Organisation intergouvernementale pour les transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail

WG TECH

47th Session

Minutes

Hybrid meeting, 7.9.2022

WG TECH 47 SUMMARY
7 SEPTEMBER 2022

1. **The United Kingdom, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, was elected to chair the session.**
2. **The agenda as submitted in document TECH-22032 dated 12 July 2022 and as amended during the session was approved.**
3. **The minutes of WG TECH 46 were approved.**
4. **The Secretariat presented the latest developments in OTIF.**
5. **For discussion**

WG TECH 47 reviewed and discussed the working documents that had been prepared for the session.

In particular, the following was discussed or agreed on the different items for discussion[1]:

5.1. Development of Annex C to the EST UR concerning a harmonised procedure for issuing safety certificates (Appendix H to COTIF):

- WG TECH was satisfied with document TECH-22022 version 2 of 9 August 2022 and agreed to forward it to the CTE for consideration.

5.2. Revision of UTP GEN-G concerning a Common Safety Method on risk evaluation and assessment:

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22027 of 9 August 2022. It made comments in relation to the scope and accreditation and recognition bodies, peer evaluation between accreditation and recognition bodies, exchange of good practice and training, references to obsolete EU directives, derogations and sharing the safety assessment reports with bodies in charge of performing a new assessment.
- WG TECH suggested clarifying the text with regard to the scope of the UTP GEN-G in relation to international traffic.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to prepare an updated version of the working document for review by WG TECH 48, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 15 for adoption.

5.3. Analysis of the criteria to be met by assessing entities (UTP GEN-E):

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22034 of 9 August 2022. It made comments regarding the coordination activities between assessing entities within the COTIF framework, requirements and obligations when subcontracting activities, the presumption of conformity of assessing entities with the UTP if they were accredited according to ISO 17065, and whether there was a need for centralised registration of certificates in relation to the non-EU CSs.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to update document TECH-22034 for review by WG TECH 48. It also requested the Secretariat to prepare a new working document for a draft revised UTP GEN-E, taking into account the analysis and the feedback provided at the meeting.

5.4. Analysis of the feasibility of developing specific UTPs dedicated to vehicles that can be used freely in international traffic:

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22035 of 9 August 2022. It supported the aim of giving more prominence to specific requirements applicable to vehicles suitable for free circulation and for general operation. However, there was no consensus on creating a specific UTP for this purpose.
- WG TECH suggested including specific requirements in chapter 0 or as an annex to UTPs, or the development of specific guidance, which could then be either included in the UTP or could exist as a separate document.

[1] At the meeting, the item 5.1 was dealt with after item 5.6.

- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to update document TECH-22035 for review by WG TECH 48.

5.5. Updates of the UTP application guides

a) Draft application guide for UTP WAG

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22014 version 2 of 9 August 2022.
- ERA was requested to provide clarification concerning the relevance of UIC Leaflet 541-4 (composite brake blocks approved for international traffic) in relation to ERA technical document ERA/TD/2009-02/INT (the list of fully UIC approved composite brake blocks for international transport) within the context of WAG TSI.
- WG TECH requested the Secretariat to prepare an updated version of document TECH-22014 for review by WG TECH 48, with the aim of submitting the document to CTE 15 for approval.

b) Draft application guide for UTP noise

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22020 version 2 of 9 August 2022.
- WG TECH was satisfied with the document and recommended that it be submitted to CTE 15 for approval.

5.6. Next step in monitoring and assessing the implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR by Contracting States

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22024 version 2 of 9 August 2022.
- WG TECH was satisfied with the document and recommended that it be submitted to CTE 15 for approval.

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

- WG TECH took note of the presentation by ERA concerning general observations on the safety certification process within the EU. It also noted the latest developments with regard to the TSI revision package 2022 and updates to the TAF related ERA technical documents.

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 48):

Paris/hybrid, 15-16 November 2022.

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 47th session of WG TECH. The meeting was held in a hybrid format. The list of participants is attached to these minutes as Annex I.

The **Secretariat** presented the practical arrangements for the hybrid format of this session of WG TECH.

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 the participants for the confidence they had placed in him.

2 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the provisional agenda for WG TECH 47 had been submitted in the invitation letter TECH-22032 of 12 July 2022. Before the meeting, **UIC** asked that their agenda item 6 "*Information on developments concerning the Future Railway Mobile Communication System*" be postponed to the 48th session. At the meeting, the Secretariat proposed that agenda item 5.1 "*Development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF)*" be discussed after item 5.6 (next steps in monitoring and assessing the implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR by CS).

