Organisation intergouvernementale pour les
transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den
internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for
International Carriage by Rail

WG TECH

41st Session

Minutes

Remote meeting, 9-10.9.2020

WG TECH 41 SUMMARY

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

1.   The agenda submitted in document TECH-20027 dated 8.7.2020 was adopted.

2.   The Secretariat presented the latest developments in OTIF.

3.   The United Kingdom, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, was elected to chair the session.

4.   The minutes of the 40th session of WG TECH were approved.

5.   Review of draft proposals:

WG TECH 41 reviewed the documents listed below. Participants were invited to provide further written comments by **9 October 2020** at the latest. After that date, the OTIF Secretariat would prepare updated versions of all the draft proposals and publish them for review by WG TECH 42.

WG TECH 41 reached the following conclusions:

a.   With regard to a draft new UTP concerning infrastructure (TECH-20021, version 2, dated 12.8.2020):

- section 1.2 reference to substitution of existing lines in the framework of maintenance should be deleted;

- section 4.2.1 (10) and (11) should be amended in order to reflect the scope of COTIF more precisely;

- section 6 should be amended as proposed at the meeting.

b.   With regard to a draft new UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks (TECH-20018, version 2, dated 12.8.2020):

- the reference in section 2.1(1) to the list of parameters in the Annex to the UTP should be in a 2-column layout;

- section 2.1: cases of admission based on "other similar processes" would be added;

- section 2.2 (2) should be amended to emphasise that any route compatibility checks are possible but should only be required in exceptional circumstances.

c.   With regard to the revision of UTP LOC&PAS (locomotives and passenger rolling stock) (TECH-20023, version 2, dated 12.8.2020):

- section 7.1.4 should be modified by introducing references to other COTIF rules instead of EU documents alone. The OTIF Secretariat should re-check other references throughout this UTP;

- Appendix K should be repealed and replaced by the UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks;

- NB Rail was invited to send the OTIF Secretariat a presentation on simplifying the validity of certificates. The OTIF Secretariat would forward the presentation to the participants of WG TECH 41.

d.   With regard to the revision of UTP PRM (accessibility for people with reduced mobility) (TECH-20022, version 2, dated 12.8.2020):

- section 4.6 should be modified so that the recommendations referring to professional competences are limited to vehicle maintenance.

e.   With regard to the revision of UTP WAG (freight wagons) (TECH-20027 dated 12.8.2020)

- section 1.1 (c) should be modified by introducing a reference to Article 19 of ATMF;

- section 7.2.2.4(4) should be modified by introducing references to other UTPs in addition to references to TSIs;

- a new paragraph relating to RIV wagons should be introduced in 7.2.2.4(7). Wagons which were previously used under the RIV agreement should keep their area of use when they are upgraded or renewed, provided that they do not undergo any technical changes that would require new admission;

- Appendix I should be repealed and replaced by the UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks.

6. **Discussion on further development of:**

   a. **Revision of UTP Marking with regard to rail/road machines (TECH-20034 dated 12.8.2020)**

   - The meeting noted that standard EN 15746-1 2010 (Track road-rail machines and associated equipment) was being revised, with results expected in 2022;

   - It was agreed to defer the discussion until the standard concerned has been revised.

   b. **Revision of UTP TAF (telematics applications for freight)**

   - ERA presented an overview concerning the TAF TSI revision 2020-22; the TAF and TAP TSIs might be merged.

   c. **Vehicle register interface specifications**

   - The meeting took note of the introduction of the feasibility analysis of establishing an OTIF/International Vehicle Register; the OTIF Secretariat would present the Terms of Reference with preliminary analyses at WG TECH 42.

7. **Discussion concerning the future revision of ATMF with regard to scope of ECM certification (TECH-20035 dated 12.8.2020)**

   - The OTIF Secretariat was requested to modify the draft proposals for Article 15 of ATMF to strengthen the obligation for all ECMs to meet the requirements in the Annex to ATMF.

