



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail

WG TECH

34th Session

The Minutes

Belgrade, 6-7.2.2018

DISCUSSION

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Bas Leermakers (head of OTIF's technical interoperability department) welcomed all the participants ([List of participants Annex I](#)), particularly Mr. Vopalecky from the Organisation for Co-operation between Railways (OSJD), which was attending the session for the first time. He welcomed the Secretary General of OTIF and participants of the EUMedRail workshop entitled "International Railway Legislation", who attended the meeting on the first day. He then opened the 34th session of WG TECH in Belgrade.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The **Secretariat** explained that the provisional agenda had been sent to participants with the invitation on 7 December 2017 ([circular TECH-17054](#)). Since there were no objections, the agenda was adopted accordingly.

Conclusion: WG TECH approved the agenda for the 34th session ([Annex II](#)).

2. GENERAL INFORMATION (FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT)

The Secretariat informed the meeting that on 22 December 2017, the UK had deposited an instrument with a reservation against the application of the Uniform Rules concerning the Contract of Use of Infrastructure in International Traffic (CUI UR – Appendix E to COTIF). In accordance with Article 42 of COTIF, the reservation would take effect on 31 December 2018.

The Secretariat informed the meeting of developments since the 33rd WG TECH:

- 6 December: 2018/2019 work programme approved by the Administrative Committee
- 7 December 2017: MoU signed between the International Union of Railways (UIC) and OTIF with a view to strengthening cooperation
- 10 January 2018: the OTIF Secretariat informed the non-EU OTIF CS about the creation of a joint OTIF/ERA register on CSM Assessment Bodies which includes the relevant procedures to be followed
- 15 January 2018: the OTIF Secretariat informed the non-EU OTIF CS about the consultation of the European Union Agency for Railways concerning:
 - The draft limited revision of the TSI NOISE (the deadline was **14 March 2018**), and
 - The draft recommendation on the revision of EU Regulation 445/2011 (the deadline was **14 February 2018**)
- 24 January 2018: MoU signed between the Universal Postal Union (UPU) and OTIF, particularly in view of the increasing number of postal consignments between China and Europe and the challenge this represents for the rail sector
- 27 February -1 March the 26th Revision Committee would convene in Bern.

In addition, the OTIF Secretariat informed the meeting that Ms. Margarethe Koschmider of the OTIF Secretariat would be leaving OTIF at the end of April and would return to the German Federal Railway Administration. The meeting was also informed that Ms. Maria Price would take up her post in OTIF's technical interoperability department from 1 May 2018.

With regard to the current geographical scope of COTIF and its appendices, the meeting was informed that there had been no changes since the previous (33rd) WG TECH meeting.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIR

According to the procedure, the **Secretariat** asked delegates for nomination for the chair. The Secretariat proposed Mr Roland Bacher (Switzerland) to chair the session. There were no other nominations. Mr Bacher accepted the nomination and WG TECH unanimously elected Switzerland, in the shape of Mr Roland Bacher, to chair this session.

The Chairman thanked WG TECH for the trust it had placed in him.

In order to update the representatives of EUMedRail, the Chairman described developments over the last 10 years with regard to APTU and ATMF and the provisions that are based on them and explained what further developments could be expected. Among other things, he noted the development of the UTPs, which set out OTIF's rules on the mutual recognition of vehicles. If adopted, the draft new Appendix H would contain rules applicable to all trains in cross-border traffic. He concluded by noting that COTIF should be ready for other states or regional organisations that might wish to apply it in the future.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 33RD SESSION OF WG TECH

Document: [WG TECH 33 PVM](#) Provisional Minutes of the 33rd session

On 22 December 2017, the **OTIF Secretariat** sent the provisional minutes to delegates who had attended the 33rd session of WG TECH (5-6 December 2017, Bern). For the attention of WG TECH 33, the Secretariat had uploaded a version of the provisional minutes with the comments received before 19 January 2018. Comments were received from RS, DE and ERA. The aim of the changes requested was to reflect more clearly what was said at the meeting, without altering the substance. At the meeting, CER proposed to replace "ISO standards" with "relevant standards" in the fourth paragraph on page 11. The minutes, including the amendments, were subsequently approved.

Conclusion: The minutes of the 33rd session of WG TECH were approved with the corrections as suggested by RS, DE, ERA and CER.

