

7th report of the TAF TSI Implementation

RU/IM Telematics Joint Sector Group (JSG)

February 2018



Version 1.1

Jan-Christian Arms, JSG Vice-chairman

Document history

Version	Name	Changes	Date
0.1	Jan-Christian Arms	Initial version for IRG	09.02.2018
0.2	Jan-Christian Arms	Update chapters 5 and 6	12.02.2018
0.3	Jan-Christian Arms	Revised at IRG	15.02.2018
0.4	Jan-Christian Arms	Agreed at ERA/JSG consultation meeting	16.02.2018
0.5	Jan-Christian Arms	Approved at JSG	27.02.2018
1.0	Jan-Christian Arms	Document finalised after ERA TAF TSI Cooperation Group	04.04.2018
1.1	Jan-Christian Arms	Corrections following NCP remarks	09.04.2018

Contents

LIST OF TABLES	5
LIST OF DIAGRAMS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1. BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT	7
2. METHODOLOGY	8
General assumptions	8
Establishment of this report	8
3. PARTICIPATION IN THE 7TH REPORTING SESSION	10
Responses to the survey	10
Participation per company type	12
4. DATA BASIS FOR EVALUATION	13
5. IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING OF TAF TSI FUNCTIONS	14
Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (IMs)	14
Common Reference Files - Company Code (all companies)	15
Common Interface Implementation (all companies)	16
Train Running Information (IMs and RUs-F)	17
Train Composition Message (IMs and RUs-F)	19
Consignment Note Data (RUs-F)	20
Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database (RUs-F)	21
Rolling Stock Reference Database (WKs)	22
Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions	23
Degree of implementation at European level	24
6. INTENTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION	26
Common sector tools	26
7. SURVEY COVERAGE	27

8. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS	28
ANNEX 1: MEMBERS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION REPORTING GROUP (IRG)	29
ANNEX 2: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST V7	30
ANNEX 3: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST V6	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Reporting periods	9
Table 2: TAF/TAP TSI functions as reported per type of company	9

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

Diagram 1: Evolution of participation over time	10
Diagram 2: Evolution of response rate over time	10
Diagram 3: Number of responses per country	11
Diagram 4: Evolution of responses per country	11
Diagram 5: Evolution of participating per company type over time	12
Diagram 6: Number of types of company per reporting session	13
Diagram 7: Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (PLC)	14
Diagram 8: Evolution of PLC implementation	14
Diagram 9: Common Reference Files - Company Codes (CC)	15
Diagram 10: Evolution of implementation for Company Codes	15
Diagram 11: Common Reference Files - Common Interface (CI)	16
Diagram 12: Evolution of implementation for Common Interface	16
Diagram 13: Train Running Information (TRI)	17
Diagram 14: Evolution of implementation for Train Running Information	17
Diagram 15: Implementation of TRI of IMs across European countries	18
Diagram 16: Train Composition Message (TCM)	19
Diagram 17: Evolution of implementation for Train Composition Message	19
Diagram 18: Consignment Note Data (CND)	20
Diagram 19: Evolution of implementation for Consignment Note Data (CND)	20
Diagram 20: Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database	21
Diagram 21: Evolution of implementation for WIMO	21
Diagram 22: Rolling Stock Reference Database	22
Diagram 23: Evolution of implementation for RSRD	22
Diagram 24: Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions	23
Diagram 25: Reported DI for mandatory IM functions	24
Diagram 26: Reported DI for mandatory RUs-F functions	24
Diagram 27: Reported DI for mandatory WK functions	25
Diagram 28: Common sector tools in use	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This 7th TAF implementation report summarized the results received via the JSG Reporting Tool in January 2018 and thus shows the status of implementation by 31 December 2017.

While invitations have grown again, responses have shown only little development, stagnating again from the 6th to the 7th reporting session. The response rate however, descended for the first time to 34 % from a previously stable value of around 40 %. Lower absolute numbers of participation result from the fact, that participation of RUs-P has decreased.

Therefore, an effort to have a more complete view of the company's feedback was made by inclusion of data from the previous reporting session in this report.

Regarding the TAF TSI functions reported, the following Levels of Fulfilment can be observed:

- The majority of IMs reported to have completed the Primary Location Codes on their network.
- The majority of companies (around 80 %) are identified by Company Code.
- The level of fulfilment for Common Interface shows a remarkable difference between IMs, RUs-F and WKs. Half of IMs have already implemented, while most of RUs-F and WKs are still developing.
- One third of participating companies have Train Running Information in production, representing a similar level of fulfilment for IMs and RUs-F.
- A good percentage (more than 60 %) of the companies is developing the Train Composition Message, while 24 % of IMs and 11% of RUs-F have implemented completely.
- Half of the RUs-F companies already started implementing the Consignment Note Data, out of which two having finished.
- Implementation of the WIMO function rests at very low degree of completion (2 %) with no sign of improvement over time.
- A large number WKs fulfil the RSRD functionality via the common sector tool RSRD², which supports the result, that about 65 % of them have RSRD in production.

