastien **Vignot**

Chargé d'affaire européenne
Etablissement public de sécurité ferroviaire
(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


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


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

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

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


Suisse/Schweiz/SwitzerlandM./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


Turquie/Türkei/TurkeyMme/Fr./Mrs. Ayben **Kaygisiz**

TCCD
 Genel Müdürlüğü Cer Dairesi Başkanlığı
 TR-Ankara

 +90 312 309 05 15 - 4532
 Fax +90 312 310 99 49
 E-mail aybenkaygisiz@tcdd.gov.tr

Turquie/Türkei/TurkeyMme/Fr./Mrs. Hicran **Akgun**

TCCD
 Genel Müdürlüğü Cer Dairesi Başkanlığı
 TR-Ankara

 +90 312 309 05 15 - 4349
 Fax +90 312 312 50 42
 E-mail hicranakgun@tcdd.gov.tr

Turquie/Türkei/TurkeyM./Hr./Mr. Necati **Akbulut**


TCCD
 Sivas Vagon Bakim Onarim Atölye Müdürlüğü
 TR-Sivas

 +90 506 440 70 25
 Fax +90 312 31099 49
 E-mail neakb2008@hotmail.com

**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

European Railway Agency (ERA)

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

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

 +33 (3) 27 09 67 90

Fax +33 (3) 27 09 68 90


E-mail christoph.kaupat@era.europa.eu

**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

M./Hr./Mr. **Jean Baptiste Simonnet**

Senior Adviser on ERA and 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

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

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

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

Homologation Manager,
SIEMENS AG, Rail Systems
Werner von Siemens Strasse 67
DE-91052 Erlangen



+49 (9131) 726 955

Fax

E-Mail: christian.zumpe@siemens.com

**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

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

First Officer

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

E-Mail: margarethe.koschmider@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr. Dragan **Nešić**

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

Final Agenda**Annex II**

1. Approval of agenda
2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. Election of chairman
4. Approval of the minutes of the 24th session of WG TECH
 Document: [Provisional minutes](#) Draft provisional minutes
5. RID and ATMF: review of joint paper of the OTIF Secretariat and the European Commission
 Document: [20141218 RID and ATMF final](#) RID and ATMF final
6. Inter-vehicle interfaces: status of input received from CER; next steps
7. Draft UTP PRM application guide: discussion and validation
 Document: [A 92-01/1.2015 version1](#) Guide for the application of the UTP PRM
8. ERA activities and developments which relate to the activities of OTIF
 - CSM amendments and their implications for UTP GEN-G
 - OPE TSI Revision
 - WAG TSI amendment on composite brake blocks
 - ERA Application guide for the CSM Assessment Body
 Document: [ERA/GUI/01-2014/SAF](#) Application Guide for the CSM Assessment Body in Regulation (EU) N° 402/2013 and in OTIF UTP GEN-G of 1.1.2014 on the CSM for risk assessment
9. Presentation by Germany on supervision in the scope of Article 9 of the ECM Regulation (Annex A to ATMF)
10. EU - OTIF equivalence table
 Documents: [A 92-00/2.2014](#) Equivalence table EU/OTIF regulations
11. Next sessions
12. Any other business
 - Provisional agenda CTE 8
 - Different templates used for ECM Certificate
 Documents: [A 94-30/1.2015 version1](#) Different templates used for ECM Certificate
 - TAF study
 Documents: [A 92-06/1.2015](#) Analysis of how OTIF should proceed with TAF TSI

- Approval of the agenda
- Presence and quorum
- Election of chairman

For adoption:

- UTP NOI revision
- ECM Rules amendment (addition of Annex V)

Question to EC/ERA if there are any amendments needed for CTE 8, e.g. for:

- UTP GEN-G amendments (CSM)
- UTP WAG/TSI WAG
 - ERA/TD/2013-02/INT version 2.0 of 15.12.2014. Specifications to perform the assessment of conformity of friction elements for wheel tread brakes
 - Appendix G of UTP WAG and TSI WAG. List of fully approved composite brake blocks for international transport;
 - Appendices J to M of 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 operation, footsteps and handrails;
- UTP LOC&PAS
 - Section 7.3.1 (1) SC cases for NO: update reference when EEA Joint Committee Decision is adopted for 2014 TSI LOC&PAS. At present the reference is for SC in 2011 CR TSI LOC&PAS.

For discussion:

- TAF TSI – study and next steps
- ATMF explanatory document
- RID/CTE
- Interchangeable coaches
- Work programme of the Committee of Technical Experts for 2015/2016 and beyond
- Any other business
- Next session

For information:

- Report from the Committee of Technical Experts' working group TECH
- Status of notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU
- ERA consultation of non-EU OTIF Member States (CMS RA)
- Status of the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States