WG TECH 47 adopted the agenda as amended during the session (Annex II – Adopted agenda).

3 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 46TH SESSION OF WG TECH

Document: WG TECH 46 PVM Provisional minutes of WG TECH 46

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that the provisional minutes had been sent for review to delegates who had attended the 46th session of WG TECH on 11 July 2022. The Secretariat had received comments from CH and CER. The modified provisional minutes had been uploaded for the attention of WG TECH 47. There were no further comments at the session. The Chair therefore concluded that the minutes of the 46th session of WG TECH were approved and asked the Secretariat to place them on OTIF's website[2].

4 INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT

The **Secretariat** gave an overview of relevant official communications since the previous session:

- Circular letter (TECH–22031 of 1 July 2022) concerning the list of decisions of CTE 14 (OTIF-22003-CTE14 of 15 June 2022)[3], in accordance with the new procedure for formalising decisions taken by the CTE. The circular was sent to the Member States of OTIF, Associate Members of OTIF, regional organisations which have acceded to COTIF and international associations that are invited to the CTE.

---

[2] Activities > Technical Interoperability > Working Group Tech > Reports

[3] Activities > Technical Interoperability > Committee of Technical Experts > Decisions

- Depositary notification (NOT-22034 of 22 July 2022)[4] concerning the revised UTPs adopted by the CTE at its 14th session held on 14 and 15 June 2022. The revised UTPs will enter into force on 1 January 2023, unless one quarter of the Member States formulate an objection before the deadline of 12 November 2022.

The Secretariat also informed the meeting about the results of the fifth Joint Coordinating Group of Experts (JCGE) meeting held on 6 September 2022. It also gave an overview of the OTIF Secretariat's activities since WG TECH 46, which included the request from the CTE to the Revision Committee to modify Article 3a § 5 and Article 15 § 2 of the ATMF UR and the Explanatory Report. A written procedure for the adoption of the modification was expected to be issued soon after the meeting. Moreover, two circulars concerning national focal points and the reporting of accidents, incidents and severe damage in international traffic would soon be sent to the OTIF Member States.

5 FOR DISCUSSION

Note: At the meeting, the item 5.1 was dealt with after item 5.6.

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

- Annex C: A harmonised procedure for issuing safety certificates

Document: TECH-22022 v2 Working document (version 2 dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of draft working document TECH-22022 of 9 August 2022, in which changes compared to the first version were shown in track changes. The new version further clarified the validity of documentary evidence in relation to the safety certification procedure and contained some editorial modifications.

To support the discussion, **ERA** (Mathieu Schittekatte) gave a presentation on the safety certification process within the EU, which includes the application and assessment processes and the supervision process. He then presented the content and format of the safety certificate issued by ERA, based on an example.

In response to questions, **ERA** informed the meeting that since June 2019, it had issued a little over 100 single safety certificates (SSCs), a small majority of which were valid for two or more EU MS. SSCs are valid for a period of up to five years, although the application/assessment file must be retained in the data system for 15 years. ERA pointed out that the SSCs are publicly available documents in the ERADIS database. If it were decided not to issue an SSC, the negative decision could be reviewed at the request of the applicant. In relation to the assessment process, ERA confirmed that on-site visits are used to support the desktop review. However, due to previous COVID restrictions, on-site visits were only partially implemented. In addition, ERA informed the meeting about the existing application guides and added that they were publicly available on its website[5].

GB asked whether the RUs have to be established in the EU in order to obtain SSC.

ERA confirmed that all applications received so far had been from EU MS or from states that have exclusive agreements with the EU, e.g. Norway, and also from Switzerland.

CH clarified that according to the current transitory measures for rail traffic between the EU and Switzerland[6], applications for single safety certificates with an area of operation including CH were dealt with by ERA and CH in a parallel process. All applications had to be made through the One Stop Shop (OSS). At the end of the OSS process, a FOT decision was issued in addition to the ERA decision.

---

4 http://otif.org/fileadmin/new/2-Activities/2E-Technical-Interoperability/2Ec-Notifications/2022/NOT-22034-e-Notification-CTE-adoption-TAF-and-Annex-B-ATMF_signed_scanned.pdf

5 https://www.era.europa.eu/applicants/applications-single-safety-certificates_en

6 Decision No 2/2019 of the Community/Switzerland Inland Transport Committee of 13 December 2019 on transitory measures to maintain smooth rail traffic between Switzerland and the European Union [2020/40]

With regard to document TECH-22022, **GB** proposed a small editorial modification in point 4 § 2, which was shown on the screen and tacitly accepted.