At European level the Degrees of Implementation show indifferent trends over time as follows:

- Decline of implementation of IMs functions might partly be explained by the growing number of smaller IMs taking part, which normally are not advanced in TAF/TAP implementation.
- Generally the proportion of RUs having finished implementation is considerably lower than for IMs. However, there are some positive trends at a low degree of implementation visible.
- For WKs the evolution of implementation remains stable.

Only a part of the companies invited to participate to the survey deliver feedback. Consequently the degree of implementation relative to invitations is always considerably lower than the degree of implementation relative to responses. It is likely, that the degree of implementation as set out in this report does not reflect real situation.

The questionnaire contained also few statistical questions, such as line-km, ton-km and passenger-km. After analysing this data the IRG was unable to draw a clear picture of the actual situation for whole Europe. Therefore the IRG suggests removing these specific questions from the questionnaire for the next reporting session.

1. BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT

According to Article 5, Section 1, of Commission Regulation (EU) No 1305/2014 relating to the Telematics Applications for Freight subsystem (TAF TSI), the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) shall assess and oversee its implementation.

The Agency has established the 'TAF TSI Implementation Cooperation Group' in order to evaluate the reports of the sector. The remit of this group is monitoring the parameters for RU/IM communication of both TAF and TAP TSIs. Members of the European railway sector are encouraged to submit their reports through the JSG to the Agency.

2. METHODOLOGY

General assumptions

Starting with the 6th Reporting session, the monitoring of RU/IM functions is being carried out using one common questionnaire for both TAF and TAP TSIs. However, results from the survey are presented in two separate reports.

The progress of implementation of the TAF and TAP TSI is reported twice a year based on the following assumptions:

- Companies are reporting per mandatory TAF or TAP TSI function compared to their own Master Plan target date. In case there is no company Master Plan it will be reported against the target implementation date.
- The level of fulfilment will be displayed in predetermined percentage steps at 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%.
- Each message based function is realized at 100%, if there is at least one implementation of message exchange in production, even if with a single partner only.

The level of fulfilment in terms of percentage steps are defined as follows:

- 0% - Level 1: Not started - Project not launched
- 25% - Level 2: Initiating phase - Implementation plan is available in the company
- 50% - Level 3: Planning phase - Project development
- 75% - Level 4: Executing phase - Pilot project / System testing
- 100% - Level 5: In-Production & Monitor and Control: Finished means Telematics data exchange is implemented

The obligation to meet functions of the TAF and TAP TSI is sometimes limited to specific stakeholders of the railway sector. Evaluation of the results of this survey is therefore stakeholder-specific. For that reason and in accordance with European legislation the following stakeholders are taken into account:

- Infrastructure Manager (IM)
- Railway Undertaking for Freight transport (RU-F)
- Railway Undertaking for Passenger transport (RU-P)
- Wagon Keeper (WK)
- Allocation Body (AB)

Establishment of this report

The present report integrates also data from wagon keepers using RSRD2 submitted by UIP.

This report summarised the results received via the JSG Reporting Tool during the seventh reporting period lasting from 2 January 2018 to 26 January 2018 and thus shows the status of implementation by 31 December 2017. Diagrams in the following chapters of this report show results per RU/IM function summarised in an anonymous way.

Table 1 gives an overview about the history of reporting periods.

Report session	Reporting period	Number of questions ¹
1 st Report	01.07.2014 - 31.12.2014	21
2 nd Report	01.01.2015 - 30.06.2015	40
3 rd Report	01.07.2015 - 31.12.2015	42
4 th Report	01.01.2016 - 30.06.2016	53
5 th Report	01.07.2016 - 31.12.2016	57
6 th Report TAF/1 st Report TAP	01.01.2017 - 30.06.2017	91
7 th Report TAF/2 nd Report TAP	01.07.2017 - 31.12.2017	65

Table 1: Reporting periods

The ‘TAF/TAP TSI Implementation Report Volume 7’ questionnaire contains ten question groups, eight of which are about the current implementation of TAF and TAP TSI functions:

TAF/TAP TSI functions for RU/IM communication to be implemented/reported per type of company		Type of company				
		IM	RU-F	RU-P	WK	AB
TAF/TAP TSI function	Primary Location Codes (PLC)	X				
	Company Code (CC)	X	X	X	X	X
	Common Interface (CI)	X	X	X	X	X
	Train Running Information (TRI)	X	X	X		
	Train Composition Message (TCM)	X	X			
	Consignment Note Data (CND)		X			
	Wagon InterModal unit Operational database (WIMO)		X			
	Rolling Stock Reference Database (RSRD)				X	

Table 2: TAF/TAP TSI functions as reported per type of company

- Primary Location Codes (PLC) - IMs only
- Company Code (CC) - all companies
- Common Interface (CI) - all companies
- Train Running Information (TRI) - IMs, RUs-F and RUs-P
- Train Composition Message (TCM) - IMs and RUs-F
- Consignment Note Data (CND) - RUs-F only
- Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database (WIMO) - RUs-F only
- Rolling Stock Reference Database (RSRD) - WKs only

Two more general question groups intend to find out the actual situation and intentions of companies:

- Company information
- Sector Tools in use

This report was drafted by the Implementation Reporting Group (IRG), the members of which are listed in Annex 1. As a result, it was endorsed at the JSG meeting on 27 February 2018 and published accordingly. It will be presented at the ERA TAF TSI Implementation Cooperation Group meeting on 14 and 15 March 2018.

