



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les
transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den
internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for
International Carriage by Rail

WG TECH

44th Session

Minutes

Remote meeting, 8-9.9.2021

WG TECH 44 SUMMARY 8 AND 9 SEPTEMBER 2021

- 1. The United Kingdom, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, was elected to chair the session.**
- 2. The agenda submitted in document TECH-21020 dated 13.7.2021 was adopted.**
- 3. The Secretariat presented the latest developments in OTIF.**
- 4. The minutes of the 43rd session of WG TECH were approved.**
- 5. For discussion**

WG TECH 44 reviewed all the working documents, which were prepared by the Secretariat, and discussed comments from delegates. The Secretariat will update all the draft working documents and upload them onto OTIF's website for review by WG TECH 45. Delegates were invited to send the OTIF Secretariat any additional comments in writing, should they have any. In particular:

5.1. With regard to the development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF)

a. Annex A to EST UR (TECH-21013 version 2 dated 06.08.2021)

- WG TECH noted subjects that needed further clarification.
- WG TECH agreed to investigate whether an additional annex to EST UR concerning procedures, structure, content and validity of safety certificates was necessary.

b. Annex B to EST UR (TECH-21014 version 2 dated 06.08.2021)

- There were no substantive comments.

5.2. With regard to the revision of UTP TAF (Telematics applications for freight services)

- ERA presented the ongoing process of the TAF and TAP TSIs revision at EU level.
- WG TECH was of the view that the process of revising the UTP TAF should not be postponed to await the outcome of the EU revision.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to prepare an updated version of the working document for review by WG TECH 45, with the aim of having the proposal submitted to CTE 14.

5.3. Analysis and review of Annex B to the ATMF UR (Derogations)

- WG TECH 45 requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft a proposal for a new version of Annex B to ATMF UR.

5.4. Vehicle registers

- ERA presented the planning concerning the development and implementation of the EVR.
- WG TECH discussed:
 - The possibility of granting entities and authorities in non-EU CS reading rights of vehicle data in the EVR.
 - The requirements and practicalities related to the additional registration in the EVR of vehicles from non-EU CSs that enter the EU and the necessity of changing the vehicle number (EVN) of such vehicles.
- WG TECH requested the OTIF Secretariat to draft suggestions for modification of the OTIF vehicle register specifications to address the issues raised.

6. Developments in EU regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by ERA and the European Commission)

WG TECH was informed that there had been no changes since the previous (43rd) WG TECH meeting.

- 7. The cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology was reviewed.**
- 8. The EU – OTIF equivalence table was reviewed.**

9. Any other business

None

10. Next session (WG TECH 45): Bern, 3 and 4 November 2021.

DISCUSSION

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers (head of OTIF's Technical Interoperability Department) who, together with Ms Maria Price and Mr Dragan Nešić, represented the OTIF Secretariat (hereinafter: "the Secretariat") welcomed all the participants, particularly those attending the session for the first time: Mr Ahmadi from Afghanistan, Mr Broos from Belgium and Mr Yousfani from Pakistan. He then opened the 44th session of the standing working group TECH (hereinafter: WG TECH). The session was held remotely. The list of participants is attached to these minutes as [Annex I](#). The Secretariat received apologies from OSJD and Ms Alice Polo, as both had to cancel their attendance due to other meetings.

The **Secretariat** presented the practical arrangements for the remote WG TECH meeting.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

The **Secretariat** proposed the United Kingdom (Mr Vaibhav Puri) to chair the session. There were no other proposals. Mr Vaibhav Puri accepted the nomination and WG TECH unanimously elected GB, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, to chair this session.

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

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

WG TECH adopted the agenda for the 44th session as proposed in the invitation letter TECH-21020 dated 13.7.2021 ([Annex II](#)).

3. INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT

The **Secretariat** provided an overview of developments since the 43rd WG TECH. It informed the meeting about the following:

- That the depositary notification of decisions taken by CTE 13 had been sent ([NOT-21008](#) dated 23 July 2021). The adopted provisions will enter into force on 1 January 2022, unless at least one quarter of the Member States formulate an objection before the deadline of 19 November 2021.
- That circular letter concerning monitoring and assessment of the implementation of APTU and ATMF UR by the Contracting States (CSs) had been sent (TECH-21026 dated 6 August 2021). CSs were requested to respond to the questionnaire before the deadline of 6 November 2021.
- The OTIF circular letter concerning the consultation by ERA on the draft revisions of the TAF TSI and TAP TSI had been sent (TECH-21027 dated 18 August 2021). Non-EU OTIF CS were asked to give their views on the preliminary drafts before the deadline of 31 October 2021.