5. PREPARATION OF DOCUMENTS FOR THE CTE:

a) Draft amendment UTP GEN-B for adoption

Document: [TECH-17055](#) Draft decision document for CTE 11

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that WG TECH 33 had agreed with the draft proposal and had requested the OTIF Secretariat to prepare the draft amendments to the UTP GEN-B for adoption at the CTE 11. The OTIF Secretariat had prepared the draft decision document, which explained the basis for the decision, the process after the decision and the proposal for decision. The amendments to the UTP GEN-B were set out in the annex to the decision document.

The **Chairman** noted that WG TECH accepted the draft decision document as presented and agreed that it should be submitted to the CTE 11 for decision.

b) Draft explanatory document concerning the procedure for urgent UTP modifications

Document: [TECH-17057](#) Draft explanatory document on UTP adoptions and modifications, including procedures for urgent modifications

The **Secretariat** explained that the explanatory document TECH-17057 was based on document TECH-17038, which had been reviewed at the WG TECH 32 and 33, and on document TECH-16023, which had been reviewed at WG TECH 29. The document described the usual process for the adoption or modification of UTP, possibilities for making urgent modifications to UTP and other possibilities for dealing with shortcomings in UTP.

The Secretariat proposed that the document be submitted to CTE 11 for review as an explanatory document on APTU to be published on OTIF's website.

CER thanked the OTIF Secretariat for preparing this document, which dealt with some of the sector's requirements, and supported the proposal.

The **Chairman** noted that WG TECH accepted the explanatory document as presented and agreed that it should be submitted to the CTE 11 for endorsement before its publication on OTIF's website.

c) Draft strategy concerning the development of provisions covering infrastructure

Document: [TECH-17045 v.2](#) Draft strategy paper

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that WG TECH 33 had discussed document TECH-17045 version 1. At the request of WG TECH 33, the document had been amended by including the aim of developing infrastructure requirements within COTIF, then the additional analysis of the existing international infrastructure requirements (such as ESCAP and FERRMED specifications), followed by a catalogue of infrastructure parameters applied in different states in Europe, Asia and Africa, and lastly, the draft proposal for decision by CTE.

FR supported the aim of harmonising the infrastructure requirements at COTIF and EU levels. It also suggested that this aim be noted in chapter 4 in as simple a manner as possible. FR also expressed its concerns in connection with transposing into COTIF the numerous EU infrastructure requirements, some of which were binding, as well as the infrastructure requirements of the non-EU OTIF MS.

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting about the principle stated in chapter 3, indent 3: "*The UTP(s) should only cover the infrastructure parameters relevant for compatibility with vehicles.*" This meant that not all the EU infrastructure requirements needed to be transposed into COTIF. Some of them might be specific to the EU and might only be relevant for new infrastructure.

The **Chairman** noted that compatibility with existing vehicle requirements would be concerned.

CER was of the view that the aims of the infrastructure requirements, as explained in chapter 4 of the document, might be too ambitious. One of the targets of the document should be to increase interoperability, and this should be reflected more clearly in chapters 3 and 4. It also wondered whether these infrastructure requirements would take the form of binding or non-binding rules in COTIF. Lastly, it wondered about the status of these requirements in relation to ongoing work related to the development of the European register of infrastructure (RINF).

The **Secretariat** agreed with CER that improving interoperability and technical harmonisation should be reflected, as this was the overall objective. The Secretariat confirmed that if a register of railway infrastructure were established within the scope of COTIF, it should be compatible with RINF in the EU. The Secretariat suggested that it might be a good starting point to ask the Member States to list the infrastructure specifications/parameters that were being applied. The **Secretary General of OTIF** added that the intention was to provide infrastructure requirements on the basis of which the Member States could ensure that international lines would be compatible with each other.

RS welcomed the initiative to develop infrastructure requirements. It shared FR's concerns and agreed with CER that the aim should be more precise. RS suggested that INF TSI should be used as a basis for the development of infrastructure requirements. In its view, the document only concerned compatibility between new vehicles and old infrastructure, but checking compatibility between old/existing vehicles and the network should also be possible. It suggested that instead of collecting data on existing infrastructure, OTIF could concentrate on developing the minimum UTP requirements for new infrastructure, limited to interfaces with UTP compliant vehicles.

The **Secretariat** was of the view that the subject should be dealt with in a way that is both useful and legally sound. As explained in the document, it was not obvious that binding rules could require states to build infrastructure in a harmonised way. The basic parameters, such as vehicle gauge, axle load capability, gradient etc. would be difficult to harmonise. For these basic parameters, the calculation

methods could perhaps be mandatory (e.g. for gauge) to ensure that the values of parameters could be compared.