The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat for preparing the document. He summarised the discussion and concluded this item as follows:

– WG TECH was satisfied with document TECH-22022 version 2 of 9 August 2022 and agreed to forward it to the CTE for consideration.

5.2 Revision of UTP GEN-G concerning a Common Safety Method on risk evaluation and assessment

Document: TECH-22027 Working document (dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** explained that according to the analysis by WG TECH 46, the UTP GEN-G had to be revised for the purpose of the EST UR. Working document TECH-22027 of 9 August 2022 was based on the consolidated version of the UTP GEN-G that included all amendments to date. In addition, it included modifications to risk evaluations and assessments relating to the safety management system (SMS) in the scope of the EST UR, as well as editorial modifications. All the changes were indicated in track changes compared to the consolidated version.

The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat for preparing the document and opened the floor for comments.

RS requested clarification on whether the references in the right-hand column to EU Directives that had been repealed should be updated to refer to the latest EU Directives. **GB** was of the view that keeping the references to the "old" directives might lead to ambiguities, for example when granting the ECM certificates as prescribed in point 8.2.

The **Secretariat** explained that the references to repealed EU Directives should be construed as references to the new EU Directives. It was not in favour of changing the references in the right-hand column, as that column should reflect the EU provisions, which also referred to the repealed directives. The Secretariat agreed that the matter should be clarified to avoid misunderstanding.

The **EC** concurred with the Secretariat and explained that the references to the repealed EU Directives should be read in conjunction with the *correlation tables* which are included in the newer EU Directives.

- **Scope** (points 2.4 and 2.6)

GB requested clarification as to why it was proposed to remove the possibility of derogations (point 2.4) from the OTIF text, whereas the possibility of derogations was still available on the right-hand side. If application of the CSM concluded that the UTP provisions were not sufficiently safe, in the absence of the possibility of derogations, the only course of action for CSs would be to contact CTE.

CER was of the view that at OTIF level, derogations were regulated in Annex B of the ATMF UR, which allowed CSs to decide on derogations at any time.

The **Secretariat** understood the concerns raised by GB and agreed with CER. The Secretariat reminded the meeting of the basic principle that when applying the CSM, the results should not lead to requirements which contradicted the structural UTPs. Should application of the CSM RA reveal a safety deficiency in the provisions of structural UTPs, then the issue should be addressed to CTE and WG TECH, and coordinated with the EU. In the meantime, CSs would be able to grant derogations from applying the UTP provisions in question by application of Annex B to the ATMF UR. However, the consequence of this would be that the vehicle that was not complying with all UTP requirements would have to be admitted separately by each CS.

NB Rail suggested keeping a reference to derogations in the text, but to be more explicit about the fact that CSs should inform CTE about the derogation. This would help CTE decide whether it was necessary to revise the (relevant) UTP.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion. He noted the wish of WG TECH to retain a reference to derogations in this UTP. He pointed out that, in accordance with Annex B to the ATMF UR, CTE must be informed with regard to derogations, so that it was not necessary to repeat that in UTP GEN-G.

GB also suggested retaining in the left-hand column a reference to projects in an advanced stage of development (point 2.6). This suggestion was tacitly supported by WG TECH.

- **Accreditation and recognition bodies** (points 14.1 and 14.2)

NB Rail noted that the EU text of Section 14 referred to both accreditation and recognition bodies, but the OTIF text only referred to accreditation bodies. It wondered whether the OTIF text should be extended to include recognition bodies as well. However, NB Rail did understand that it might be difficult simply to require the same from recognition bodies as from accreditation bodies. With regard to peer evaluation and training, which was a task currently coordinated by ERA, it highlighted the importance of a process for harmonising good practice among the recognition and accreditation bodies. Such a process already existed at the level of European cooperation for Accreditation (further in the text: EA).

The **Secretariat** agreed with NB Rail to draft wording in section 14 that included recognition bodies. It pointed out that recognition bodies are governmental bodies. As COTIF is implemented at national level by sovereign states, they cannot be legally obliged to undergo peer evaluation. At the same time, as accreditation bodies act independently from the government and because non-EU accreditation bodies were members of EA, they could be requested to participate in peer evaluation organised by ERA, provided they were admitted to it. The Secretariat did not think it had a role with regard to organising coordination work between recognition and accreditation bodies, as it lacked a mandate and the resources to do so.

RS agreed that recognition bodies should be included in the left-hand column of section 14. It also wondered whether the organiser of such peer evaluations and training should also be indicated. **GB** made a similar comment.