With regard to this point, GB asked the Secretariat whether there were any plans to take over the provisions of the TAP TSI into a UTP. In reply to GB's question, the **Secretariat** explained that this was not part of CTE's current work programme and before planning such a task, a more detailed analysis of the feasibility of taking over TAP provisions in COTIF would be necessary.

- The Working Group of Legal Experts (GTEJ) was scheduled for 9 and 10 November 2021. WG TECH 39 had requested assistance from GTEJ for further analysis and advice concerning the mutual recognition of ECM certificates. This question was on the agenda of the said meeting.
- The main agenda items of the 15th General Assembly were as follows: Election of the Secretary General for the period from 2022–2024, general discussion on OTIF's Long Term Strategy, report of the ad hoc Committee on Cooperation and the Working Group of Legal Experts – GTEJ (among others, the monitoring and assessment of legal instruments), general discussion on the budget framework and designation of the Administrative Committee for the period 2022-2024.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 43RD SESSION OF WG TECH

Document: [WG TECH 43 PVM](#) Provisional minutes of WG TECH 43

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that the provisional minutes had been sent to delegates who had attended the 43rd session of WG TECH on 9 July 2021. Following comments received from ERA and CER, the modified provisional minutes had been uploaded for the attention of WG TECH 44. At the session, the meeting was informed of a minor correction concerning the name of the Austrian ministry in charge of transport. There were no further comments. The Chair therefore concluded that the minutes of the 43rd session of WG TECH were approved.

5. FOR DISCUSSION:

5.1. Development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF)

a. Annex A - Common Safety Method on Safety Management System requirements

Document: [TECH-21013](#) Draft for review by WG TECH 44 (version 2 dated 06.08.2021)
(Common Safety Method on Safety Management System requirements)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of the draft working document TECH-21013. The modifications compared to version 1 were in track changes.

RS suggested that Article 7 § 2 point b) should be more precise in defining which national rules must be notified to the Secretary General in addition to the text reference to Article 12 of APTU UR, which was about the notification of national requirements concerning vehicles. **GB** supported **RS** and added that even some guidance or public instruction on those national rules might be of use. The **Secretariat** agreed and proposed that the reference to Article 3 § 4 of EST UR be used instead.

DE wondered whether the wording in point 2.1.1 (j) of Annex I could be more precise in defining “*the main place of business*” of the RU. It suggested the wording “*the place where the RU is registered in the commercial register*”. **NB-Rail** proposed wording for “*Multi-Site Organization*” as used in the IAF Mandatory Document, which had been aligned with ISO/IEC TS 17023:2013: “*An organization covered by a single management system comprising an identified central function (not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain processes/activities are planned and controlled, and a number of sites (permanent, temporary or virtual) at which such processes/activities are fully or partially carried out*”.¹ The **Secretariat** took note of **DE**’s and **NB-Rail**’s proposals and offered to consider them carefully and modify the working document for the next meeting of WG TECH.

With regard to the last paragraph of point 2.1.1 (j) of Annex I, **RS** wondered why the mutual acceptance of the assessment results was limited to leadership and commitment. It wondered whether the entire SMS could be subject to mutual acceptance and later be used when issuing safety certificates. It suggested deleting the mutual acceptance of the leadership and commitment assessment, as mutual acceptance should refer not only to these assessments, but to all assessments concerning the SMS.

The **Secretariat** explained that in accordance with the EST UR, RUs were required to obtain a safety certificate in each state in which they wished to operate trains in international traffic. The SMS was a precondition for obtaining a safety certificate. However, the EST UR did not contain the principle of the (automatic) mutual recognition of safety certificates. In principle, the validity of safety certificates was limited to the state that issued it. The mutual recognition of safety certificates was possible, but only on the basis of an additional separate agreement between states. Accordingly, the scope of Annex A was limited to the SMS requirements. With regard to the mutual acceptance of the assessment results on leadership and commitment, as part of the SMS, it was important that the assessment was carried out only once, in the state where the senior management of the RU was based. The **Secretariat** agreed with **RS** that the assessment

¹ The International Accreditation Forum (IAF), Inc.
IAF Mandatory Document for the Audit and Certification of a Management System Operated by a Multi-Site Organization
(IAF MD 1:2018, issue 2, 29.01.2018, on page 6); https://iaf.nu/iaf_system/uploads/documents/MD1Issue2Jan2018Pub29012018.pdf

result had to be mutually accepted on the basis of the EST UR and that as a result, it did not have to be repeated in an Annex to it. Therefore, the mutual acceptance of the leadership and commitment assessment should indeed be deleted.