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

   - The European Commission provided a progress report concerning the TSI revisions, planned to be completed in 2022, and on cleaning up the process of national technical rules in the EU MS;

   - ERA explained the current process for registering vehicles coming from non-EU OTIF CS into the EU.

9. **Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology was reviewed.**

10. **EU-OTIF equivalence table was reviewed.**

11. **Any other business**

    None

12. **Next session: Bern, 17 and 18 November 2020**

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 and opened the 41st 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** presented the context and practical arrangements for the WG TECH meeting.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

WG TECH adopted the agenda for the 41st session as proposed in the invitation letter TECH-20027 dated 8.7.2020 (Annex II).

2. GENERAL INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT

The **Secretariat** presented the developments since the 40th WG TECH (see also presentation). It reminded the meeting that the Working Group of Legal Experts and the ad hoc Committee on Cooperation initially planned for 21 and 22 April 2020 had been postponed to 20-22 October 2020.

With regard to the status of the vote by written procedure, the Secretariat reminded the meeting that **30 September 2020** was the deadline for those Member States that are entitled to vote to submit their vote to the Secretary General. By the end of October 2020 the members of the CTE would be notified of the voting results. The proposals and information about the process were available on OTIF´s website: Activities => Technical Interoperability => Voting Using the Written Procedure.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIR

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that Christophe Le Borgne, who, on behalf of Switzerland, had chaired previous meetings, would no longer be attending WG TECH meetings. Therefore, a new Chair had to be elected. The Secretariat proposed the United Kingdom in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri to chair the session. There were no additional proposals. WG TECH unanimously elected Mr Vaibhav Puri to chair the session.

The **Chair** thanked WG TECH for the trust it had placed in him. He briefly introduced himself, and expressed his appreciation for the openness and inclusiveness of the sessions that had been fostered by the former chairs of WG TECH and that he would do his best to maintain that in WG TECH 41.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 40TH SESSION OF WG TECH

Document: WG TECH 40 PVM   Provisional Minutes of the 40th session

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that the provisional minutes had been sent to delegates who attended the 40th Session of WG TECH on 30 June 2020. For the attention of WG TECH 41, the revised provisional minutes were uploaded, following comments received from Germany, the European Commission, the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) and CER.

The **Chair** concluded that the minutes of the 40th session of WG TECH, as amended according to comments received before the meeting, were approved.

5. REVIEW OF DRAFT PROPOSALS FOR:

a. A new UTP concerning infrastructure (UTP INF)

Document: TECH-20021 v2   Draft for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that the draft text included substantial and editorial modifications in track changes compared to the previous version. It introduced the main elements of the modifications.

Section 1.2

GB[1] suggested amending the text in the second paragraph by removing *substitution in the framework of maintenance*, on the basis that *substitution* was covered by *renewal* (in point 7.3.1) and that the *substitution in the framework of maintenance* was also excluded from point 7.3.3.3 of the UTP, as the left-hand side mentioned *reserved*. **GR** and **NB Rail** supported GB's proposal.

The **Secretariat** agreed and noted that the text should be amended not only for reasons of consistency, but also because, in accordance with Article 8 of ATMF, admission of infrastructure and supervision of its maintenance remained subject to the provisions in force in the Contracting State in which the infrastructure is located.

Section 4.2.1 (10) and (11)

GB suggested indicating more clearly that the UTP INF should not prevent Contracting States from using infrastructure for the movement of vehicles which do not fall within the scope of COTIF. GB also requested clarification of the change in the provision in section 4.2.1 (11). In its view, the text had been changed from a recommendation to an obligation; it suggested reverting to the former text.

In reply to GB's question, the **Secretariat** explained that the aim of the change was only to improve the text editorially. It had not been the intention to alter the legal meaning of the sentence. The Secretariat proposed to revert to the text of the previous version.

Section 6

NB Rail asked whether the reference to UTP GEN-E should be mandatory with regard to the independence of staff involved in assessments.

UIC suggested the need for further clarification as to what independence, and from whom, was required.

GB requested more clarification by recommending that CSs have mechanisms and procedures in place which promote and enable robust and reliable conformity assessment.