¹ Please note, the questions in the TAF and TAP RU/IM questionnaire are context specific. The number of question to be responded, depend on the type of company and is not the total number listed in the table 1.

3. PARTICIPATION IN THE 7TH REPORTING SESSION

Responses to the survey

The number of project managers invited to report about the implementation of the TAF TSI and TAP TSI is shown in diagram 1 together with the number of responses received thereof. Starting from the first report, invitations have grown continuously. Since the third report, responses have shown only little development, stagnating again from the 6th to the 7th reporting session.

The 7th report includes 70 WKs submitted by UIP using RSRD².




Diagram 1: Evolution of participation over time

The response rate however, calculated as number of responses in relation to number of invitations, descended for the first time to 34 % from a previously stable value of around 40 %, mainly due to the higher number of invitations (see diagram 2).




Diagram 2: Evolution of response rate over time

Diagram 3 displays the distribution of total responses per country. The feedback comprises 22 EU Member States plus Norway, Switzerland and Turkey. The average number of answers per country is close to 8.




Diagram 3: Number of responses per country

Diagram 4 shows the distribution and the development of responses per country.




Diagram 4: Evolution of responses per country

Participation per company type

Companies in this survey may have multiple roles, such as RU and WK at the same time. Therefore, the total number of responses displayed in diagram 1 (186 companies) and listed in Annex 2 is lower than the total number of company types shown in diagram 5 hereafter (231 companies).

Compared to the previous survey, the number of types of company went down, mainly caused by missing RUs-P (- 15).

Annex 2 ‘Responses contact list v7’ to this report gives a detailed overview about the companies per country having replied to the seventh session of TAF and TAP TSI implementation monitoring. Please note, that there are entities which have reported on behalf of several companies.

Annex 3 ‘Responses contact list v6’ to this report lists the companies per country having replied to the sixth session of TAF and TAP TSI implementation monitoring and not to the present one.




Diagram 5: Evolution of participating per company type over time

4. DATA BASIS FOR EVALUATION

In order to establish a wider sector representation, 43 companies from the previous survey, which have not replied this time, are also taken into consideration. For companies having reported to both surveys, only the company information from the 7th session is included.

Diagram 6 displays the total number of types of company (272) with their allocation to 6th and/or 7th reporting session. The reporting period thus represents the whole year 2017.




Diagram 6: Number of types of company per reporting session

5. IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING OF TAF TSI FUNCTIONS

Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (IMs)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Primary Location Code Function (PLC) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2013. This activity corresponds to Primary Location Codes, which have to be defined by IMs. Consequently, the following diagram only refers to IMs. Responses refer to initial upload of primary location codes, but update and maintenance process and use of codes is a different issue and not part of this report.

Diagram 7 indicates, that the majority of IMs reported to have completed the Common Reference Files for locations on their network. However, complete population of PLC is not yet reached. Regarding the level of fulfilment of PLC implementation, diagram 7 shows 22 IMs with complete implementation. 2 out of 34 IMs in the evaluation are considered with data from the previous survey.




Diagram 7: Common Reference Files - Primary Location Codes (PLC)

Diagram 8 shows complete implementation of PLC in relation to the number of IM responses.




Diagram 8: Evolution of PLC implementation

Common Reference Files - Company Code (all companies)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Company Code Function (CC) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2013.

The bar chart below (diagram 9) is indicating the existence and use of company codes as part of the Common Reference Files for IMs, RUs-F and Wks. For CCs only two predefined percentage steps exist, because either a company does have an own CC or not. The vast majority of companies having replied to the query possess a CC.




Diagram 9: Common Reference Files - Company Codes (CC)

According to Diagram 10, the number of companies with CCs declined for IMs and grew for RUs-F and Wks. The degree of implementation is around 80 % for all of them.




Diagram 10: Evolution of implementation for Company Codes

Common Interface Implementation (all companies)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Common Interface Function (CI) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2013.

Diagram 11 summarises the feedback related to the availability of CI and shows a difference in level of fulfilment between IMs, RUs-F and WKs. The CI is completely implemented by 18 IMs, 20 RUs-F and 16 WKs.