CER was of the view that the document should be less prescriptive, allowing the application of different options for CSs, depending on how the recognition and accreditation bodies are organised.

The **Chair** concluded that recognition should be added to section 14 and that recognition bodies should be encouraged to exchange experience and good practice, whereas accreditation bodies could be required to participate in relevant international activities, such as training and peer evaluation, provided they had access to it.

- **Safety assessment reports** (point 15.5, point 4.1)

GB noted that in accordance with point 15.5, safety assessment reports issued by one assessment body should not be called into question by other assessment bodies. However, it also noted that this was conditional upon demonstrating that the system would be used under the same functional, operational and environmental conditions as the system that was already accepted. GB sought clarification as to who could decide whether or not these conditions were the same. In addition, GB wondered whether it was also necessary to define which organisational changes would be related to international traffic.

In response to GB, **NB Rail** explained that the applicant would provide the new assessment body with the safety assessment report issued by the previous assessment body. The applicant should demonstrate to the new assessment body that the system would be used under the same functional, operational and environmental conditions as the system that was already accepted. If that were demonstrated, the new assessment body should not call the safety assessment report into question.

The **Chair** thanked everybody for their comments. He then summarised and concluded this agenda item as follows:

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22027 of 9 August 2022. It made comments in relation to the scope and accreditation and recognition bodies, peer evaluation between accreditation and recognition bodies, exchange of good practice and training, references to obsolete EU

directives, derogations and sharing the safety assessment reports with bodies in charge of performing a new assessment.

- WG TECH suggested clarifying the text with regard to the scope of the UTP GEN-G in relation to international traffic.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to prepare an updated version of the working document for review by WG TECH 48, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 15 for adoption.

5.3 Analysis of the criteria to be met by assessing entities (UTP GEN-E)

Document: TECH-22034 Discussion document (dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** had carried out a comprehensive analysis concerning the qualification and independence of assessing entities by comparing the COTIF provisions of the ATMF UR and UTP GEN-E with the EU provisions in the latest interoperability Directive. The left-hand column of the annex to TECH-22034 of 9 August 2022 contained the OTIF Secretariat's observations on whether the corresponding EU provisions were relevant or necessary in the scope of COTIF. The Secretariat suggested preparing a draft proposal for a revised UTP GEN-E for WG TECH 48, taking into account the discussion at the 47th session. It also suggested that no modification of the ATMF UR should be considered in this context.

- **Coordination activities between assessing entities**

With regard to page 6 of TECH-22034, **NB** Rail reminded the meeting that non-EU assessing entities were invited to meetings of NB-Rail's subgroup rolling stock. It suggested that non-EU assessing entities could also be invited to meetings on subjects other than rolling stock. NB Rail informed the meeting that from the non-EU CSs, only assessing entities from Türkiye had participated in its meetings so far.

The **EC** welcomed NB Rail's suggestion and confirmed that it would provide its feedback for the next WG TECH.

Where the document mentioned CEN/CENELEC, **UIC** suggested including the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI) in the context of communication developments.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that it received invitations from NB Rail to the meetings of subgroup rolling stock and that it forwarded these to all assessing entities of the non-EU CSs, accompanied by a letter with additional explanations. It agreed to include ETSI when referring to European standardisation bodies.

- **Subcontracting of tasks and subsidiaries**

With regard to page 10 of TECH-22034, **FR** was of the view that provisions regarding the subcontracting of tasks and subsidiaries of assessing entities should be included in UTP GEN-E.

The **Secretariat** agreed with FR. In its view, it would not be necessary to take over the provisions of Articles 27-45 of Directive (EU) 2016/797 clause by clause, because the aims of the COTIF and EU provisions were different.

NB Rail explained that when subcontracting, the main assessing entity (i.e. lead assessor) enters into a legal agreement with another assessing entity to carry out a part of the assessment. However, the assessment report could not be subject to subcontracting, as the main assessing entity remained solely responsible for the report[7].

In **RS's** view, the responsibility of the assessing entities was already prescribed by ATMF UR, so in-depth requirements similar to those on the right-hand side would not be necessary. It also informed the meeting that subcontracting is not allowed in Serbia. However, certificates issued by the EU MSs are accepted.

The **Chair** noted that it should be ensured that whether or not subcontracting was used, all requirements had to be met.