In response to NB-Rail, UIC and GB, the **Secretariat** thought that mandatory independence criteria were not possible, as Article 8 of ATMF laid down that the admission of infrastructure and supervision of its maintenance remained subject to the provisions in force in the Contracting State in which the infrastructure is located. UTP GEN-E should therefore not be mandatory in this context.

Assisted by GB, the Secretariat proposed new wording, which would recommend that states have mechanisms and procedures in place which promote and enable robust and reliable conformity assessment. The new text was shown to the participants on the screen.

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

- section 1.2 reference to substitution of existing lines in the framework of maintenance should be deleted;
- section 4.2.1 (10) and (11) should be amended in order to reflect the scope of COTIF more precisely;
- section 6 should be amended as proposed at the meeting.

---

[1]   In accordance with ISO 3166-1 GB stands for United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

b.   A new UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks (UTP TCRC)

Document: TECH-20018 v2   Draft for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting of the small editorial modifications in document TECH-20018 in track changes compared to the previous version. It also suggested that Appendix I to the UTP WAG and Appendix K to the UTP LOC&PAS should be removed from the respective UTPs, as the provisions would be superseded by the UTP TCRC.

Following input **from ERA, GB, the Secretariat and NB Rail,** it was agreed that the said appendices should be repealed from the UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS once the UTP TCRC enters into force.

Section 2.2 (2)

GB noted that, according to EU law, the infrastructure manager (IM) was not permitted to require from the railway undertaking (RU) additional checks beyond the list of parameters in Appendix D1 to OPE TSI. In EU law, this list of parameters was therefore exhaustive. GB noted that the draft UTP text did not consider the list of parameters in the annex as exhaustive and wondered whether this was deliberate.

ERA confirmed that IMs in the EU could not impose any additional technical checks for route compatibility beyond Appendix D1.

The **Secretariat** replied that Appendix D1 had been developed at EU level and was exhaustive for the networks of EU MS. There was however no certainty that parameters in Appendix D 1, which was taken over in the Annex of the draft UTP TCRC, would also exhaustively cover the networks of non-EU OTIF CS. Therefore, it suggested that the UTP TCRC should not consider the list exhaustive for all networks.

GB proposed to add a new second paragraph indicating that in most cases, the parameters in the Annex should be sufficient to support assessment of route compatibility. Any additional technical checks should only be required in exceptional circumstances where reasonable justification is provided.

The **Secretariat** agreed with GB and showed some text proposals on the screen.

ERA noted the proposal and explanation provided by the Secretariat. ERA said it might provide the OTIF Secretariat with further feedback after the meeting.

CER suggested an editorial improvement in the last paragraph of section 2.1(1), by referring to the list of parameters in the Annex to UTP in a 2 column layout, with the right-hand column referring to the list of parameters in Appendix D1 to OPE TSI. This suggestion was tacitly supported by the meeting. With regard to section 2.1, CER said that as only the two cases of admission according to ATMF and authorisation according to EU law are mentioned in the UTP part, this case is more restrictive than the European case, where "other similar processes" can be considered. CER therefore suggested the following: the same wording "or other similar processes" should be added to the UTP (left) part. This suggestion was agreed at the meeting.

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

- −   the reference in section 2.1(1) to the list of parameters in the Annex to the UTP should be in a 2 column layout;

- −   section 2.1: cases of admission based on "other similar processes" would be added;

- −   section 2.2 (2) should be amended to emphasise that any route compatibility checks are possible but should only be required in exceptional circumstances.

c.   Revision of UTP LOC&PAS (locomotives and passenger rolling stock)

Document: TECH-20023 v2   Draft for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** introduced the main amendments to the UTP LOC&PAS, which had been made in track changes and marked in yellow compared to the previous version.

ERA noted that in point 7.1.4 the references to other UTPs should be introduced in addition to references to TSIs. The Secretariat took note of the comment and would re-check other references throughout this UTP.