DE agreed with **RS** that the requirements should be developed on the basis of INF TSI, with the focus on requirements related to the link between infrastructure and vehicle. It might be useful to check other TSIs like for example energy for other vehicle-infrastructure related requirements/critical points and thus ensure interoperability between vehicles and infrastructure.

With regard to the collection of data related to infrastructure, **CER** suggested that this be kept as simple as possible and that the focus should be on those data that are relevant to the specific needs of COTIF.

In reply to a question from the Chairman, **OSJD** informed the meeting that it had no experience in the collection of data related to existing infrastructure. However, it mentioned that there appeared to be difficulties when operating wagons built to OSJD standards on new lines and platforms built to EU standards. For example, this was the case for wagons coming from the east into Hungary.

DE said that the aim of the TSIs was to ensure compatibility between vehicles and infrastructure. The vehicle TSIs harmonised vehicles to a large extent, whilst the INF TSI only harmonised the interfaces with vehicles. Almost 90% of the infrastructure requirements were not prescribed by the INF TSI, but were subject to national provisions and practices. The starting point for a UTP should be the TSIs, which could then be compared with the requirements of non-EU OTIF CSs as a second step. States which are not a member of OTIF should not be involved initially.

UIC agreed with **FR** and **DE**. It reminded the meeting that all IMs already have their infrastructure catalogues, but that the infrastructure parameters concerned might differ among them. UIC had undertaken similar initiatives to try to establish a catalogue of infrastructure data, but without success. It therefore suggested as a first step that so-called *general parameters* be described, i.e. only those that are necessary in order to check the compatibility of vehicles and infrastructure for international traffic.

The **Secretary General of OTIF** said that the main aim of this process was to provide the best solution for OTIF's Contracting States and suggested that for the sake of efficiency, it would be better to start from the requirements that already exist, e.g. the INF TSI. The requirements would then be analysed from an OTIF perspective and the OTIF MS would check whether they are necessary for international traffic.

ERA (Christoph Kaupat) welcomed the document and the inclusion of the ESCAP and FERRMED specifications. With regard to the UIC's suggestion, he informed the meeting that dedicated ERA working parties on RINF and rolling stock were trying to harmonise their mutual parameters. It was anticipated that both these working groups would complete their work by summer 2018. It might be useful to use their output in this work.

The **Secretariat** explained that the basic idea behind the OTIF Secretariat's proposal was that some states, whether Contracting States or potential future members of OTIF, did not necessarily develop their infrastructure in accordance with INF TSI. As an example, it mentioned the high capacity lines being developed in the Middle East. On the other hand, the possible introduction of the new infrastructure requirements, for example, the third height of the platform, in addition to the two heights already defined in PRM UTP, would not make any sense either. Therefore, the Secretariat suggested reducing all the infrastructure parameters to a few elementary ones.

CER suggested waiting for the outcome of the ERA working party which develops the route compatibility parameters. These parameters could be listed without values as a first step and, as a second step, these values could then be defined.

DE agreed with **CER** and wondered how route compatibility was currently ensured in practice. **DE** suggested that it might be useful to check whether the RINF data would be of use to OTIF.

CER agreed with **DE**.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and concluded as follows:

1. WG TECH discussed document TECH-17045 v.2
2. WG TECH noted that the infrastructure requirements should focus on ensuring compatibility

between vehicles and infrastructure and compliance with existing UTP vehicle requirements. As vehicle UTPs take over the vehicle requirements of the TSIs, the infrastructure requirements should also be based on the TSIs.

3. WG TECH did not support the Secretariat's proposal to collect infrastructure specifications used outside the EU. Such an exercise was deemed to be too complex and would not provide any obvious added value (UIC had tried this in the past without success). As a consequence, there would be no catalogue of data.
4. WG TECH requested the OTIF Secretariat to modify the document as follows before sending it to the CTE 11:
 - Update the list of aims in chapter 4, by adding the following aims:
 - Maintaining compatibility with EU law, so as to ensure that the COTIF provisions will not create new obligations for EU MSs over and above their obligations under EU law.
 - Improving interoperability and technical harmonisation.
 - Delete the data collection and cataloguing.
5. With regard to the initial discussion on binding/non-binding provisions, the WG TECH concluded as follows:
 - Binding provisions may be the most useful, but there is doubt about the legal basis for them in COTIF.
 - Certain calculation methods could be mandatory (e.g. for gauge) to ensure that the values of parameters can be compared.
6. With regard to the next steps, the WG TECH suggested as follows:
 - Wait for ERA's list of route compatibility parameters (should become available by June 2018).
 - Prepare a checklist for completeness and incorporate other (non-EU) parameters if necessary (for the vehicle/infrastructure interface in international traffic).
 - Start the development of COTIF infrastructure provisions on the basis of the TSIs.