---

7 ERA Technical document 'requirements for conformity assessment bodies seeking notification'

- **Presumption of conformity of assessing entities**

NB Rail highlighted a problem in the analyses in the left-hand column of Article 37 (on page 12) and Article 33 (on page 9). Article 33 of the EU text presumed conformity of the assessing entity when it complied with relevant standards. Article 37 of the EU text indicated that notification could be based on accreditation, which in accordance with AE practice meant compliance with standard ISO 17065. However, under COTIF, it was suggested that the option of presumption of conformity based on compliance with standards was not necessary. NB Rail suggested that assessing entities from the non-EU CSs should also be able to rely on compliance with a standard, e.g. ISO 17065 as that standard is used in the EU.

After consideration by the meeting, the **Chair** suggested adding to the UTP that compliance with ISO 17065 indicated presumption of conformity with the OTIF rules for assessing entities.

With regard to the obligation in the EU for NoBos to provide information on issued certificates (Article 42 on page 15), **GB** wondered whether similar centralised registration of certificates should be provided by the non-EU assessing entities as well, and whether the ERADIS database and experience in relation to the ECM certificates might be of use.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that COTIF did not currently contain requirements on centralised registration/administration of certificates and that if this became necessary, such requirements should not be indicated in the UTP GEN-E, but elsewhere. If centralised registration were required, OTIF and ERA might be able to draw on experience with the joint ECM register.

NB Rail confirmed that, at present, NoBos register all the certificates they issue in ERADIS. ERA checks these certificates when issuing vehicle authorisations.

The **Chair** noted that the necessity for centralised registration of certificates in relation to the non-EU CSs should be investigated further. He thanked the Secretariat for preparing the document and the participants for the constructive debate. The Chair summarised the discussion and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22034 of 9 August 2022. It made comments regarding the coordination activities between assessing entities within the COTIF framework, requirements and obligations when subcontracting activities, the presumption of conformity of assessing entities with the UTP if they were accredited according to ISO 17065, and whether there was a need for centralised registration of certificates in relation to the non-EU CSs.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to update document TECH-22034 for review by WG TECH 48. It also requested the Secretariat to prepare a new working document for a draft revised UTP GEN-E, taking into account the analysis and the feedback provided at the meeting.

5.4 Analysis of the feasibility of developing specific UTPs dedicated to vehicles that can be used freely in international traffic

Document: TECH-22035 Discussion document (dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that, following the request from CTE 14, it had carried out an analysis and prepared working document TECH-22035 of 9 August 2022. The subject of interchangeable coaches had already been discussed within OTIF in 2014 and 2015, which had facilitated the analysis. The subject of vehicles that could easily be used internationally was of specific importance to OTIF, as OTIF only dealt with international traffic. In contrast, the EU TSIs, on which the UTPs were based, also covered vehicles that would only be used domestically.

The working document described a difference between requirements for free circulation related to the admission by all CSs and those for general operation related to the ability for vehicles to be coupled and operated together in a train. The document gave the UTP WAG as an example. It specified three layers of requirements for wagons: compulsory requirements as the first layer, optional requirements for free circulation as a second layer and optional provisions for general operation as the third layer. A similar set of requirements was being developed by ERA for passenger coaches in the TSI LOC&PAS. As these requirements were so essential for OTIF, the question as to whether they deserved a more prominent place than in an annex to the UTP was justified.

The Secretariat therefore suggested the creation of a new UTP that would contain *optional specifications* for different categories of rolling stock structured in two levels:

- Free circulation, allowing a wide area of use during the first admission;
- General operation, facilitating the use and exchange of vehicles by RUs.

Lastly, the Secretariat explained that application of the *optional specifications* should always be in addition to compliance with the other applicable UTP requirements. A new UTP could replace the existing provisions from section 7.1.2 of the UTP WAG and section 7.2.6a of the UTP LOC&PAS, with the possible development of additional categories of vehicles.

FR supported the development of these specific requirements. However, instead of adding them to a new UTP, it preferred to maintain them in the dedicated areas of the UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS.

NB Rail agreed with FR. As far as NB Rail was aware, ERA intended to include specific requirements for coaches and locomotives as an appendix to the LOC&PAS TSI, in a similar manner to how appendix C had been introduced into the WAG TSI.

GB welcomed the Secretariat's work. In its view, duplicate requirements in several UTPs should be avoided. It wondered whether a separate new UTP would not add unnecessary complexity and workload when the UTPs had to be revised.

In response to the comments, the **Secretariat** suggested that bearing in mind the need to have more prominent and easily discoverable rules for the non-EU CSs, rather than creating a new UTP, the existing UTPs could contain dedicated sections dealing with the requirements suitable for free circulation and general operation. In view of the fact that UTPs and TSIs should continue to be aligned, the Secretariat suggested that these specific requirements could be included in chapter 0 of the relevant UTPs.