GB wondered why the lamp control requirements in point 4.2.7.1.4 were not in full width. The **Secretariat** explained that the rules for using lamps at the front of trains to indicate emergency situations were not harmonised in COTIF. Therefore, it suggested not to include this requirement in this UTP by placing the text in the right-hand column only.

NB Rail was of the view that the validity of the design type certificate issued in relation to phases A and B should not be time-limited (sections: 7.1.1.2.1 and 7.1.3.1). In its view, as long as the TSI/UTP requirements do not change and the characteristics of the vehicle comply with the TSI/UTP, the certificate should remain valid and not, as is currently the case, expire after a number of years. It pointed out that this subject was discussed in ERA's task force on migration and transition. NB Rail offered to share its presentation on the subject with WG TECH. The meeting welcomed the information provided by NB Rail about ERA's task force on migration and transition.

ERA wondered whether the specific categories related to changes to existing rolling stock or rolling stock types, as prescribed in section 7.1.2.2, were sufficiently in line with the EU provisions. In particular, it requested that point 7.1.2.2(7) refer to application of the common safety method on risk assessment (CSM RA).

The **Secretariat** explained that it had drafted the provisions of 7.1.2.2 taking due account of all the relevant EU rules. It had also taken into account the differences in context and scope between EU law and COTIF, for example that APTU/ATMF concerned the mutual acceptance of vehicles in international traffic, where EU law concerned the entire EU railway system. It believed that the proposed text required conformity assessment, which had to be equally robust, as required by the TSI. The text in 7.1.2.2 was also similar to the text that was being proposed for the UTP WAG in the written procedure. The Secretariat clarified that point 7.1.2.2(7) did require application of the CSM RA, by reference to UTP GEN-G, but agreed to make the text of 7.1.2.2(7) more explicit on this aspect by introducing an explicit reference to 7.1.2.2(8), which mandated the use of the UTP GEN-G (CSM RA).

In summary, the **Chair** noted the different scope of application of COTIF and EU law and concluded this item as follows:

- section 7.1.4 should be modified by introducing references to other COTIF rules instead of EU documents alone. The OTIF Secretariat should re-check other references throughout this UTP;

- Appendix K should be repealed and replaced by the UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks;

- NB Rail was invited to send the OTIF Secretariat a presentation on simplifying the validity of certificates. The OTIF Secretariat would forward the presentation to the participants of WG TECH 41;

- Delegates were invited to provide the Secretariat with any further feedback they might have by the first week of October, which would allow the Secretariat to take the feedback into account in the preparation of the documents for the 42nd session.

d. Revision of UTP PRM (accessibility for people with reduced mobility)

   Document: [TECH-20022 v2] Draft for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** explained that the draft text included a minor editorial modification in section 3 table 2.

GB questioned whether section 4.6 correctly addressed professional competences and limited the requirements to vehicle maintenance only. WG TECH reviewed the provisions, agreed with GB's comments and invited the Secretariat to develop alternative wording.

The **Chair** noted that there were no other comments and concluded as follows:

- section 4.6 should be modified so that the recommendations referring to professional competences are limited to vehicle maintenance.

e. Revision of UTP WAG (freight wagons)

Document: TECH-20027   Draft for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that new draft text had been prepared on the basis of the UTP WAG subject to vote by written procedure and was in line with the latest version of the WAG TSI dated 9.3.2020. The Secretariat introduced the meeting to the main changes in the draft. Like Appendix K of the UTP LOC&PAS, Appendix I of the UTP WAG should also be deleted, as it would be replaced by the UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks.

UIP suggested making clear that wagons which were accepted under the RIV agreement should keep their "grandfather rights" as defined in ATMF when such wagons are modified. It pointed out that the area of use for these wagons should remain unchanged.

RS supported UIP. It noted that this UTP should prescribe new admission only if the technical characteristics of the wagon were to be changed.

NB Rail agreed with UIP and RS. It reminded the meeting that the category of the change would be assessed by assessing entities.