Diagram 11: Common Reference Files - Common Interface (CI)

The development of complete implementation of the CI over time according to diagram 12 shows again the relation to the number of responses per company type. 50% of IMs have already finished the implementation of the CI. However, with completion being at 25 % of responding companies, the majority of RUs-F is still developing. For WKs completion is below 15 %, projects have not started yet or are at initiating phase. RSRD² has yet not implemented the CI. WKs using RSRD² therefore form part of the 25% level.




Diagram 12: Evolution of implementation for Common Interface

Train Running Information (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Running Information message (TRI) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was end of 2017. This monitoring concerns only one aspect of the TAF TSI basic parameter 'Train running forecast', the Train Running Information message. The Train Information System (TIS) is a common sector tool managed by RNE. Messages sent by IMs to TIS or messages received by RUs from TIS through traditional interfaces are considered as 75 % complete fulfilment and TAF messages sent or received by Common Interface are counted as 100 % fulfilment.

Diagram 13 indicates 12 IMs and 24 RUs-F with 100 % level of fulfilment. This leads to a degree of implementation for IMs and RUs-F having reported to the JSG Reporting Tool of about 35 % for IMs and 30 % for RUs-F.




Diagram 13: Train Running Information (TRI)

Regarding diagram 14, both the number of RUs-F having implemented the TRI and the degree of completion increased in comparison to the 6th reporting session. For IMs the trend is opposing.




Diagram 14: Evolution of implementation for Train Running Information

Diagram 15 gives an impression about the state of implementation of TRI by IMs in countries across Europe. The IMs having the longest network have been taken as relevant for the country. For IMs still in development the current planned end date and the respective level of fulfilment is shown in diagram 15.

Among the IMs there are 8 small companies, such as harbours, having responded to this survey. Contrary to the level of fulfilment of dominating IMs, such small companies have not even started projects.




Diagram 15: Implementation of TRI of IMs across European countries

Train Composition Message (IMs and RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Train Composition Message (TCM) as part of the Train Preparation Function according to the TAF TSI Masterplan is end of 2018. TCM is mandatory to be sent by RUs-F. However, implementation by IMs is also reported. Most of them are still developing this TAF TSI function.




Diagram 16: Train Composition Message (TCM)

Figures show a little increase in terms of complete implementation of TCM since last reporting session. 9 RUs-F out of 81 which replied to the survey have completely implemented the TCM, leading to a degree of implementation of about 10%. The degree of implementation for IMs, monitored for the first time, calculates to about 25 %.




Diagram 17: Evolution of implementation for Train Composition Message

Consignment Note Data (RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Consignment Note Data function (CND) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was end of 2017.

Diagram 18 indicates only 2 RUs-F out of 81 having finished implementation of CND.




Diagram 18: Consignment Note Data (CND)

The degree of implementation rests at a very low level for this function.




Diagram 19: Evolution of implementation for Consignment Note Data (CND)

Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database (RUs-F)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database function (WIMO) according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2016.

The 'Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database' function (WIMO) is relevant for RUs-F only. However, IMs realising this function on behalf of RUs-F are not taken into account in the present report.

This function remains at a low degree of implementation of about 2 %. The reason for this must be further investigated. Companies claim that some requirements and the criteria for fulfilling are still unclear (diagrams 20 and 21).




Diagram 20: Wagon and Intermodal Unit Operating Database

Diagram 21 indicates the very low degree of completion for WIMO with no sign of improvement over time.




Diagram 21: Evolution of implementation for WIMO

Rolling Stock Reference Database (WKs)

The Target Implementation Milestone for realisation of the RSRD function according to the TAF TSI Masterplan was 2015.

The 'Rolling Stock Reference Database' function (RSRD) is relevant for companies which keep wagons. Those companies might at the same time also be RUs or IMs.

A number of companies intends fulfilling this functionality in a collaborative way via the common sector tool RSRD². Information delivered by UIP for RSRD² means 100% of fulfilment. 72 of 114 WKs have implemented this function thanks to RSRD², the degree of implementation is reported to be at 63 %.




Diagram 22: Rolling Stock Reference Database

Following the increasing number of WKs using RSRD² and the higher participation to the survey, the implementation rate remains stable compared to the previous report (see diagram 25).




Diagram 23: Evolution of implementation for RSRD

Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions

Companies could declare in a dedicated answer for each TAF/TAP TSI function one reason why they did not yet start implementing it. Diagram 24 gives a summary of the reasons selected by the companies.

Feedback regarding reasons for not implementing increased with plus 61 in total more than participation to the survey. All categories were affected by that evolution.




Diagram 24: Reasons for not starting implementation of TAF/TAP TSI functions

Degree of implementation at European level

This chapter summarises the development of the Degree of Implementation (DI) at European level for the TAF TSI functions since the beginning of reporting.

The DI in this report is defined as the relation of companies having fully implemented (100 %) the particular function compared to the companies having replied to this query in per cent.