6. FOR DISCUSSION:

a) Analysis of the possibility of simplifying the provisions and procedures for vehicle admission

Document: [TECH-17058](#) Analysis of the possibility of simplifying the provisions and procedures for vehicle admission

The **Secretariat** had prepared draft discussion paper TECH-17058. It reminded the meeting that it was based on TECH 17037, which had been reviewed and discussed at WG TECH 33. It introduced to the meeting the following basic principles that underpin the further development of technical provisions (point 2.3 of the document):

- Harmonisation over widest possible geographical area to attract new states
- The requirements should be flexible to fit different national legal systems
- To maintain compatibility with the EU concerning vehicle authorisation
- Prescriptive (mandatory) rules for technical provisions, complemented by (voluntary) recommendations where relevant (e.g. the concept of appendix C wagons)
- Compatible with the possible accession of other economic integration organisations

Following these five basic principles, the four different subjects presented in the draft paper in the following four separate chapters were analysed:

- Removing the 2-column layout of UTPs
- Modification of Article 3a of ATMF
- Component Certification instead of ICs
- Removing declarations in the scope of vehicle admission

Before discussing each of the subjects, the **Chairman** asked the meeting whether it agreed with the principles. The meeting tacitly agreed. The Chairman explained to the meeting that the proposed subjects continued the work that was decided by the General Assembly, which includes the following: enlargement of geographical scope, putting in place conditions for other regional organisations to accede to COTIF and maintaining COTIF/EU compatibility for vehicle admission/authorisation.

CER thanked the OTIF Secretariat for preparing the document. It supported the aim of ensuring that COTIF is suitable for a geographical extension, but also suggested caution in defining the principles. It wondered how compatibility between COTIF, EU legislation and the legislation of other regional organisations that might accede to COTIF could be ensured.

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the minimum requirements for vehicles to be used in international traffic are prescribed in COTIF's Uniform Rules and the relevant UTPs. These requirements are harmonised with EU law and this compatibility between COTIF and EU law should be maintained. If a new regional organisation wished to have vehicles in international traffic under COTIF, it would need to harmonise its rules for vehicle admission with COTIF and, as a consequence, indirectly with the EU.

RS said that at present COTIF allows other regional organisations to accede to COTIF. It also agreed with the Secretariat that newly acceded states or other regional organisations could use their vehicles in international traffic under COTIF, provided that they had previously applied the APTU and ATMF Appendices.

DE was not in favour of modifying the relationship between EU law and the APTU and ATMF Appendices. It reminded the meeting that since 2001, when the APTU and ATMF Appendices were not compatible with EU law, a lot of effort had been necessary to allow the mutual acceptance of vehicles between the EU and COTIF. With regard to the basic principles proposed in chapter 2.3, DE suggested that they should be more specific. DE also said that the amendment of Article 3a of ATMF was a sensitive issue and caused DE some concern. With regard to the possible accession of another regional organisation, it suggested the introduction of a new Article 3b), as a first step, where the interaction between OTIF and the other regional organisation would be defined, followed, as a second step, by an appropriate analysis of how that regional organisation interacts with the EU.

The **Secretariat** confirmed the necessity of maintaining equivalence between EU law and COTIF, but also pointed out that in order to create truly uniform rules, it might be necessary to supplement the TSIs and UTPs with the specifications of other regional organisations after they accede to COTIF. As an example, GCC's 32 ton axle load lines were mentioned.

The **representative of the EC** supported the geographical extension of COTIF. He noted that maintaining compatibility between EU law and COTIF was very important.

RS supported DE and agreed with the EC about the importance of maintaining equivalence between OTIF and EU legislation.

UNIFE (Sebastian Giera) agreed with DE. He also agreed with ensuring that COTIF is suitable for geographical extension.

The **Chairman** noted that WG TECH should be very careful not to disrupt the equivalence of the system of mutual acceptance. The Chairman highlighted that the admission of vehicles based on COTIF would only have added value if it is mutually recognised in all OTIF contracting states.