NB Rail concurred with the Secretariat and, as an alternative to the Secretariat's proposal, suggested that a dedicated application guide should be drafted, which would explain how to facilitate international traffic and how to apply vehicle circulation requirements. This guide, which could include wagons, coaches, locomotives and train sets, could be annexed to UTPs or could become a separate document.

ERA wondered whether it was necessary to develop specific requirements for coaches. As far as it was aware, the use of train sets would significantly overtake the use of coaches within the EU in the near future. It also wondered if the RIC pool still existed.

The **Secretariat** was not convinced that the use of coaches would be marginalised in the future. As an example, it pointed out the recent revival of sleeping cars intended to be used in night trains. In addition, coaches for free circulation could easily be resold on the second-hand market, as they could be used everywhere. This made them interesting for keepers. Lastly, coaches remained important for international traffic, particularly in the non-EU CSs, as locomotives and trainsets were often not able to cross borders because of incompatibility with the network on the other side.

UIC confirmed that as far as it was aware, RUs are using train sets more often for both domestic and international traffic. However, UIC also pointed out that the use of coaches with compartments and sleeping cars in international traffic had also increased recently, especially in international traffic. UIC confirmed that the RIC agreement still existed. It had around 700 members (RUs and keepers) and governed contracts on the commercial use of vehicles.

OSJD informed the meeting that the applicable OSJD Leaflets prescribed obligatory requirements that coaches and sleeping cars must unconditionally comply with in international traffic between OSJD members.

RS was of the view that, in addition to these specific requirements, the introduction of the UTP for command control and signalling (UTP CCS) would also help eradicate some problems that RUs encounter when operating their vehicles internationally.

With regard to the future UTP CCS, the **Secretariat** explained that in the past, priority had been given to the development of UTPs with rolling stock requirements. The Secretariat was of the view that UTP CCS could be included in CTE's work plan in the near future, provided the EU requirements were stable.

NB Rail indicated that even coaches and wagons had interfaces with CCS, such as for track circuits and axle counters. Trainsets and locomotives had CCS on board and their interfaces with the track side CCS were therefore much more complex. It therefore suggested first to develop requirements for coaches and then, in following steps, to develop requirements for the free circulation of locomotives and train sets.

GB requested clarification concerning point 2.2.2 regarding the area of use.

The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat for preparing the document. He then summarised and concluded this agenda item as follows:

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22035 of 9 August 2022. It supported the aim of giving more prominence to specific requirements applicable to vehicles suitable for free circulation and for general operation. However, there was no consensus on creating a specific UTP for this purpose.
- WG TECH suggested including specific requirements in chapter 0 or as an annex to UTPs, or the development of specific guidance, which could then either be included in the UTP or could exist as a separate document.
- WG TECH asked the Secretariat to update document TECH-22035 for review by WG TECH 48.

5.5 Updates of the UTP application guides

a) Application guide for UTP WAG

Documents: TECH-22014 v2 Working document (dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of the document. The modifications concerned further clarification of equivalence and transitional provisions, as well as the scope and definition of the subsystems. In addition, the safety integration of the vehicle into the rail system and safe operations had been clarified. All the modifications were shown in track changes.

CER asked whether the reference to the ERA technical document ERA/TD/2009-02/INT in the blue rectangle on page 42 should be updated, bearing in mind that on 29 July 2022, UIC had published the latest version of the fully approved composite brake blocks (CBB) (UIC Leaflet 541-4 Annex M)[8].

The **Secretariat** thought that the list of fully approved CBB as published in ERA/TD/2009-02/INT of 23 July 2015 (Appendix G to UTP WAG) was the latest version of this list and was no longer updated. Appendix O to UTP WAG, which was a transcription of an ERA technical document concerning CBB requirements and test methods, provided the necessary specifications for notified bodies to perform the assessment of conformity of CBB as an interoperability constituent. It was therefore no longer necessary to update ERA's technical documents. The Secretariat suggested that ERA could be asked to inform WG TECH of the status of the UIC's Leaflet 541-4 Annex M in relation to the ERA/TD/2009-02/INT in the context of WAG TSI.

ERA noted the request and confirmed that it would provide its feedback for the next WG TECH.

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

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22014 version 2 of 9 August 2022.
- ERA was requested to provide clarification concerning the relevance of UIC Leaflet 541-4 (composite brake blocks approved for international traffic) in relation to ERA technical document ERA/TD/2009-02/INT (the list of fully UIC approved composite brake blocks for international transport) within the context of WAG TSI.
- WG TECH requested the Secretariat to prepare an updated version of document TECH-22014 for review by WG TECH 48, with the aim of submitting the document to CTE 15 for approval.

