13TH SESSION

Work Programme
1. INTRODUCTION

From their inception, all the technical provisions of COTIF have been based upon provisions developed in the European Union. This is partly explained by the fact that 25 of the 43 states that apply APTU and ATMF are also members of the EU. The EU Member States have been developing their EU safety and interoperability provisions to connect their railway systems, which, for historical reasons, are often technically and operationally diverse.

The OTIF Secretariat will continue its intensive coordination with Member States, the EU institutions, and sector organisations with a view to ensuring continued compatibility and equivalence between EU law and COTIF’s technical provisions. This includes preparing amendment proposals to ensure that APTU, ATMF and the UTPs continue to be aligned with the provisions of the technical pillar of the EU’s fourth railway package, which was adopted in 2016.

The following work programme presents the principles underlying a sustainable legal framework for international rail transport, the need to consider updating the UTP and ATMF annexes, further development of the EST UR (Appendix H), and proposes a work plan for 2020 and 2021.

2. PRINCIPLES UNDERPINNING REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS

In accordance with the decision taken by the Committee of Technical Experts at its 11th session (12-13 June 2018) the following principles are used as a basis to underpin further development of the technical provisions of COTIF. These principles have also been incorporated into OTIF’s 2020/2021 Work Programme approved by the Administrative Committee in accordance with Article 15 § 5 of COTIF.

The principles adopted are as follows:

1. Harmonisation of technical and operational rules is most useful if it is implemented over the widest possible geographical scale. Attracting new Contracting States is therefore relevant. COTIF provisions should make sense and be of use in different geographical areas and between states which may have different legal systems. The organisation of railways can be different as well, ranging from competitive open-access to fully integrated state monopolies. COTIF should build a bridge between these differences.

2. Compatibility between the COTIF technical provisions and provisions of EU law is an important aim, as is the continued mutual acceptance of vehicles authorised or admitted in accordance with equivalent provisions.

3. States may choose the level of interoperability suitable for them, i.e. border crossing of vehicles only or of complete trains. The technical provisions should cater to requirements at all levels and should therefore be appropriately flexible. However, this also justifies the development of far reaching interoperability provisions to be used only between states which want to facilitate the cross-border operation of complete trains.

4. Compatibility with the European Union legislation must be maintained. This does not mean that all aspects can be taken over, as the general scope of COTIF must be complied with. For example, elements from European Union legislation linked only to market opening, either for services or for products, should not be taken over as there is no basis for them in COTIF.

5. There may be potential to simplify some existing COTIF provisions which have already been taken over from EU law, for example those linked to vehicle admission/authorisation (consisting of verifications, declarations, certifications etc.). It could e.g. be analysed, in coordination with sector organisations, whether the number of different levels related to vehicle
admission (i.e. ‘interoperability constituents’ (IC) level, subsystem-level and vehicle-level) are actually useful or could be reduced.

6. The technical provisions of COTIF should be attuned to the possible accession of additional regional economic integration organisations which meet the conditions of Article 38 of COTIF. Provided the relevant conditions are met, these organisations should be able to enjoy similar legal relations with COTIF as the EU currently enjoys\(^1\). In this context, the feasibility should be analysed of:
   - The current symmetry between EU law and ATMF as set out in Article 3a of ATMF.
   - The requirement for a 2-column layout in UTPs as set out in Article 8 § 9 of APTU.

Any feasibility analysis or proposal for modification of these provisions should be accompanied by concrete alternative proposals which ensure that no functionality will be lost, and by an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed modifications.

7. The technical provisions should consist of:
   - Prescriptive rules to ensure interoperability, but limited in scope to what is essential in terms of the aims of the Convention and the scope of its appendices. This is a well-established principle of the existing UTPs.
   - Where relevant, complemented by recommended practices for efficient and harmonised solutions whose application is voluntary. Examples are Appendix C to the UTP/TSI for freight wagons and the draft provisions for interchangeable passenger coaches.

3. UPDATING DETAILED PROVISIONS

On 1 March 2019, the modifications to the APTU and ATMF UR adopted by Revision Committee at its 26\(^{th}\) session entered into force. The modifications ensure continued compatibility with the provisions of the railway directives applicable in the European Union in the context of the fourth railway package. As a next step, the more detailed subsidiary provisions are being addressed.