Initial discussion about the removal of the 2-column layout of UTPs

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the APTU UR require all UTPs to have a 2-column layout, reproducing, for information only, EU law in the right-hand column. Firstly, it questioned whether it was necessary to reproduce EU law in COTIF and secondly, how the provisions of other potential regional organisations could be dealt with. Might this lead to a 3-column layout? The Secretariat suggested that instead of a 2-column layout, the differences between the UTPs and EU law could be indicated elsewhere.

The **Chairman** commented that, in principle, the legal texts should be limited to legal requirements and not contain explanations.

UNIFE was not in favour of removing the 2-column layout. He said that the 2-column layout was a very useful tool, especially in the process of certifying passenger coaches outside the EU. It provided transparency and certainty, was of great help to UNIFE and should be maintained. If it were decided to dispense with the 2-column layout, manufacturers would need other tools to provide the same functionality.

DE reminded the meeting that a 2-column layout had been introduced in order to provide legal certainty in connection with the mutual acceptance of vehicles admitted in accordance with the UTPs. It agreed that the text in full width, together with the additional documents as an explanation, might be adequate for those regional organisations that would like to accede to COTIF. However, before taking a decision, the WG TECH should assess the consequences of deleting the 2-column layout and whether deletion of this layout was supported by the industry and sector.

RS said that EU MS only apply TSIs, so there was no purpose in maintaining the 2-column layout, as it was of no use to the contracting states that apply UTPs. **RS** was anxious to avoid a multi-column layout in COTIF that included the rules of other regional organisations. It supported the Secretariat's proposal to delete the 2-column layout in the basic legal texts. However, **RS** was in favour of maintaining the 2-column layout in the working documents.

CER was of the view that in order to facilitate mutual acceptance of vehicles throughout COTIF, it would be useful to keep the 2-column layout.

DE noted that from OTIF's perspective it might be useful to remove the 2-column layout. However, **CER** and **UNIFE** had put forward arguments in favour of maintaining the 2-column layout. In its view, the CTE 11 should decide whether or not to remove the 2-column layout, but should not discuss the subject, as this was a task for the WG TECH.

FR supported the global aim of the document. However, it thought it might be premature to take a decision on the principles. In order to examine the consequences, WG TECH would need more information and analysis on the subject.

ERA (Richard Lockett) noted that there seemed to be a consensus that if the 2-column layout were removed, there must be some other reference document containing a comparison of EU and COTIF provisions.

CER agreed that a decision on whether to remove the 2-column layout was premature.

The **Chairman** concluded that it was premature to propose or discuss specific solutions. The document should therefore be amended to define the problems and aims more clearly, without going into possible solutions.

The **Chairman** summarised the discussion and concluded as follows:

1. WG TECH did not review the entire document TECH-17058 and concluded that there first had to be a detailed discussion on principles and aims before the proposals for improvement could be discussed in detail. Nevertheless, there was also an expression of support for the objectives.
2. In particular WG TECH agreed that:
 - COTIF/EU equivalence should be maintained.

- The provisions should be useful and not hinder or prevent new states from applying them.
 - The geographical extension of COTIF is a logical objective for the Organisation and the accession of regional organisations in addition to the EU was a possibility.
 - It should be possible for regional organisations to have legal interactions with APTU and ATMF, such as the EU has at present.
3. WG TECH discussed the removal of the 2-column layout of UTPs. The following arguments were noted:
- Text for information should not appear in the legal text
 - Reminders of EU law may be useful to some, but not to others
 - If, in addition to the EU, another regional organisation were to join OTIF, the layout might become too complex (e.g. 3 column layout)
 - The 2-column layout is useful for the industry in the EU and encourages the use of COTIF
 - Dissimilarities could also be indicated elsewhere (chapter 0 of the UTP, annex to the UTP, separate table, etc.)
 - In many cases where there is a 2-column layout, this was just to indicate UTP | TSI
4. WG TECH requested the OTIF Secretariat to create a new document for the CTE with regard to the following:
- Focus on the principles (current chapter 2.3)
 - Further elaborate the text so that the aim, objective and principles become clearer
 - The delegates would be consulted on a draft version of these principles before the CTE document was issued
 - Specific ideas should be discussed in future WG TECH meetings, but not in CTE 11.

b) Draft strategy concerning the development of registers for route compatibility checks

Document: [TECH-17044 ver. 2](#) Draft strategy concerning the development of registers for route compatibility checks

The **Secretariat** had prepared draft discussion paper TECH-17044 version 2. It reminded the meeting that the previous version had been discussed at WG TECH 33. It highlighted that the document no longer focussed on registers, but on the purpose of the registers, namely route compatibility checks. In addition, the Secretariat introduced to the meeting the amendments to the document.