[8] https://uic.org/IMG/pdf/20220729_fiche_uic_541_4_4eed_annexe_m.pdf

b) Application guide for UTP NOI

Documents: TECH-22020 v2 Working document (dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of the document. The modifications concerned changes similar to those made to the UTP WAG application guide. It was also clarified that COTIF did not stipulate binding requirements for the purpose of authorising vehicles outside the scope of COTIF. All the modifications were shown in track changes.

The **Chair** noted that there were no further comments and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22020 version 2 of 9 August 2022.
- WG TECH was satisfied with the document and recommended that it be submitted to CTE 15 for approval.

5.6 Next step in monitoring and assessing the implementation of APTU and ATMF by Contracting States

Documents: TECH-22024 v2 Working document (dated 9.8.2022)

The **Secretariat** presented the second version of the working document, which had been updated in line with the suggestions made by WG TECH 46. The modifications concerned the addition of a brief description of the second step in monitoring and assessing, adding questions related to international railway passenger traffic and passenger coaches, and whether additional training or explanations of COTIF would be of help to CSs. All the modifications compared to the previous version were shown in track changes. The Secretariat also reminded the meeting that it was planned to submit the questionnaires for approval to CTE 15 (planned for June 2023), after which the second step in monitoring and assessing the implementation of APTU and ATMF UR by CSs could start.

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

- WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22024 version 2 of 9 August 2022.
- WG TECH was satisfied with the document and recommended that it be submitted to CTE 15 for approval.

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

The **EC** gave a progress report on the TSI revision package 2022. On 1 July 2022, ERA issued its recommendation to the EC. The EC then started the internal process of preparing the draft implementing acts. The EC's next step would be to organise public consultations in which non-EU CSs would be able to provide their comments on the draft implementing act. This step would take four weeks. As a final step, at its November 2022 meeting, the EC's Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) should review and adopt the TSI revision proposals.

ERA (Stefan Jugelt) informed the meeting of the updates to the TAF-related ERA technical documents. In accordance with established practice, ERA would prepare the proposal to amend Appendix I to UTP TAF and submit it to the OTIF Secretariat for further processing.

ERA invited participants to attend its webinars. The links to these and recordings of the webinars are available on ERA's website under https://www.era.europa.eu/events-news/events_en.

The **Chair** thanked the EC and ERA for providing feedback and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH took note of the presentation by ERA concerning general observations on the safety certification process within the EU. It also noted the latest developments with regard to the TSI revision package 2022 and updates to the TAF-related ERA technical documents.

7 CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: TECH-17049 Working document for review by WG TECH 47 (dated 9.8.2022)

The document was presented by the **Secretariat**. There were no modifications compared with the version submitted to WG TECH 46.

8 EU – OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: TECH-18024 Working document for review by WG TECH 47 (dated 9.8.2022)

The document was presented by the **Secretariat**. Compared to the version submitted to WG TECH 46, the *Comments* column was updated to reflect the pending status of the provisions adopted at CTE 14 (revised UTP TAF and Annex B to ATMF UR).

WG TECH took note of the document without further comment.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

10 NEXT SESSIONS

The following sessions are scheduled to be held in a hybrid format; if new travel restrictions are imposed, the sessions will be held remotely:

- 48th session of WG TECH on 15 and 16 November 2022 in Paris (UIC premises)
- 15th session of CTE on 13 and 14 June 2023 in Bern (UNIA building)
- 49th session of WG TECH on 15 June 2023 in Bern
- 6th Joint Coordinating Group of Experts (JCGE) on 6 September 2023 in Bern
- 50th session of WG TECH on 7 September 2023 in Bern (to be confirmed).

CLOSING REMARKS

The **Chair** thanked all participants for the productive discussion and the OTIF Secretariat for preparing all the documents on time and concluded the 47th hybrid session of WG TECH.