The **Secretariat** took note of the remarks and agreed that sections 1.1 (c) and 7.2.2.4 would have to be amended accordingly. These amendments should include an introduction to references to other UTPs where necessary. It also noted that some of the concerns were already addressed in section 7.2.2.3, which set out particular rules for the modification of existing units.

The **Chair** concluded this item as follows:

- section 1.1 (c) should be modified by introducing a reference to Article 19 of ATMF;

- section 7.2.2.4(4) should be modified by introducing references to other UTPs in addition to references to TSIs;

- a new paragraph related to RIV wagons should be introduced in 7.2.2.4(7). Wagons which were previously used under the RIV agreement should keep their area of use when they are upgraded or renewed, provided that they do not undergo any technical changes that would require new admission;

- Appendix I should be repealed and replaced by the UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks;

- Delegates were invited to provide the Secretariat with any further feedback they might have by the first week of October, which would allow the Secretariat to take the feedback into account in the preparation of the documents for the 42nd session.

6. DISCUSSION ON FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF:

a. Revision of UTP Marking with regard to rail/road machines

Document: TECH-20034   Discussion document for review by WG TECH 41
(dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that WG TECH 40 had reviewed proposals to revise UTP concerning vehicle marking and had decided that the text and table added at the end of part 16) should not be included in the document subject to vote by written procedure. However, WG TECH 40 had also decided to discuss this subject again at one of the following WG TECH meetings. The Secretariat had therefore issued a discussion document which summarised the subject.

RS explained that the main objective for the proposal related to rail/road machines was to clarify categories from 1 to 4, which had not been defined in UTP.

The **Chair** informed the meeting that standard EN 15746-1 2010 (Track road-rail machines and associated equipment) dealt with this subject and that it was being revised, with the results expected in 2022.

GB thought that it might be premature for WG TECH to draft a text in the UTP on this subject, as there were many uncertainties in terms of how to proceed.

The **Secretariat** explained that, in addition to the pending outcome of the revision of the standard, and in view of its limited experience with the very specific subject of rail/road machines, it would be difficult for the OTIF Secretariat to support WG TECH with an analysis on this subject for the next session. In addition, it wondered how far rail/road machines were used within the scope of APTU and ATMF, which were limited to the use of vehicles in international traffic by rail.

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

- The meeting noted that standard EN 15746-1 2010 (Track road-rail machines and associated equipment) was being revised, with results expected in 2022;

- It was agreed to defer the discussion until the standard concerned has been revised.

b. Revision of UTP TAF (telematics applications for freight)

ERA presented an overview concerning the TAF TSI revision 2020-22. Among other things, the revision would harmonise TAF and TAP requirements, rationalise communication processes between RUs and IMs and extend the data exchange to operators for combined transport. In addition, it explained the legal background to this revision and the steps that would follow. ERA informed the meeting that the whole process would be finished by submitting a recommendation to the European Commission before 31.12.2021.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that it had received an invitation to attend the first meeting of ERA's revision working group on TAF and TAP. Bearing in mind that, unlike TAF, TAP had not been taken over in COTIF, merging it at EU level could create complications at OTIF level.

The **Chair** thanked ERA for its presentation.

c. Vehicle register interface specifications

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that WG TECH 40 had pointed out the need to explore possibilities to facilitate access to vehicle data between vehicle registers, for example, by developing an IT tool for this purpose. The Secretariat informed the meeting that it would carry out a feasibility analysis of establishing an OTIF/International Vehicle Register that was compliant with the (future) Vehicle Register specifications and could be connected to the EVR. It informed the meeting that the following steps were being considered:

- The OTIF Secretariat establishes internal Terms of Reference for analysis;

- The OTIF Secretariat carries out the analysis in close coordination with stakeholders;

- The OTIF Secretariat drafts the preliminary results and presents them to WG TECH;

- Present conclusions of the analysis at the CTE 13 meeting in June 2021.

The aim of the analysis was not to propose a specific IT solution, but to provide a view on the feasibility and the resources that would be required to establish a database or other tool that could connect to the EVR. Depending on the outcome, the competent OTIF organs should be able to decide whether or not to pursue the development of such an IT solution at OTIF level further.