The **representative of the EC** suggested that point 8.3 of the paper should be clarified so that in terms of process these compatibility parameters would first be developed by the EU and then, as a second step, would be checked by non-EU states to decide whether additional parameters are necessary.

The **Chairman** reminded the meeting that this item was closely linked to the discussion on development of the infrastructure requirements in COTIF (agenda item 5. c) and that the aim of the provisions under COTIF (chapter 5 of this document), as amended by the OTIF Secretariat, was correct. The Chairman concluded this item as follows:

1. WG TECH reviewed document TECH-17044 version 2 and tacitly agreed the following modifications:
 - Accept all the amendments proposed by the OTIF Secretariat
 - Point 3 of chapter 8 of the document should be reworded to say that the compatibility parameters should first be developed within the EU and, as a second step, checked by non-EU states to decide whether additional parameters are necessary in order to take into account specific situations on their networks.

7. DEVELOPMENTS IN EU REGULATIONS WHICH MAY AFFECT EQUIVALENCE WITH COTIF

a) Vehicle Authorisation under the fourth railway package

ERA (Christoph Kaupat) informed the meeting that there were no significant changes since the last meeting. There were only developments concerning EU internal procedures, such as those for fees and charges. He added that the relevant application guide was currently being discussed within ERA, and should be completed by April 2018.

b) Clarification of the concept of “area of use”

After reminding the meeting about the terms “network” and “area of use of vehicle”, as defined in the Interoperability Directive, **ERA** (Richard Lockett) provided a status update on the clarification and common understanding of the concept of “area of use”. The EC and ERA had established a common position on the concept of “area of use”, which defined the area of use as the network or networks on which a vehicle is permitted to operate.

The **representative of the EC** explained that “area of use” was a concept with both a technical and a geographical component. It was technical in the sense that it refers to networks and says that a network is defined by a common set of rules, and it was geographical in the sense that a network is located in one or more states.

CER agreed with the EC that the set of rules should be used to define a network. With this in mind, it asked whether or not the ETCS level 3 would then need to be authorised by each of the EU MS.

The **representative of the EC** explained that within the “area of use”, there were technical and geographical specifications that might require possible re-examination. He also explained that in the authorisation process the applicant specifies where (in which state) the vehicle would be used, and then the technical compatibility between the vehicle and relevant network(s) has to be checked.

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the forthcoming 26th Revision Committee would discuss amendments to ATMF which, among other things, included the concept of “area of use”. The Secretariat was not sure whether the interpretation of the term “area of use” (as a combination of the technical and geographical components) would be valid for COTIF as well. It reminded the meeting that except those vehicles that meet the requirements of Article 6.3 of ATMF and 7.2 of UTP WAG, admission for all other types of vehicles was required on a state-by-state basis, so the area of use linked to a particular admission could not go beyond the network of the state that issued that admission.

c) Status of the revisions of the LOC&PAS TSI and the WAG TSI

ERA (Christoph Kaupat) informed the meeting that there were no significant changes since the last meeting. It was planned to submit the draft recommendation to the EC by June 2018, which would be followed by consultations between ERA and DG MOVE. The final recommendation would be submitted to the EC by December 2018.

The **representative of the EC** confirmed that the RISC 81 had voted on TAF TSI and had reached agreement in principle to include an energy metering and data collection system in LOC&PAS TSI and ENE TSI respectively. As these changes were purely technical and the amendments should also be discussed with the World Trade Organisation, the RISC 81 did not formally vote on this. It also reminded the meeting about the planning of ERA and that both TSIs would be discussed and voted on at RISC 84 in January 2019, with the aim of entry into force by June 2019.

The **Secretariat** asked EC and ERA to inform WG TECH of any revisions to TSIs which might also require modification of the UTPs or any other OTIF regulations.

IT wondered whether the Joint Coordinating Group of Experts (JCGE) had been set up, and what next steps were envisaged.