NB RAIL suggested using the following wording instead: “*unless there is justifiable doubt, a safety certificate can be considered as proof of compliance with the rules that apply to it, in order to avoid duplication of the assessment of requirements common to the CSs*”. In its view, this wording would avoid possible duplicate assessment.

The **Secretariat** took note and would modify the working document for the next meeting of WG TECH.

RS proposed that a new annex to EST UR be drafted to deal with the procedures, structure, content and validity of safety certificates. It suggested that such an annex should define the requirements for a foreign RU to obtain a safety certificate from the safety certification authority and how the certificate should look. Although such an annex was not listed in Article 8 § 3 of the EST UR, the **Secretariat** confirmed that the list in Article 8 was not exhaustive, so it would be possible to develop annexes in addition to those listed. It was not sure whether it was necessary to harmonise the safety certification process between CSs. The Secretariat suggested that RS could be invited to prepare a document to explain its ideas. This document could be submitted to the next WG TECH meeting for discussion. **RS** agreed.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH noted the subjects that needed further clarification in working document TECH-21013, version 2 dated 06.08.2021 prepared by the Secretariat, in particular:
 - Article 7 (b), which national rules must be notified to the OTIF Secretariat;
 - Section 2.1.1 (j), the wording *main place of business*. The last paragraph in letter (j) could be reworded so that duplicate assessments could be avoided.
- The Secretariat was invited to prepare an updated version of the working document for review by WG TECH 45.
- WG TECH noted that the mutual acceptance of safety certificates is outside the scope of Annex A, However, it would discuss whether the additional annex to EST UR concerning the procedures, structure, content and validity of safety certificates was necessary. RS agreed to prepare the initial draft and submit it to the WG TECH 45 for discussion.

b. Annex B - Common Safety Method on monitoring

Documents: [TECH-21014](#) Draft for review by WG TECH 44 (version 2 dated 06.08.2021)
(Common Safety Method on monitoring)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of the draft working document TECH-21014. The main modifications were in track changes.

As there were no comments on the draft working document, the **Chair** concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH had no comments on working document TECH-21014 version 2 dated 06.08.2021, prepared by the Secretariat.
- The Secretariat was invited to accept all the track changes in the document and publish it as version 3 for WG TECH 45.

5.2. Revision of UTP TAF (Telematics applications for freight services)

Document: [TECH-21015](#) Draft for review by WG TECH 44 (version 2 dated 06.08.2021)
(Telematics applications for freight services)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of the draft working document TECH-21015. The modifications were in track changes and highlighted in yellow compared to the first version. The Secretariat reminded the meeting of the ongoing ERA consultations on the draft revisions of the TAF TSI and TAP TSI ([TECH-21027](#) dated 8 August 2021). These future revisions would be in addition to the TSI with which the UTP was currently being harmonised. The Secretariat therefore suggested that the meeting should discuss the impact of these future TSI revisions on the current UTP TAF revision process. In particular, the

Secretariat asked whether the UTP revision should be put on hold until the new TSI revision had been finalised, so that it could also be taken into account in the UTP revision. In connection with this, the Secretariat asked ERA to present the TAF and TAP revision process.

ERA (Mr Skibinski) presented the TAF/TAP TSI revision process and its milestones and proposed changes to the legal texts and further steps. He pointed out that there was a plan for the partial merging of those parts of the TAF/TAP that were common to each other, which related to path allocation, real-time data and IT requirements. He also explained in more detail the other changes envisaged in the draft revised TAF TSI, subject to consultations². Lastly, he informed the meeting that ERA would make the relevant recommendation to the Commission before 31 December 2021.

The **Chair** thanked Mr. Skibinski for the presentation. He pointed out that there were two options on how to proceed with the revision of the UTP TAF. The first option would be to wait until the ongoing revision of TAF/TAP TSI was finished (i.e. adopted by the EU), or to continue the revision of UTP TAF as planned, as the second option. The risk inherent in the first option would be the creation of inconsistencies between TAF TSI and UTP TAF for the next three years.