UIC supported the intention of the Secretariat to carry out a feasibility analysis and offered its full support.

ERA noted the importance of the analysis and confirmed that it had had a constructive dialogue with the OTIF Secretariat on this topic. However, the level of assistance it could offer would depend on the availability of resources within ERA.

GB supported the analysis and offered the OTIF Secretariat its full support.

The **Chair** concluded this item as follows:

- The meeting took note of the introduction of the feasibility analysis of establishing an OTIF/International Vehicle Register; the OTIF Secretariat would present the Terms of Reference, with preliminary analyses, at WG TECH 42.

7. DISCUSSION CONCERNING THE FUTURE REVISION OF ATMF WITH REGARD TO SCOPE OF ECM CERTIFICATION

Document: TECH-20035   Draft proposals for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that at the previous session of WGTECH, the question was raised as to whether the ECM-related provisions in ATMF needed updating. It had therefore analysed the current ATMF provisions and presented its findings and draft proposals.

GB wondered whether the ATMF should include provisions for the recognition of non-certified ECMs as well, bearing in mind that there are exemptions from mandatory ECM certification.

DE said that in addition to the provision on who would issue these ECM certificates, the general rule that ECMs had to be certified should be laid down in Article 15 § 2 of ATMF in order to avoid possible ambiguities.

NB Rail supported DE. It also said that mandatory ECM certification refers to ECM's outsourcing maintenance function and maintenance workshops, whose compliance with the mandatory rules should be demonstrated through the certification process.

The **Secretariat** was of the view that ATMF should provide general rules relevant to ECMs, while Annex A to ATMF should prescribe detailed requirements to be met by all ECMs and ECM Certification Bodies. It would revise the proposals for the next meeting to address the matters raised.

GB suggested keeping in mind that the extension of the scope of obligatory certification for ECMs would be applied from June 2022 at EU level.

The **Chair** concluded this item as follows:

−   The OTIF Secretariat was requested to modify the draft proposals for Article 15 of ATMF to strengthen the obligation for all ECMs to meet the requirements in the Annex to ATMF.

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

The **European Commission** gave a progress report with regard to the TSI revisions, which covered the period from June to September 2020. The work of the topical working groups was carried out as planned, with the aim of having preliminary recommendations in September 2021 for completion in 2022. It also informed the meeting about the process of cleaning up national technical and safety rules in the EU MS.

ERA reminded the meeting of the legal background and architecture of the European vehicle register and explained the process for registering vehicles coming from non-EU OTIF CS into the EU. It explained the current process for registering vehicles. ERA also shared the link to the relevant Registration Entities[2] that non-EU OTIF CS could contact if necessary.

The **Chair** thanked the European Commission and ERA for the information.

9. CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: TECH-17049   Working document for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** presented the document. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 39, there were small changes, which included:

−   ERA's becoming a competent authority for EU states as of 16 June 2019 (on page 6);
−   Clarification that rules for RUs to offer services are not harmonised under COTIF (page 11-12) and
−   Editorial change (page 10).

The meeting took note of the document without further comments.

---

[2]   https://www.era.europa.eu/sites/default/files/registers/docs/list_of_registering_entities_en.pdf

10. EU-OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: TECH-18024   Working document for review by WG TECH 41 (dated 12.8.2020)

The **Secretariat** presented the document. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 39, the document had been tidied up with an improved layout (formatting, editorial and other minor changes). As a result, the final document did not show the amendments in track change mode. The Secretariat also provided brief guidance on how to understand the table:

– The last updated date refers to the date when that document and all other relevant documents were published for the WG TECH meeting

– The headings in the table had been improved to provide more clarity

– The legal references were _hyperlinked_ to the document on either the OTIF or the eur-lex website

The meeting took note of the document without further comments.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The **Chair** gave the floor to each delegate consecutively so that they could raise any other business. No matters of substance were raised.

12. NEXT SESSIONS

The 42nd session of WG TECH - 17 and 18 November 2020 in Bern, remote meeting.

