



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les  
transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den  
internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for  
International Carriage by Rail

# WG TECH

37th Session

The Minutes

Bern, 5-6.2.2019

## **WG TECH 37 SUMMARY**

### **1. Approval of the agenda**

WG TECH 37 adopted the agenda submitted in document TECH-18034 dated 5.12.2018.

### **2. General information from the OTIF Secretariat**

WG TECH 37 was informed of the latest developments in OTIF following WG TECH 36.

### **3. Election of chair**

WG TECH 37 elected Switzerland, in the shape of Mr Christophe Le Borgne, to chair this session.

### **4. Approval of the minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH**

The minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH, as amended according to comments received before the meeting, were approved.

### **5. Preparation of 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts (CTE):**

- a. Draft proposal for a decision to adopt the UTP infrastructure
  - WG TECH 37 discussed the modified draft UTP covering infrastructure set out in document TECH-19002 v3 dated 7.1.2019
  - WG TECH 37 made editorial modifications to the draft UTP covering infrastructure
  - Although the UTP covering infrastructure was ready to be submitted to CTE 12, WG TECH 37 suggested postponing its adoption in order to align it with the latest INF TSI, which will become available in the course of 2019. As a consequence, a proposal to adopt the UTP covering infrastructure will be submitted to CTE 13 in 2020.
- b. Draft proposal for a decision to modify the NVR specification
  - WG TECH 37 discussed the modified draft NVR specification set out in document TECH-19001 dated 7.1.2019
  - WG TECH 37 made editorial modifications to the draft NVR specification
  - WG TECH 37 agreed to submit this document to CTE 12 with a proposal for decision.
- c. Draft explanatory document concerning National Technical Requirements
  - WG TECH 37 discussed document TECH-18023 v3 dated 7.1.2019
  - Editorial changes were made in Chapter 2
  - Chapter 5 point 1 was modified to reflect more clearly the correlation between UTPs and NTRs, open points and specific cases
  - WG TECH 37 agreed to submit the paper and explain the conclusions to CTE 12 and ask CTE to remind the CS of their obligation to notify.

### **6. Developments in EU regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by ERA and DG MOVE):**

- a. Fourth Railway Package TSI package – Status of revision process and ensuring continued compatibility with COTIF after adoption
  - WG TECH 37 noted the report by the European Commission that the “TSI Package” (except OPE TSI and CCS TSI) had been adopted at EU level at the end of January 2019.
- b. Entity in Charge of Maintenance (ECM) regulation – status of revision process and ensuring continued compatibility with COTIF after adoption
  - WG TECH 37 was informed that the EU intends to extend the scope of ECM certification to all vehicles, with some exceptions. For RUs that carry out the maintenance of their rolling stock in-house, certification could be done through the Safety Management System. A vote on the revised text is expected at EU level in April 2019

- WG TECH 37 noted that the consequences of the EU’s extension of the scope of ECM to COTIF was not clear and should be analysed and taken into account.
- c. UTP TAF: ERA document describing the objective of the CCM Changes approved by the ERA Change control board TAF TSI (see doc: TECH-18026-WGT35)
  - WG TECH 37 discussed document TECH-18037 dated 7.1.2019
  - The document will be submitted to CTE 12 with a proposal for decision.

## **7. For discussion:**

- a. Development of EU centralised vehicle register (EVR) and consequences for the European Vehicle Register and its connection to the National Vehicle Registers
  - WG TECH 37 discussed document TECH-18035 dated 8.1.2019
  - WG TECH 37 noted that Scenario 3 (EVR and NVRs) and Scenario 1 (single OTIF/EU vehicle register) are the most favourable and should be analysed further. For scenario 3, the VVR needs to be maintained, in which case the analysis should concern the vehicle data security, maintenance of the VVR and how these costs could be covered.
- b. Planning concerning the alignment of the UTPs with the TSIs revised in 2019
  - WG TECH 37 agreed to prioritise the process of revising the UTPs, starting with the so-called “freight package” UTPs, including UTP INF, and then to continue with the other UTPs. However, some flexibility in this prioritisation may be required
  - The EU’s development of the ECM specification and the next steps are to be discussed at WG TECH 38.
- c. Provisional agenda for the 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts
  - WG TECH discussed and approved the provisional agenda for CTE 12.

## **8. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology**

The Secretariat presented the updated version of the cross reference terminology table. WG TECH took note of the table as presented. WG TECH members were invited to give the OTIF Secretariat feedback, if necessary, before the next WG TECH meeting.

## **9. EU-OTIF equivalence table**

The Secretariat presented the updated version of the equivalence table and asked WG TECH members to give the OTIF Secretariat feedback, if necessary, before the next WG TECH meeting.

## **10. Next sessions**

WG TECH agreed that WG TECH 38 would be held in Bern on 11 and 12 September 2019.

## **11. Any other business**

None.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat**

Mr Bas Leermakers (OTIF's Secretary General ad interim and head of OTIF's technical interoperability department) welcomed the participants ([List of participants Annex I](#)) and opened the 37<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH in Bern.

### **1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The **Secretariat** explained that the provisional agenda had been sent with the invitation to participants on 5 December 2018 ([circular TECH-18034](#)). Since there were no objections, WG TECH 37 adopted the agenda that was submitted in document TECH-18034 dated 5.12.2018. ([Annex II](#)).