Diagram 25 shows the DI for functions to be implemented by IMs. TCM is being reported for the first time. Implementation of all functions decline compared to the last report. This might partly be explained by the growing number of smaller IMs taking part, which normally are not advanced in TAF/TAP implementation.




Diagram 25: Reported DI for mandatory IM functions

Diagram 26 indicates the evolution of implementation for RUs-F functions. Generally the proportion of RUs having finished implementation is considerably lower than for IMs. The DI for the CC stays high at 83 %. For the CI and TRI functions a positive trend with about 10 % increase is visible, but the other RUs-F functions stagnate at a low level of implementation.




Diagram 26: Reported DI for mandatory RUs-F functions

Diagram 27 shows the reported DI for WKs in the present report. Similar to the RU-functions, only the DI of CI increases, whereas the CC and RSRD completion remains stable.




Diagram 27: Reported DI for mandatory WK functions

6. INTENTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Common sector tools

Participants of the questionnaire could select all common sector tools in use to meet some specific requirements of the TAF/TAP TSI. The number of companies having indicated using such tools are summarised in diagram 28.




Diagram 28: Common sector tools in use

The tools named KADR, LWP and EMAN are recorded for the first time in this report.

Responses of common sector tools went up by 25 % from last reporting, RSRD² and TIS both remaining the most used ones.

In respect to the responses received from relevant types of company, RSRD² is in use by about 80 % and TIS is in use by about 60 % of its potential users.

From 49 companies using other common sector tools, no company has indicated the tools in use.

7. SURVEY COVERAGE

The present reporting period contained also few statistical questions, such as line-km, ton-km and passenger-km.

After analysing the partly incomplete data from the companies and the comparison of this data with the available statistical data the IRG was unable to draw a clear picture of the actual situation for whole Europe. Also a first check with the available ABC-analysis² did not show any reliable results.

Therefore the IRG suggests removing these specific questions from the questionnaire for the next reporting session.

Since a European-wide picture of the real implementation status would be very helpful, the IRG proposes to put more effort in aforementioned analysis with the support of the NCPs.

² ABC-analysis means the classification of companies in relation to their market share.

8. CONCLUSION AND FINDINGS

The number of companies having responded to the 7th questionnaire is, as always as, significantly lower than the number of companies having been invited. The response rate descended for the first time to 34 % from a previously stable value of around 40 %.

Lower absolute numbers of participation result from the fact, that participation of RUs-P has decreased.

Implementation of some functions decline compared to the last report. This might partly be explained by the growing number of smaller companies taking part, which normally are not advanced in TAF/TAP implementation.

For some TAF TSI functions there is a strong need to precisely define the compliance with TAF TSI regulation. For example for the WIMO function, companies claim that some requirements and the criteria for fulfilling are still unclear. This task has been initiated from the sector and work is ongoing.

The degree of implementation as set out in diagrams 25 to 27 of this report is calculated from the responses to the questionnaire. If companies not having responded would be also taken into calculation, the degree of implementation would drop off.

The inclusion of data from the previous reporting session in this report was an effort to have a more complete view of the company's feedback and the current level of implementation.

ANNEX 1: MEMBERS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION REPORTING GROUP (IRG)

Last Name	First Name	Company	e-mail
Arms (Chair)	Jan-Christian	DB AG	jan-christian.arms@deutschebahn.com
Achermann	Rudolf	SBB	rudolf.achermann@sbb.ch
Achille	Vito Sante	RFI	v.achille@rfi.it
Heydenreich	Thomas	UIP	rsd@th-heydenreich.de
Lo Duca	Carmen	Trenitalia	c.loduca@trenitalia.it
Mastrodonato	Emanuele	CER	ema@cer.be
Weber	Christian	SNCF	christian.weber@sncf.fr