In 2018, the following UTPs were aligned with the latest provisions applicable in the EU, in particular:
   - UTP GEN-A (Essential requirements),
   - UTP GEN-B (Subsystems),
   - UTP GEN-C (Technical file)

and at its 12\(^{th}\) session (Bern 12-13 June 2019) the Committee decided on the prioritisation of tasks. Accordingly, proposals for decision on the following provisions were prepared for the 13\(^{th}\) session:
   - Annex A on the certification of entities in charge of maintenance,
   - UTP NOI (rolling stock noise),
   - Vehicle register specifications,

\(^1\) The preconditions for such similar legal relations should be met, such as, for example, similar and compatible requirements concerning: approval of railway material, procedures and responsibilities concerning railway operations and maintenance; verification procedures and independence; qualification requirements related to the entities/authorities which perform the tests/checks.
• UTP WAG (freight wagons) and
• UTP Marking (vehicle numbering and marking).

The CTE also suggested that the UTPs related to vehicles other than freight wagons should be addressed and that a new UTP concerning infrastructure should be drafted. Following discussions at the 38th and 39th sessions of WG TECH, a new UTP concerning route compatibility checks and train composition should also be developed. It should contain a list of all relevant route compatibility parameters to be checked by railway undertakings and provisions concerning train preparation and pre-departure checks (currently set out in Appendix I to the UTP WAG and Appendix K to the UTP LOC&PAS). The UTP would be based on two EU Commission Implementing Regulations: OPE TSI (2019/773) and the RINF infrastructure register (2019/777).

This means proposals for the following UTPs should be prepared for the 14th session of the Committee:

• Revision of UTP LOC&PAS (locomotives and passenger rolling stock),
• Revision of UTP PRM (accessibility for people with reduced mobility),
• A new UTP concerning infrastructure,
• A new UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks and
• Revision of UTP TAF (telematics applications for freight).

Furthermore, in 2020 the EU is expected to amend the WAG TSI and the LOC&PAS TSI as regards provisions concerning the extension of the area of use and transition phases. As a consequence, in addition to the UTP LOC&PAS already mentioned above:

• The UTP WAG should again be reviewed and possibly modified.

If proposals for the 13th session are not adopted by the Committee, new proposals should be prepared for the 14th session as a priority.

4. DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO THE EST UR (APPENDIX H)

In September 2018, at the 13th session of the General Assembly, a new Appendix H to COTIF was adopted. Entry into force of the EST UR is pending approval by two-thirds of the OTIF Member States which, according to previous experience, may take several years. After this required approval is obtained, it will take approximately one year for the provisions to enter into force. The General Assembly recommended that the Committee of Technical Experts prepare proposals for annexes to the EST UR before the EST UR enter into force. The proposals could then be adopted by the Committee of Technical Experts without delay after the EST UR enter into force.

More particularly, in order to implement the requirements of the EST UR in a harmonised way, the annexes to be developed will include:

• A Common Safety Method for safety management system requirements to be applied by Safety Certification Authorities when issuing Safety Certificates and by railway undertakings and infrastructure managers when developing, implementing, maintaining and improving their safety management systems;
• A Common Safety Method on monitoring to be applied by railway undertakings and infrastructure managers and entities in charge of maintenance;
• The necessary links to the Common Safety Method on risk evaluation and assessment to be applied by the railway undertakings, infrastructure managers and entities in charge of maintenance when making any technical, operational or organisational change to the railway system;

• A Common Safety Method on supervision to be applied by Supervision Authorities.

Furthermore, the Committee of Technical Experts will consider the inclusion of harmonised procedures for the issuing of Safety Certificates.

Considering the relatively long time it might take for the EST UR to enter into force, it is proposed not to give the development of these annexes priority, but to start developing them once the UTPs have been updated in accordance with this work programme. Development in this area therefore will not start before the 14th session of the Committee.

5. PROPOSAL FOR DECISION

The Committee of Technical Experts adopts the priorities and provisional timetable for the revision of UTPs and other provisions under the scope of the APTU UR, the ATMF UR and the EST UR set out in this document and requests the Secretariat, in coordination with the standing working group (WG TECH), to draft proposals to modify or establish the technical provisions of COTIF accordingly and submit them to the Committee for approval.

In particular, this means proposals for the following UTPs should be prepared for the 14th session of the Committee:

• Revision of UTP LOC&PAS (locomotives and passenger rolling stock),

• Revision of UTP PRM (accessibility for people with reduced mobility),

• A new UTP concerning infrastructure,

• A new UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks,

• Revision of UTP TAF (telematics applications for freight),

• Revision of the UTP WAG (freight wagons).

If proposals for the 13th session are not adopted by the Committee, new proposals should be prepared for the 14th session as a priority.
*) assuming the proposals for CTE 13 (June 2020) are adopted; if not, new proposals should be submitted to CTE 14 (2021).