The 13th session of CTE - 22 and 23 June 2021 in Bern, remote or hybrid meeting to be confirmed, depending on developments in connection with COVID-19.

The 43rd session of WG TECH - 23 and 24 June 2021, directly following CTE 13.

The 44th session of WG TECH - 8 and 9 September 2021, remote or hybrid meeting to be confirmed.

GB offered to host one of the WG TECH meetings in London.

CLOSING REMARKS

The **Chair** thanked all the participants for the productive discussion, the OTIF Secretariat for preparing all the documents on time and closed the 41st session of WG TECH.

List of participants   **Annex I**

I.   Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

M./Hr./Mr.   Heiko **Heid**   Expert
                                              Eisenbahn-Bundesamt

France/Frankreich/France

M./Hr./Mr.   Henri **Lacour**   Chargé de mission conventions internationales
                                              Ministère de la Transition écologique et solidaire

M./Hr./Mr.   Anthony **Godart**   Chargé d'affaire
                                              Autorité française de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)

Grèce/Griechenland/Greece

Mme/Fr./Ms   Eirini **Pavli**   Expert
(only 1ˢᵗ day)   Ministry for Infrastrucure and Transport -
                                              Department for Railway Interoperability and
                                              Safety, Railway Directorate

Italie/Italien/Italy

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

Iran

M./Hr./Mr.   Ali **Abdollahi**   Head of International Organizations Group
(only 1ˢᵗ day)   International Affairs Dept.
                                              Iranian Railways

**Royaume-Uni/
Vereinigtes Königreich/
United Kingdom**

M./Hr./Mr.   Peter **Coverdale**   Policy Advisor
                                              Department for Transport

M./Hr./Mr.   Vaibhav **Puri**   Head of Technical & Regulatory Policy
                                              Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB)

Serbie/Serbien/Serbia

M./Hr./Mr.   Miloš **Stanojević**   Associate
                                              Department for Railways and Intermodal
                                              Transport
                                              Ministry of Construction, transport and
                                              Infrastructure

M./Hr./Mr.   Milan **Popović**   Head of the department for Safety
(only 2nd day)   Directorate for Railways

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

Mme/Frau/Ms. Linda **Ay**   Project Manager Safety and Interoperability
                                                         Federal Office of Transport

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**   Policy Officer
                                              European Commission - Directorate General for
                                              Mobility and Transport
                                                Unit C4 – Rail Safety and Interoperability

ERA

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

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

M./Hr./Mr.   Oscar **Martos**   Project Officer

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

M./Hr./Mr.   Filip **Skibinski**   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**   General Manager

UIC

| M./Hr./Mr. | Jozef **Fázik** | Chargé de mission, Relations Institutionelles |
| | | Union internationale des chemins de fer (UIC) |

UIP

| **M./Hr./Mr.** | **Gilles Peterhans** | Secretary General |
| | | International Union of Wagon Keepers (UIP) |

IV. Secrétariat
Sekretariat
Secretariat

M./Hr./Mr.	Bas **Leermakers**	Head of Department
Mme/Fr./Ms.	Maria **Price**	Expert
M./Hr./Mr.	Dragan **Nešić**	Expert

Approved Agenda   **Annex II**

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. Election of chair
4. Approval of the minutes of the 40th session of WG TECH
5. Review of draft proposals for:
    a. A new UTP concerning infrastructure
    b. A new UTP concerning train composition and route compatibility checks
    c. Revision of UTP LOC&PAS (locomotives and passenger rolling stock)
    d. Revision of UTP PRM (accessibility for people with reduced mobility)
    e. Revision of UTP WAG (freight wagons)
6. Discussion on further development of:
    a. Revision of UTP Marking with regard to rail/road machines
    b. Revision of UTP TAF (telematics applications for freight)
    c. Vehicle register interface specifications
7. Discussion concerning the future revision of ATMF with regard to scope of ECM certification
8. Developments in EU regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by ERA and DG MOVE)
9. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
10. EU-OTIF equivalence table
11. Any other business
12. Next sessions