ANNEX 2: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST V7

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
1	AT	IM	ÖBB Infrastruktur AG	
2	AT	RU-FWK	Rail Cargo Austria AG	
3	AT	WK	Bahnbau Wels GmbH	RSRD ²
4	AT	WK	Felbermayr Transport- und Hebeteknik GmbH & Co KG	RSRD ²
5	AT	WK	GATX Rail Austria GmbH	RSRD ²
6	AT	WK	Logistik Service GmbH	RSRD ²
7	AT	WK	Propangas AG	RSRD ²
8	BE	IM	Infrabel	
9	BE	WK	LINEAS	RSRD ²
10	BE	WK	LINEAS GROUP	RSRD ²
11	BE	WK	LINEAS Intermodal	RSRD ²
12	BG	IM	NRIC	
13	BG	RU-F	BDZ Cargo	
14	BG	RU-F	Bulgarian Railway Company (BRC)	
15	BG	RU-F	EXPRESS SERVICE OOD	
16	BG	RU-F	Rail Cargo Carrier - Bulgari Ltd.	
17	BG	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Bulgaria	DB Cargo AG
18	CH	IM	BLS-Netz AG	
19	CH	IM	SBB AG, Division Infrastruktur	
20	CH	RU-F	BLS Cargo	
21	CH	RU-F	SBB Cargo International	
22	CH	RU-F	WRS Widmer Rail Services AG	
23	CH	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Switzerland	DB Cargo AG
24	CH	RU-FWK	SBB CARGO AG	
25	CH	RU-P	SBB AG, Division Personenverkehr	
26	CH	WK	Diversified Investments SA	RSRD ²
27	CH	WK	Ermewa SA, Geneva branch	RSRD ²
28	CH	WK	HASTAG (Zürich) AG	RSRD ²
29	CH	WK	MITRAG AG	RSRD ²
30	CH	WK	SBB Cargo AG	RSRD ²
31	CH	WK	TRANSWAGGON AG	RSRD ²
32	CH	WK	VTG Schweiz GmbH	RSRD ²
33	CH	WK	WASCOSA AG Luzern	RSRD ²
34	CZ	IM	PDV RAILWAY a.s.	
35	CZ	IM	Správa železniční dopravní cesty, státní organizace	
36	CZ	RU-F	BF Logistics s.r.o.	
37	CZ	RU-F	DBV-ITL, s.r.o.	
38	CZ	RU-F	LTE Logistik a Transport Czechia s.r.o.	LTE Group
39	CZ	RU-F	MH-spedition s.r.o.	
40	CZ	RU-F	SLEZSKOMORAVSKA DRÁHA a.s.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
41	CZ	RU-F	Sokolovská uhelná, právní nástupce, a.s.	
42	CZ	RU-F	TCHAS ŽD s.r.o.	
43	CZ	RU-F	VÍTKOVICE Doprava, a.s.	
44	CZ	RU-F/RU-P	LTE Logistik a Transport Slovakia s.r.o.	LTE Group
45	CZ	RU-F/RU-P	RegioJet	
46	CZ	RU-F/RU-P/WK	Ceske drahy, a.s.	
47	CZ	RU-F/WK	Advanced world transport a.s.	
48	CZ	RU-F/WK	ČD Cargo.a.s.	
49	CZ	RU-F/WK	LOKO TRANS s.r.o.	
50	CZ	RU-F/WK	UNIPETROL Doprava, s.r.o.	
51	CZ	WK	ArcelorMittal Ostrava a.s.	RSRD ²
52	CZ	WK	Česká republika -Správa státních hmotných rezerv	
53	CZ	WK	Českomoravský cement, a.s.	
54	CZ	WK	Coal Services a.s.	
55	CZ	WK	Felbermayr Transport- und Hebetchnik spol.s.r.o.	RSRD ²
56	CZ	WK	KOS Trading, akciová společnost	RSRD ²
57	CZ	WK	Lafarge Cement, a.s.	RSRD ²
58	CZ	WK	Lovochemie, a.s.	RSRD ²
59	CZ	WK	NH-TRANS, SE	
60	CZ	WK	Railco a.s.	RSRD ²
61	CZ	WK	RYKO PLUS spol. s r.o.	RSRD ²
62	CZ	WK	V.K.S. Vagon Komerc Speed, spol. s r.o.	RSRD ²
63	CZ	WK	Vápenka Čertovy schody a.s.	
64	CZ	WK	VÁPENKA VITOŠOV s.r.o.	
65	CZ	WK	ZX-BENET CZ s.r.o.	
66	DE	IM	DB Netz AG	
67	DE	IM	Häfen und Güterverkehr Köln AG	
68	DE	IM/RU-F	Bayernhafen GmbH & Co KG	
69	DE	IM/RU-F/RU-P	Hafen Krefeld GmbH & Co. KG	
70	DE	RU-F	Captrain CargoWest GmbH	
71	DE	RU-F	RTB CARGO GMBH and VIAS GMBH (freight part)	
72	DE	RU-F	SBB Cargo Deutschland GmbH	SBB Cargo International
73	DE	RU-F/WK	DB Cargo AG	
74	DE	RU-F/WK	MEG Mitteldeutsche Eisenbahn GmbH	DB Cargo AG
75	DE	RU-F/WK	RBH Logistics GmbH	DB Cargo AG
76	DE	RU-P	DB Regio AG	
77	DE	WK	AlzChem AG	RSRD ²
78	DE	WK	Aretz GmbH und Co. KG	RSRD ²
79	DE	WK	BASF SE	RSRD ²
80	DE	WK	DAHER PROJECTS GmbH	RSRD ²
81	DE	WK	Ermewa GmbH	RSRD ²
82	DE	WK	ERR European Rail Rent GmbH	RSRD ²