GB was in favour of the second option. In addition, it suggested considering the impact on the railway industry at CTE 14, bearing in mind the likely inconsistencies between the revised UTP TAF and the latest TAF TSI.

The **Chair** noted that there were no other remarks or objections and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH had no substantial comments on the working document TECH-21015 version 2 dated 06.08.2021 prepared by the Secretariat.
- WG TECH took note of a presentation by ERA on the ongoing process of revising the TAF and TAP TSIs.
- With regard to the ongoing new revision of the TAF and TAP TSIs at EU level, WG TECH was of the view that the process of revising the UTP TAF should not be postponed to await the outcome of the EU revision, so the UTP should be revised in line with the version of the TSI currently in force.
- WG TECH would review the working document at its next session, with the aim of submitting the proposal to CTE 14.

5.3. Analysis and review of Annex B to the ATMF UR (Derogations)

Document: [TECH-21016](#) Draft for review by WG TECH 44 (version 2 dated 06.08.2021)
(Derogations)

The **Secretariat** gave an overview of the activities carried out so far. It then presented the second version of the draft working document TECH-21015. The modifications were in track changes compared to the first version. The new version suggested the revision of Annex B to ATMF and suggested some principles and the substance of the revision.

RS, GB, CER and **UIC** welcomed the document and supported the proposals it contained.

RS requested clarification of the conditions under which applicants would be allowed to request permission for derogations (second indent of the penultimate paragraph on page 5).

GB agreed with **RS**. It highlighted the fact that Annex B to the ATMF UR should not deal with derogations on infrastructure.

CER provided editorial comments.

In its reply to **RS**'s request, the **Secretariat** proposed to add the following clarifications (in bold) in the penultimate paragraph on page 5: "...request permission, **with justification**, for derogations concerning specific..." (in the second indent) and "... **and to facilitate route compatibility assessment.**" (at the end

² Some of the subjects explained: inclusion of port authorities in the data exchange, facilitation of combined transport, adding the new identifiers (a unique ID for all objects in the TAF process), adding a temporary specific case to delay the use of 4N company code until the end of 2025, and including a link to the SMGS (OSJD) consignment note.

of the fourth indent). WG TECH tacitly agreed with the modifications, which were shown on the screen. With regard to the next steps, the Secretariat proposed that it could draft a new version of Annex B to ATMF UR following the principles explained in the document. Once adopted, the current version should be repealed.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH had no substantial comments on working document TECH-21016 version 2 dated 25.5.2021 prepared by the Secretariat.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to draft a proposal for a new version of Annex B to ATMF UR for review by WG TECH 45.

5.4. Vehicle registers

Document: [TECH-21017](#) Discussion paper for review by WG TECH 44 (dated 06.08.2021)
(the relevance of access to vehicle registers)

The **Secretariat** gave an overview of the activities carried out so far. It then presented working document TECH-21017. It reminded the meeting of the main elements of the OTIF Specifications for vehicle registers (OTIF Specifications), which had entered into force on 1 April 2021. The Secretariat pointed out the relationship between the OTIF Specifications and the EVR and the associated scenarios, as follows:

- EU Member States that use the EVR would not be subject to the OTIF Specifications.
- Vehicles from the non-EU Contracting States intended to be used in international traffic within the EU must be registered in the EVR. The data would therefore be accessible to relevant actors in the EU through the EVR.
- If vehicles registered in the EVR were used in non-EU states that do not use the EVR, the data concerning these vehicles should also be accessible to relevant actors in the non-EU state where the vehicles were used. However, the OTIF Specifications did not currently regulate non-EU actors' access to vehicle data stored in the EVR.
- If data concerning a foreign vehicle could not be retrieved, the state where the vehicle was used may require that the vehicle data be re-entered, leading to additional registration.
- Additional registration should be avoided where possible.