The **representative of the EC** confirmed that the JCGE had not yet met. He reminded the meeting that one of the objectives of JCGE would be to coordinate the current and future regulatory alignments between RID and TSIs. In practical terms, JCGE would look at which of the technical requirements in RID should be included in TSIs. The deadline for completing this alignment was 2020.

d) Status of any other on-going work relevant to OTIF (e.g. ECM, registers, noise TSI)

ERA (Christoph Kaupat) informed the meeting that there were no significant changes since the last meeting. He reminded the meeting of the relevant deadlines for amendments to TSIs and revision of the EVR, ECM and RINF:

- CSM on risk evaluation and assessment (UTP GEN-G) – presently no revision ongoing
- ECM Regulation (ATMF Annex A) – ERA would send the EC a recommendation by May 2018
- RINF Decision – ERA would send the EC a recommendation by June 2018
- NVR Decision 2007/756/EC (NVR 2015) would be replaced by the EVR Act and would be repealed from 16 June 2021
- ERATV Decision: ERA would send the EC a recommendation by December 2018. The new legal act on ERATV was expected to be adopted by 2019.

In addition, the following subjects would be dealt with in the next period of RISC meetings: PRM TSI and EVR (to be discussed at RISC 82, planned to be held in June 2018), NOI TSI (for existing wagons) and RINF (at RISC 83, November 2018), LOC&PAS TSI, WAG TSI, CCS TSI, OPE TSI and INF TSI (links with RST) (at RISC 84, January 2019), and lastly, PRM TSI, SRT TSI and NOI TSI (at RISC 85, April 2019).

The **representative of the EC** also explained that the technical and functional specifications of the EVR were scheduled for adoption by June 2018, with a transitional period of three years, and that they would replace the existing NVR decision.

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that on 15 January, the OTIF Secretariat had informed those OTIF CS which are not members of the EU about ERA’s consultation on the revision of the TSI NOI and the ECM Regulation. It also informed WG TECH of the position papers that it intended to issue concerning these subjects.

The **Chairman** thanked Mr Collignon, Mr Lockett and Mr Kaupat for providing all the information.

8. CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: [TECH-17049](#) Draft table of correspondence between COTIF and EU terminology

The **Secretariat** had prepared draft working document TECH-17049-WGT34, dated 18 January 2018. It reminded the meeting that the technical requirements for rolling stock applicable in OTIF and the EU are fully equivalent, but not identical. It also said that the table could be analysed in more depth and improved. The main changes compared to the previous version submitted to WG TECH 33 included the new terms “pre-engagement” and ”requirements capture”, for which there was no equivalent in COTIF, but which might be suitable for future consideration.

The **Chairman** noted the information on the updated version of the cross reference terminology table.

9. EU-OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document [TECH-18005](#) Equivalence table EU/OTIF regulations

The **Secretariat** had prepared draft working document TECH-18005-WGT34, dated 18 January 2018. It informed the meeting that there had not been any changes to the equivalence table since the WG TECH 33.

The **Chairman** noted the information and asked WG TECH members to give the OTIF Secretariat adequate and timely feedback, if necessary.

10. NEXT SESSIONS

The 11th session of the Committee of Technical Experts will be held on 12 and 13 June in Bern

The 35th session of WG TECH will be held on 11 and 12 September in Bern (hosted by CH)

The 36th session of WG TECH will be held on 27 and 28 November (venue to be decided later).

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The **Secretariat** had submitted proposals to WG TECH for the agenda of CTE 10.

The Chairman proposed to modify item 6.3 and EC proposed that the items 6.3 and 6.4 be swapped round. Both proposals were shown on the screen.

The **Chairman** noted that since there were no objections, the draft agenda for CTE 11 was approved ([Annex III](#)) with the editorial corrections requested during the meeting.

Closing remarks

The **Chairman** informed the meeting that Ms. Margarethe Koschmider would leave the OTIF Secretariat by the end of April. On behalf of the WG TECH, the Chairman thanked her for her productive cooperation and contributions. The Chairman wished Ms Koschmider all the best for the future.

The Chairman addressed special thanks to the colleagues who had organised this meeting in the premises of the Serbian Parliament: Ms. Jana Ćirković, Ms. Nina Ivković and the Protocol of the Parliament of the Republic of Serbia.

The Chairman also thanked participants for the productive discussion and the OTIF Secretariat for preparing the documents on time and closed the 34th session of WG TECH.