On behalf of the delegates, the **Secretariat** thanked the Chair for his excellent work in chairing the WG TECH 47 meeting.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS — ANNEX I

I. Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

M./Hr./Mr. Remote	Philipp **Unge**r	Technischer Regierungsamtsrat Eisenbahn-Bundesamt

Autriche/Österreich/Austria

M./Hr./Mr. Remote	Thomas **Helnwein**	Amtssachverständiger Bundesministerium für Klimaschutz, Umwelt, Energie, Mobilität, Innovation und Technologie

Croatie/Kroatien/Croatia

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Darjan **Konjić**	Senior Expert Advisor Ministry of Sea, Transport and Infrastructure
M[me]/Fr./Ms remote	Matea **Jakšić**	Expert correspondent Ministry of Sea, Transport and Infrastructure

France/Frankreich/France

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Sylvain **Cozette**	Chargé d'affaires Autorité française de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)
M[me]/Fr./Ms remote	Celine **Montalti**	Legal adviser Autorité française de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)

Italie/Italien/Italy

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Rocco **Cammarata**	Head of Technical Standards of Vehicles Office Agenzia Nazionale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie e delle Infrastrutture Stradali e Autostradali (ANSFISA)

Macédoine du Nord/
Nordmazedonien
North Macedonia

M[me]/Fr./Ms remote	Svetlanka **Popovska**	Assistant Head of the Railway Department Ministry of Transport and Communications

Pakistan/Pakistan/Pakistan

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Sufyan Sarfaraz **Dogar**	Chief Marketing Manager Pakistan Railways, Headquarters Office

Roumanie/Rumänien/Romania

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Dragoş **Floroiu**	Scientific Secretary Romanian Railway Authority - AFER

Royaume-Uni/
Vereinigtes Königreich
United Kingdom

M./Hr./Mr. in person	Peter **Coverdale**	Rail Technical Standards Legislation Manager Department for Transport
M./Hr./Mr. in person	Vaibhav **Puri**	Director of Sector Strategy Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB)

Serbie/Serbien/Serbia

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Milan **Popović**	Head of the department for rules and authorisation of structural subsystems Directorate for Railways Direkcija za zeleznice

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

M[me]/Fr./Ms. in person	Linda **Ay**	Project Manager Safety and Interoperability Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland - FOT

Türkiye/Türkiye/Türkiye

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Serdar **Akil**	Transportation and Communication Assistant Expert Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure

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

M[me]/Fr./Ms. remote	Alice **Polo**	Policy Officer European Commission - Directorate General for Mobility and Transport Unit C4 – Rail Safety and Interoperability

European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Christoph **Kaupat**	Project Officer Networks, International and IMS Unit, ERA
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Mathieu **Schittekatte**	Team Leader Planning and Approvals Delivery Unit, ERA
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Piotr **Cukierski**	Project Officer Planning and Approvals Delivery Unit, ERA

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Jean-Paul **Lodzinski**	Project Officer Analysis and Monitoring Unit, ERA
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Stefan **Jugelt**	Project Officer ERTMS and Telematics Unit, ERA

III. Organisations et associations internationales
Internationale Organisationen und Verbände
International Organisations and Associations

CER

M./Hr./Mr. in person	Gilles **Quesnel**	Directeur Interopérabilité, Normalisation et Recherche Europe (SNCF) CER / SNCF

NB Rail

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Francis **Parmentier**	General Manager of the NB Rail Association

OSJD

M./Hr./Mr. in person	Radovan **Vopalecky**	Chairman of the Commission on Infrastructure and Rolling Stock OSJD - Committee of the Organization for Cooperation of Railways Commission on Infrastructure and Rolling Stock

UIC

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

IV. Secrétariat
Sekretariat
Secretariat

M./Hr./Mr.	Bas **Leermakers**	Head of Technical Interoperability Department ☏ +41 (31) 359 10 25 Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11 E-mail bas.leermakers@otif.org
M^{me}/Fr./Ms.	Maria **Price**	Expert in Technical Interoperability Department ☏ +41 (31) 359 10 26 Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11 E-mail maria.price@otif.org
M./Hr./Mr.	Dragan **Nešić**	Expert in Technical Interoperability Department ☏ +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. Approval of the minutes of the 46th session of WG TECH
4. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
5. For discussion:
   - 5.2. Revision of UTP GEN-G concerning a Common Safety Method on risk evaluation and assessment
   - 5.3. Analysis of the criteria to be met by assessing entities (UTP GEN-E)
   - 5.4. Analysis of the feasibility of developing specific UTPs dedicated to vehicles that can be used freely in international traffic
   - 5.5. Updates to the UTP application guides:
     - a) Application guide for UTP WAG
     - b) Application guide for UTP NOI
   - 5.6. Next step in monitoring and assessing the implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR by Contracting States
   - 5.1. Development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF):
     - Annex C: A harmonised procedure for issuing safety certificates
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

Postponed to WG TECH 48

- Information on developments concerning the Future Railway Mobile Communication System (presented by UIC)