In the proposed way forward, the Secretariat proposed that the following be considered:

- Development of guidelines and/or modifications to the OTIF Specifications for vehicle registers on the basis of practical use cases, with the aim of avoiding the additional registration of vehicles.
- The OTIF rules require that the Contracting States should make it possible for all eligible foreign actors to retrieve vehicle data on any vehicle that they have registered and which is used internationally. However, EU states are instead bound by the requirements of the EU EVR Decision.
- Vehicle data in the EVR should also be accessible to eligible actors in the non-EU Contracting States that do not use the EVR, but on whose territory the EVR-registered vehicle is used. Without access to the EVR vehicle data, these non-EU Contracting States were entitled to require that the vehicle data must also appear in their own registers. This would mean additional registrations.
- Access to foreign vehicle data should be limited to vehicles that are actually used in the Contracting State concerned.
- The *area of use* of a vehicle could serve as an indicator of where the vehicle will be used.
- The OTIF Specifications should be revised to this end.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission indicated after the meeting there is no need to revise the OTIF Specifications, as they already fulfilled the purpose described above.

The Chair thanked the Secretariat for presenting the subject. He emphasised two aspects that needed to be clarified. Firstly, how access to the registers would be provided (*automatic access* by using a pre-assigned user name and password, or access to vehicle data *after submitting a request* to the appropriate registration entity). Secondly, how the additional registration in other vehicle registers should be understood (as a *re-inputting* of data in another system or as *re-registration* in the system)?

ERA (Mr Kaupat) reminded the meeting that Annex II point 3.3 of the EVR Decision governed access rights to the EVR. In the case of non-EU Contracting States, access rights were subject to bilateral agreements with the EU. With regard to additional registration, ERA confirmed that the EU Member States had to register the vehicle that had entered the EU rail system in the EVR if the vehicle's data were not already in the EVR (Annex II, point 3.2.1.5 of the EVR Decision).

ERA (Mr Fajardo) further explained that as far as he understood, vehicles additionally registered in the EVR would be assigned a new EVN. In practical terms, the new registration with this new EVN (related to the EU Member State that issued the EVN) would contain a parameter with the previous 12-digit number. Without prejudice to the position of the European Commission, access to the EVR would only be given to the competent authorities of the non-EU Contracting States (i.e. registration entities), not to other actors. These entities would be allowed to check a selected vehicle's data one at a time. He thought that the Secretariat's suggestion to use the *area of use* as one of the indicators related to access rights was a good idea. However, he also noted that that subject was not regulated at EU level and was not therefore implemented in the EVR. In reply to the Chair's question with regard to what the implications for the vehicle marking would be when the EVN had been changed, he suggested that this subject should be further investigated.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission indicated after the meeting that:

- EU legislation does not require mandatory assignment of a new EVN. On the contrary, EU legislation explicitly allows the current 12 digit number to be kept. The 12 digit number of that vehicle will therefore be registered in the EVR by the first EU Member State where the vehicle will operate. What the IT tool currently allows may be a subset of functionalities, but they will all be implemented.
- For EU registered wagons which operate in non-EU countries, third parties will be given limited EVR access.

ERA (Mr Dayez) gave an overview of developments in the EVR and the steps that were still to be taken. At present, EU Member States were either allowed to use the centralised EVR or to continue using their (decentralised) vehicle register, adapted to EVR by the relevant Member State until 2024, with a link to the EVR. The European Commission had also offered non-EU Contracting States the opportunity of using the EVR in a centralised manner. According to ERA's plans, the EVR would be fully operational before the end of 2021. Bearing in mind that not all the EU MS would migrate their vehicle data into EVR before the end of 2021, ERA proposed to the European Commission that the ECVVR should continue to be available during 2022 and would thus work in parallel with the EVR. This would ensure business continuity, including the possibility of consulting vehicle registration data at least until 2022.

RS reiterated its position that additional registration of the same vehicle in several registers should be avoided. It pointed out that access to all registers (including the EVR) should be provided to all eligible actors. RS asked ERA to provide more details concerning the usage of the EVR and ECVVR, i.e. contact points, charges and costs; technical requirements concerning software and hardware, etc.

In reply, **ERA** explained that there were still open questions regarding the level of costs and charges. It pointed out that due to ERA's limited resources for the migration of data to a centralised EVR, the EU Member States' vehicle data would be dealt with first. Non-EU Contracting States would be able to use the ECVVR under certain conditions, in accordance with the assigned access rights, at least until 2022.

GB expressed its concerns regarding the concept of two EVNs and multiple registrations. It highlighted the importance of extending access rights to the EVR to all eligible actors and not only to the competent authorities. Otherwise, it would have to be ensured that vehicles entering the United Kingdom were also registered in the GB's NVR. GB encouraged the EU to seek a solution, even if it resulted in a change to the

relevant EU legislation. Furthermore, it should be ensured that vehicles registered in the EVR could keep their original EVN, irrespective of where it was issued. Otherwise, international traffic would be hampered significantly.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission indicated after the meeting that two numbers would not be required and that vehicles will keep their original number.