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
83	DE	WK	GATX Rail Germany GmbH	RSRD ²
84	DE	WK	Kombiverkehr Deutsche Gesellschaft für kombinierten Güterverkehr mbH & Co KG	RSRD ²
85	DE	WK	Mosolf Automotive Railway GmbH	RSRD ²
86	DE	WK	NACCO GmbH	RSRD ²
87	DE	WK	On Rail - Gesellschaft für Eisenbahnausrüstung und Zubehör mbH	RSRD ²
88	DE	WK	On Rail Gesellschaft für Vermietung und Verwaltung von Eisenbahnwaggons mbH	RSRD ²
89	DE	WK	Petrochem Mineralöl-Handels-GmbH	RSRD ²
90	DE	WK	TRANSWAGGON GmbH	RSRD ²
91	DE	WK	Tyczka Gase GmbH	RSRD ²
92	DE	WK	voestalpine Rail Center Königsborn GmbH	RSRD ²
93	DE	WK	Vossloh Logistics GmbH	RSRD ²
94	DE	WK	VTG Aktiengesellschaft	RSRD ²
95	DE	WK	VTG Rail Europe GmbH	RSRD ²
96	DE	WK	Zürcher Bau GmbH	RSRD ²
97	DK	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Scandinavia A/S	DB Cargo AG
98	ES	IM	ADIF Administrador de Infraestructuras Ferroviarias	
199	ES	RU-F	ACCIONA RAIL SERVICES	
100	ES	RU-F	RENFE MERCANCIAS	
101	ES	RU-FWK	TF Transfesa	DB Cargo AG
102	ES	WK	Sociedad de estudios y explotacion de material auxiliar de transportes S.A.	RSRD ²
103	ES	WK	Transportes Ferroviarios Especiales S.A.	RSRD ²
104	FI	RU-F/RU-P	Vr Group	
105	FR	IM	SNCF Réseau	
106	FR	RU-F	SNCF MOBILITES - Fret	
107	FR	RU-FWK	ECR Euro Cargo Rail SA	DB Cargo AG
108	FR	RU-P	SNCF Mobilités Voyageurs	
109	FR	WK	ATIR-RAIL	RSRD ²
110	FR	WK	Compagnie Française de Produits Métallurgiques	RSRD ²
111	FR	WK	Ermewa SA	RSRD ²
112	FR	WK	Millet SAS	RSRD ²
113	FR	WK	Monfer France SASU	RSRD ²
114	FR	WK	NACCO S.A.S.	RSRD ²
115	FR	WK	SOCOMAC	RSRD ²
116	FR	WK	STVA S.A.	RSRD ²
117	FR	WK	VTG Austria Ges.m.b.H.	RSRD ²
118	FR	WK	VTG France SAS	RSRD ²
119	HU	AB	VPE - Vasúti Pályakapacitás-elosztó Kft.	
120	HU	IM	GYSEV Zrt.	
121	HU	IM	MÁV	
122	HU	RU-F	GYSEV CARGO Zrt.	
123	HU	RU-F	MMV Magyar Magánvasút Zrt.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
124	HU	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Hungária Kft.	DB Cargo AG
125	HU	RU-FWK	Rail Cargo Hungaria Zrt.	
126	HU	RU-P	MÁV-START	
127	IE	WK	TOUAX Rail Ltd.	RSRD ²
128	IT	IM	EAV Naples Italy	
129	IT	IM	Ferrovie Emilia Romagna	
130	IT	IM	Gruppo Torinese Trasporti S.p.A.	
131	IT	IM	La Ferroviaria Italiana S.p.A.	
132	IT	IM	RFI	
133	IT	IM/RU-P	FERROVIE DEL GARGANO	
134	IT	RU-F	Captrain Italia Srl	
135	IT	RU-F	Dinazzano Po	
136	IT	RU-F	GTS Rail S.p.A.	
137	IT	RU-F	HUPAC SpA	
138	IT	RU-F	TX Logistik AG - Sede Secondaria Italiana	
139	IT	RU-F/RU-P	Trasporto Ferroviario Toscano SpA	
140	IT	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Italia Srl	DB Cargo AG
141	IT	RU-FWK	Mercitalia Rail s.r.l.	
142	IT	RU-P	GRUPPO TORINESE TRASPORTI SPA	
143	IT	RU-P	Italo - Nuovo Trasporto Viaggiatori S.p.A.	
144	IT	RU-P	SAD-Trasporto Locale SpA	
145	IT	RU-P	SNCF Voyages Italia	
146	IT	RU-P	Trasporto passeggeri emilia romagna	
147	IT	RU-P	Trenitalia S.p.A.	
148	IT	RU-P	TRENTINO TRASPORTI ESERCIZIO SPA	
149	IT	WK	Lotras srl	RSRD ²
150	IT	WK	Monfer Cereali SRL	RSRD ²
151	LT	IM/RU-F/RU-P/WK	JSC "Lithuanian Railways"	
152	LU	IM/RU-F/RU-P/WK/AB	CFL (IM), CFL (RU), CFL CARGO (RU + WK), ACF (AB)	
153	LV	IM/RU-F/WK	VAS Latvijas dzelzceļš (LDz)	
154	NL	IM	ProRail B.V.	
155	NL	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Nederland N.V.	DB Cargo AG
156	NL	RU-P	NS Reizigers & NS International	
157	NO	IM	Bane NOR	
158	PL	IM	PKP Polskie Linie Kolejowe S.A.	
159	PL	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Polska Spółka Akcyjna	DB Cargo AG
160	PL	WK	Felbermayr Immo Sp.z.o.o.	RSRD ²
161	PL	WK	GATX Rail Poland Sp. z o.o.	RSRD ²
162	PL	WK	Tankwagon Sp. z o. o.	RSRD ²
163	PT	IM	Infraestruturas de Portugal	
164	PT	RU-FWK	Medway - Operador Ferroviário e Logístico de Mercadorias, SA	
165	PT	RU-FWK	Takargo	
166	PT	RU-P	CP - Comboios de Portugal, E.P.E.	