List of participants**Annex I****I. Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments****Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany**

M./Hr./Mr. Michael **Schmitz** Leiter Stabstelle 92
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Annerkennungsstelle für Benannte Stellen,
internationale Angelegenheiten

Bosnie et Herzégovine/Bosnien und Herzegowina/Bosnia and Herzegowina

M./Hr./Mr. Tihomir **Narić** Director
Railways Regulatory Board

M./Hr./Mr. Mirko **Vulić** Senior Expert Associate
Railways Regulatory Board

France/Frankreich/France

Mme/Fr./Ms Cécilia **Le Gal** Direction des Référentiels
EPSF – Établissement public de sécurité ferroviaire
Division Système, interopérabilité et interfaces

Italie/Italien/Italy

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

Roumanie/Rumänien/Romania

M./Hr./Mr. Marian Mihail **Calin** Head of delegation
Deputy General Manager
Romanian Railway Authority

M./Hr./Mr. Dragos **Floroiu** Romanian Railway Authority
Bucharest
Roumanie

Serbie/Serbien/Serbia

M./Hr./Mr. Milan **Popović** Head of the department for regulations
Directorate for Railways

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

M./Hr./Mr. Roland **Bacher** Projektleiter
Bundesamt für Verkehr
Sektion Zulassungen + Regelwerke

**Commission européenne/
Europäische Kommission/
European Commission**

M./Hr./Mr. Bertrand **Collignon** Directorate -General for Mobility and Transport
Policy Officer - Single European Area
European Commission

European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)

M./Hr./Mr. Christoph **Kaupat** Project Officer
Interoperability Unit

M./Hr./Mr. Peter **Mihm** Head of Technical Cooperation

M./Hr./Mr. Richard **Lockett** Head of Strategy, Research & International Standards
Unit

M./Hr./Mr. Ilyas **Daoud** Project Officer
ERA - European Railway Agency
Interoperability Unit

**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/Direction Système & Techno Ferroviaire /
Direction Interopérabilité & Normalisation

OSJD

M./Hr./Mr. Radovan **Vopalecky** Chairman of the V Commission on Infrastructure and
Rolling Stock
Organisation für die Zusammenarbeit der
Eisenbahnen (OSShD)

UIC

M./Hr./Mr. Jozef **Fázik** Senior advisor
Union internationale des chemins de fer (UIC)

UNIFE

M./Hr./Mr. Christian **Zumpe** Homologation Manager
Siemens

M./Hr./Mr. Sebastian **Giera** Legal Counsel
Bombardier Transportation GmbH

**III. Secrétariat
 Sekretariat
 Secretariat**M./Hr./Mr. François **Davenne**

Secretary General

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

Head of Department

M./Hr./Mr. Dragan **Nešić**

First Officer

Approved Agenda**Annex II**

1. Approval of the agenda
2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. Election of chair
4. Approval of the minutes of the 33rd session of WG TECH
5. Preparation of documents for the Committee of Technical Experts:
 - a. Draft amended UTP GEN-B for adoption
 - b. Draft explanatory document concerning the procedure for urgent UTP modifications
 - c. Draft strategy concerning the development of provisions covering infrastructure
6. For discussion:
 - a. Analysis of the possibility of simplifying the provisions and procedures for vehicle admission
 - b. Draft strategy concerning the development of registers for route compatibility checks
7. Developments in EU regulations which may affect equivalence with COTIF (by ERA and DG MOVE):
 - a. Vehicle authorisation under the 4th railway package
 - b. Clarification of the concept of “area of use”
 - c. Status of the revisions of the LOC&PAS TSI and the WAG TSI
 - d. Status of any other on-going work relevant to OTIF (e.g. ECM, registers, noise TSI)
8. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
9. EU-OTIF equivalence table
10. Next sessions
11. Any other business

Draft Agenda for CTE 11**Annex III**

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Presence and quorum
3. Election of chairman
4. For information:
 - 4.1. Report from the Committee of Technical Experts' working group TECH
 - 4.2. Status of notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU (presentation by OTIF)
 - 4.3. Status of the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States (presentation by OTIF)
 - 4.4. Status of the development of freight noise abatement measures in the European Union (presentation by EU)
5. For adoption:

Draft amended UTP GEN-B
6. For discussion:
 - 6.1. Explanatory document concerning the procedure for UTP adoptions and modifications
 - 6.2. Strategy concerning the development of provisions covering infrastructure
 - 6.3. Strategy concerning facilitation of route compatibility checks
 - 6.4. Future development of vehicle admission requirements
 - 6.5. CTE work programme 2018/19
7. Any other business
8. Next session