CER requested clarification on a number of points concerning the extent of the problem: how many Contracting States would use the EVR, how many vehicles would be affected by additional registration, what progress was there with regard to the Data Search and Consultation function (DSC function), could the DSC function be used to search the NVRs of the Contracting States that do not use the EVR and, lastly, how would the EVR be implemented throughout 2022-2024 and beyond?

ERA (Mr Fajardo) confirmed that until the end of 2024 the EU Member States were permitted, at their request, to keep their vehicle data in a decentralised database adapted to the EVR, by means of the so-called DSC function. He confirmed that the ECVVR would remain operational in 2022, but it had not yet been decided whether it would continue to run in 2023 and 2024. With regard to the DSC function, this would only be provided until 2024 for the EU Member States that requested it. Mr Dayez added that it would also be provided to non-EU Contracting States upon request, for which a budget still needed to be allocated.. ERA noted that at present, only railway vehicles from the EU Member States and those coming from ATMF Contracting States that had so requested could be registered in the EVR.

The **Secretariat** thanked ERA for the information provided and expressed its disappointment and concerns about it. For many years, within the context of WG TECH and CTE, the Contracting States, the EU and the sector associations had constructively cooperated to find solutions that facilitated international traffic. It questioned whether renumbering vehicles, limiting or preventing access to vehicle data and the requirement to register vehicles in two or more registers was in line with the aim of the Organisation to facilitate, in all aspects, international traffic by rail. The Secretariat hoped that WG TECH would consider potential consequences and that a practical solution would be found in a constructive spirit. It hoped that the European Commission and ERA would also consider the consequences and investigate whether the problem could be resolved.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission indicated after the meeting that it would not be necessary to renumber vehicles and that access to vehicle data would not be prevented. There should not be a legal problem; it was merely a matter of IT implementation of the EVR,

UIC and **CER** supported the Secretariat. They both pointed out that the creation of new barriers should be avoided.

ERA (Mr Kaupat) said it hoped that a solution would be found. It reminded the meeting of the EU's arguments and the reasoning that had led to the creation of the EVR, which should ensure, inter alia, simplification of the vehicle registration process, the reduction of costs and improved data quality. In its point of view, although it was not perfect, the EVR did offer an improvement and mitigate the problems related to the ECVVR.

GB suggested an interpretation of point 4.1.1 of Annex II of the EVR Decision, according to which the EVN of a vehicle that already has a 12-digit number should not be changed.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission indicated after the meeting that this was the correct interpretation of the EVR provisions.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion so far and emphasised that international traffic should not be undermined. It noted that a practical problem had arisen and that pragmatic solutions were required.

CER suggested that WG TECH should not focus on the interpretation of the EVR but on how to facilitate international traffic in the meaning of COTIF instead.

GB supported CER. In its view, the OTIF specifications for registers did not serve the same purpose as the EVR in the EU. It informed the meeting that its NVR was quite comprehensive and contained more information than the EVR. From GB's perspective, it should be feasible for both vehicle registers to work simultaneously without any problems.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission shared this view after the meeting. However, the EVR could not guarantee a connection with all non-EU registers. For this purpose, EVR could provide one unique interface for external connection, for example an OTIF register.

The **Secretariat** said it understood the merits of the EVR for the EU. It reminded the meeting of the OTIF specifications for vehicle registers, which took into account the EVR and, at least at a legal level, ensured compatibility between the EVR and any other national or regional vehicle registers. This would only work if the data concerning vehicles operating internationally were accessible to all relevant actors. This could avoid additional registrations in multiple vehicle registers. The Secretariat supported the suggestion from CER and GB. WG TECH was not the place to consider or discuss modifications to the EU provisions on registers. It was, however, the place to discuss and develop OTIF specifications. The Secretariat suggested that, as a first step, WG TECH could examine possible modifications to the OTIF specifications for vehicle registers that would address the issues that had been discussed. Then, as a next step, the European Commission and ERA could be invited to check whether these modifications were compatible with EU law.