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
167	PT	RU-P	FERTAGUS	
168	PT	WK	ADP Fertilizantes, S.A.	RSRD ²
169	PT	WK	CIMPOR - Serviços de Apoio à Gestão de Empresas, S.A.	RSRD ²
170	RO	IM	CFR	
171	RO	RU-FWK	DB Cargo Rail Romania SRL	DB Cargo AG
172	SE	IM	Trafikverket	
173	SE	RU-FWK	Green Cargo	
174	SE	WK	Stena Recycling AB	RSRD ²
175	SE	WK	TRANSWAGGON AB	RSRD ²
176	SI	IM	SŽ Infrastruktura d.o.o. Kolodvorska 11, 1000 Ljubljana Slovenia	
177	SI	RU-F	SŽ TOVORNI PROMET D.O.O.	
178	SI	WK	Adria kombi d.o.o.	RSRD ²
179	SK	RU-F	BULK TRANSSHIPMENT SLOVAKIA, a.s.	
180	SK	RU-F/RU-P	LTE Logistik a Transport Slovakia s.r.o.	LTE Group
181	SK	RU-FWK	Železničná spoločnosť CARGO Slovakia, a.s.	
182	SK	WK	Felbermayr Slovakia s.r.o.	RSRD ²
183	SK	WK	Ing. Alica Ovciariková A.O.	RSRD ²
184	TR	WK	TRANSWAGGON Vagon Isletmeleri Ltd. Sti.	RSRD ²
185	UK	IM	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	
186	UK	RU-FWK	DB Cargo UK	

ANNEX 3: RESPONSES CONTACT LIST V6

Nr.	Member State	Type of Company	Company name	Reporting Entity
1	BE	RU-F	Lineas Group	
2	BE	RU-P	THI factory	
3	CZ	RU-F	EP Cargo	
4	CZ	RU-F	IDS CARGO	
5	CZ	RU-F	TONCUR	
6	CZ	RU-F/RU-P	CityRail	
7	CZ	RU-F/RU-P	Jindrichohradecké místní dráhy	
8	CZ	RU-F/RU-P	KŽC Doprava	
9	CZ	RU-P	GW Train Regio	
10	CZ	WK	Cement Hranice	
11	CZ	WK	ČR SSHR	
12	CZ	WK	KKB	
13	CZ	WK	KOTOUČ ŠTRAMBERK	
14	CZ	WK	Škoda Auto	
15	CZ	WK	Spolek pro chemickou a hutní výrobu	
16	CZ	WK	státní podnik DIAMO	
17	DE	RU-F	RheinCargo	
18	DK	RU-P	DSB	
19	EL	IM	O.S.E.	
20	ES	RU-F	Logitren Ferroviaria	
21	ES	RU-F/RU-P	FERROVIAL RAILWAY	
22	IT	RU-F/RU-P	Società Ferrovie Udine Cividale	
23	IT	RU-F/RU-P	TRENORD	
24	IT	RU-P	ARRIVA Italia Rail	
25	PL	RU-P	Arriva RP	
26	PL	RU-P	Koleje Dolnoslaskie	
27	PL	RU-P	Koleje Małopolskie	
28	PL	RU-P	Koleje Śląskie	
29	PL	RU-P	PKP	
30	PL	RU-P	PKP Intercity	
31	PL	WK	Łódzka Kolej Aglomeracyjna	
32	SE	RU-F	Hector Rail	
33	SE	RU-F	LKAB Malmtrafik	
34	SE	RU-P	sj	
35	SK	IM	Slovak Railways	
36	SK	RU-P	RegioJet	
37	SK	RU-P	Železničná spoločnosť Slovensko	

Disclaimer

The RU/IM Telematics Joint Sector Group (JSG)

The JSG was set up in October 2012 as a voluntary organisation supported by nine European Associations involved in the implementation of the rail technical specifications for interoperability of the Telematic Application for Freight (TAF TSI).

<http://taf-jsg.info/>