Post meeting note:

The European Commission indicated after the meeting that there is no need to modify the OTIF or EU register specifications. The current provisions already granted relevant authorities access and did not require changes to vehicle numbers.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion and noted that the approach with two EVNs and additional registrations would have significant implications and present a number of legal challenges. He encouraged WG TECH to find pragmatic solutions to this end. He concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-21017 dated 06.08.2021 prepared by the OTIF Secretariat. Delegates were invited to send written comments to the OTIF Secretariat, should they have any.
- WG TECH noted the timeline concerning the development of the EVR provided by ERA.
- WG TECH discussed the following information provided by ERA:
 - The concept of access rights to the EVR, whereby only the competent authorities (registration entities) of the non-EU CS will be given access, and
 - The additional registration of vehicle data in the EVR, where the additional vehicle number (EVN) would be assigned in addition to the existing one.

Delegates expressed their concerns, pointed out the potential practical problems and consequences concerning both items and invited ERA to find appropriate IT solutions to fulfil the EVR and OTIF specifications.
- Open questions to be discussed at the next WG TECH meeting:
 - Implications of potentially having two EVNs, followed by legal observation.
 - Implications for the marking of vehicles and with regard to the requirements of the UTP Marking.
- Further development of OTIF vehicle registers

- WG TECH requested the OTIF Secretariat to draft suggestions for modifications to the OTIF vehicle register specifications for review by WG TECH 45. The focus should be on facilitating international traffic without creating more barriers and on mitigating existing barriers, notably how to avoid the need for additional (multiple) registrations. The next step would be to analyse compliance with the EU legislation.

Post meeting note:

With regard to these conclusions, the European Commission indicated after the meeting that:

- Vehicles will not have to be renumbered
- Vehicles will not have two numbers.
- There is no need to modify the OTIF or EU register specifications.

Therefore, no further discussion, analysis or proposals regarding these matters are needed.

6. DEVELOPMENTS IN EU REGULATIONS THAT ARE OF RELEVANCE TO COTIF (PRESENTED BY ERA AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION)

ERA (Christoph Kaupat) informed the meeting that there were no new developments since his last report to the last WG TECH meeting. He reminded the meeting of the six-month delay to the previously agreed schedule for TSI revisions, so that ERA's recommendations would be submitted to the Commission before the end of June 2022. ERA expected that these recommendations could be approved by RISC in November 2022.

The **Chair** noted that there were no questions or comments during the meeting.

7. CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: [TECH-17049](#) Working document for review by WG TECH 44 (dated 06.08.2021)

The **Secretariat** presented the document. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 43, there were no modifications.

8. EU-OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: [TECH-18024](#) Working document for review by WG TECH 44 (dated 05.08.2021)

The **Secretariat** presented the document. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 43, the following modifications had been made in the form of tracked changes:

- The table concerning vehicle registers had been renamed *Vehicle Register Specifications* (instead of the former *National Vehicle Register (NVR Uniform Rules)*)
- The *comments* column had been updated to reflect:
 - The pending status of the provisions adopted at CTE 13 (new UTPs for TCRC and INF and revised UTPs for LOC&PAS, WAG and PRM)
 - The extension of the scope to include ECMs for all types of vehicles (ATMF Annex A)
 - The status of the discussion on requirements and the procedure for derogations (ATMF Annex B)
 - Further editorial corrections (UTP GEN-B, UTP GEN-C and UTP TAF).

WG TECH took note of the document without further comment.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

10. NEXT SESSIONS

45th session of WG TECH – 3 and 4 November 2021 in Bern, remote or hybrid meeting.

14th session of CTE - 14 and 15 June 2022 in Bern, remote or hybrid meeting.

46th session of WG TECH – 16 June 2022 in Bern, remote or hybrid meeting.

47th session of WG TECH – 7 and 8 September 2022 in Bern, remote or hybrid meeting, directly following the JCGE meeting.

CLOSING REMARKS

The **Chair** thanked all the participants for the productive discussion and the OTIF Secretariat for preparing all the documents on time and closed the 44th session of WG TECH.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ANNEX I

I. Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments**Afghanistan**

M./Hr./Mr. Faridon **Ahmadi**
(Only 1st day) Maintenance Engineer of Installation, Equipment
Afghanistan Railway Authority

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

M./Hr./Mr. Philipp **Unger** Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Sachgebiet 92 Internationale Angelegenheiten

Autriche/Österreich/Austria

M./Hr./Mr. Thomas **Helnwein** Dipl.-Ing.
Bundesministerium für Klimaschutz, Umwelt, Energie,
Mobilität, Innovation und Technologie
Sektion IV - Verkehr
Gruppe Eisenbahn/Abteilung E5 – Technik

Belgique/Belgien/Belgium

M./Hr./Mr. Luc **Opsomer** Ing. Expert matériel roulant ferroviaire
Service de Sécurité et d'Interopérabilité des Chemins
de Fer

M./Hr./Mr. Johan **Broos** FOD Mobiliteit en Vervoer
(Only 1st day)

France/Frankreich/France

M./Hr./Mr. Anthony **Godart** Chef de délégation
Chargé d'affaires

M./Hr./Mr. Henri **Lacour** Chargé de mission à l'international
Ministère de la Transition écologique

Italie/Italien/Italy

M./Hr./Mr. Rocco **Cammarata** Head of Technical Standards of Vehicles Office
Agenzia Nazionale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie

Pakistan

M./Hr./Mr. Kashif **Yousfani** Chief Marketing Manager
Ministry of Railways, Government of Pakistan

Roumanie/Rumänien/RomaniaM./Hr./Mr. Dragos **Floroiu**Scientific Secretary
Romanian Railway Authority**Royaume-Uni/
Vereinigtes Königreich
United Kingdom**M./Hr./Mr. Peter **Coverdale**Policy Advisor
Department for TransportM./Hr./Mr. Vaibhav **Puri**Deputy Director of Standards and Head of Technical &
Regulatory Policy
Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB)**Serbie/Serbien/Serbia**M./Hr./Mr. Milan **Popović**Head of the railway safety department
Directorate for Railways**Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland**Mme/Fr./Ms Linda **Ay**Project Manager Safety and Interoperability
Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland – FOT**II. Organisation régionale d'intégration économique
Regionale Organisation für wirtschaftliche Integration
Regional economic integration organisation****Union européenne / Europäische Union / European Union****Commission européenne/
Europäische Kommission/
European Commission**Mme/Fr./Ms Alice **Polo**

Sent appologies

**European Union Agency for Railways
(ERA)**M./Hr./Mr. Peter **Mihm**Head of Technical Cooperation
Strategy, Research and International Standards UnitM./Hr./Mr. Rémy Dayez
(Only 2nd day)Chef de la division Sécurité Interopérabilité,
Section de coordinationM./Hr./Mr. Christoph **Kaupat**

Project Officer

M./Hr./Mr. Javier Vicente **Fajardo**

Project Officer

M./Hr./Mr. Filip **Skibinski**
(Only 1st day)

Project Officer

**III. Organisations et associations internationales non-gouvernementales
Nichtstaatliche internationale Organisationen und Verbände
International non-governmental Organisations or Associations**

CER

M./Hr./Mr. Gilles **Quesnel**

Directeur Interopérabilité et Normalisation (SNCF)
CER / SNCF

NB Rail

M./Hr./Mr. Francis **Parmentier**
(Only 1st day)

General Manager of the NB Rail Association

OSJD

M./Hr./Mr. Radovan **Vopalecky**

Sent appologies

UIC


M./Hr./Mr. Jozef **Fázik**

Chargé de mission, Relations Institutionelles
Union internationale des chemins de fer (UIC)

**IV. Secrétariat
Sekretariat
Secretariat**


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

Head of Department

 +41 (31) 359 10 25
Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
E-mail bas.leermakers@otif.org


Mme./Fr./Ms Maria **Price**

Expert

 +41 (31) 359 10 26
Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
E-mail maria.price@otif.org

M./Hr./Mr. Dragan **Nešić**

Expert

 +41 (31) 359 10 24
Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11
E-mail dragan.nesic@otif.org

APPROVED AGENDA**ANNEX II**

1. Election of chair
2. Approval of the agenda
3. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
4. Approval of the minutes of the 43rd session of WG TECH
5. For discussion:
 - 5.1. Development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF)
 - a. Annex A - Common Safety Method on Safety Management System requirements
 - b. Annex B - Common Safety Method on monitoring
 - 5.2. Revision of UTP TAF (Telematics applications for freight services)
 - 5.3. Analysis and review of Annex B to the ATMF UR (Derogations)
 - 5.4. Vehicle registers
6. Developments in EU regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by ERA and European Commission)
7. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
8. EU – OTIF equivalence table
9. Any other business
10. Next sessions