### **2. GENERAL INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT**

In connection with the developments that took place after WG TECH 36, the **Secretariat** informed the meeting about the following:

- It reminded the meeting that from 1 March 2019, the revised Appendices F (APTU) and G (ATMF) to the Convention adopted by the 26<sup>th</sup> Revision Committee would enter into force.
- With regard to the results of the vote by written procedure concerning modifications to UTP GEN-B and UTP TAF, the Secretary General received valid votes from 28 states, all of which were in favour of all the proposed modifications. The Member States of OTIF were notified of the results of the vote on 17 December 2018 ([NOT-TECH-18009](#)). The deadline for objections expires on 13 April 2019 and unless at least one-quarter of the Contracting States (CS) objected, the modified UTPs would enter into force on 1 June 2019.
- It announced that the main agenda item of the 14<sup>th</sup> General Assembly would be the election of a Secretary General for the period from 8 April 2019 to 31 December 2021.
- On 19 December 2018, an MoU had been signed between the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) and the OTIF Secretariat with a view to providing a multilateral regulatory framework to support the development of international rail transport in Asia, particularly South-East Asia.
- In connection with the current geographical scope of COTIF and its Appendices, the meeting was informed that there had not been any changes since the previous WG TECH 36. With regard to the accession of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to COTIF, the application for accession would be deemed to be accepted on 15 February, unless five Member States lodged objections with the Depository. The accession was expected to take effect on 1 May 2019 and Afghanistan would become the 51<sup>st</sup> Member State of OTIF.

### **3. ELECTION OF CHAIR**

The **Secretariat** nominated Switzerland as chair of the WG TECH 37 meeting. It asked the delegates if there were additional proposals. As there were no other nominations, the Secretariat proposed that Mr Christophe Le Borgne (Switzerland) chair the session. Mr Le Borgne accepted the nomination and WG TECH unanimously elected Switzerland, in the shape of Mr Christophe Le Borgne, to chair this session.

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

## 4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 36<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF WG TECH

Document: [WG TECH 36 PVM](#) Provisional Minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> session

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that on 20 December 2018, the OTIF Secretariat had sent the provisional minutes to the delegates who attended the 36<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH (27-28 November 2018, Bern). Comments were received from EC and ERA. The Secretariat had uploaded for the attention of WG TECH 37 a version of the provisional minutes with the comments received before 7 January 2019. There were no further comments at the meeting.

**Conclusion:** The minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH, as amended according to comments received before the meeting, were approved.

## 5. PREPARATION OF 12<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE OF TECHNICAL EXPERTS (CTE)

### a. Draft proposal for a decision to adopt the UTP infrastructure

Documents: [TECH-19002 UTP INF](#) Draft proposal for adoption  
[Draft Decision](#)

[TECH-18025 v3 UTP INF](#) Draft UTP subsystem infrastructure

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that following the discussions at WG TECH 36, it had modified draft working document TECH-18025 version 2 UTP INF. It had uploaded the amended document version 3 in track changes for the attention of WG TECH 37. In addition, the Secretariat had drafted document TECH-19002 UTP INF, which contained a proposal for the decision to be taken by CTE.

Bearing in mind that there is parallel work among the EU OTIF Contracting States on TSIs and in order to ensure their alignment with the UTPs, two options were presented as next steps:

- **Option 1: Propose the two documents for adoption at CTE 12 in 2019:**  
Under this option, UTP INF would be aligned with the current version of the INF TSI. When the new TSI version is adopted by the EU OTIF Contracting States, UTP INF will need to be re-examined (tentatively in 2021).
- **Option 2: Postpone the UTP INF for adoption until CTE 13 in 2020.**  
Under this option, the UTP could be aligned with the most recent version of the INF TSI, which would become available in the course of 2019 as part of “The Package” [TSIs: LOC&PAS, WAG, CCS, INF, ENE, RST, NOI, OPE; Registers: RINF, ERATV].

The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat for the introduction and proposed that WG TECH should first discuss the amendments to the draft UTP INF if delegates had any comments, and should then discuss how to proceed.

### Discussion on the content of the draft UTP covering infrastructure (UTP INF)

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) wondered whether the route compatibility checks should be mentioned in point 4.4 or whether it would suffice just to mention them in point 7.6.

**CER** (Christian Chavanel) suggested maintaining this requirement in both points. Point 4.4 says that all the states should have operational rules in force, whereas point 7.6 refers to the implementation plans, which did not necessarily mean that all states would have them.

**RS** (Milan Popović) was of the view that the RUs’ obligation to operate a vehicle on compatible infrastructure already existed in ATMF and that as this was in force in all CS, it might not be necessary to prescribe it in this UTP. RS made some additional editorial remarks.

The **Secretariat** noted the proposals. It also reminded the meeting that WG TECH 36 had discussed the subject and had decided that this should be noted in both points, i.e. in 4.4 and 7.6. However, the requirement could be reworded and kept in only one of the points.

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) wondered whether the published list of lines complied with UTP INF, as mentioned in chapter 7, include lines other than existing, i.e. those lines that would comply with UTP INF in the future.

The **Secretariat** explained that COTIF only applies to international traffic, so this UTP would apply to lines used for international traffic and not to entire networks. Therefore, CS should provide an overview of its lines which are compatible with the UTP INF.

**CER** (Christian Chavanel) was of the view that within the EU, not many lines complied with all TSIs at the moment.

**NB Rail** (Francis Parmentier) reminded the meeting that chapter 4 of the existing INF TSI already provided links to other TSIs. At present therefore, it was possible to declare new or existing lines (including when the line is renewed or upgraded) compatible with the TSIs. The concept had been maintained in the new INF TSI.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion and noted that WG TECH agreed to modify chapter 7, left-hand column, second paragraph, by deleting: “*With a view to facilitating route compatibility checks*”. In addition, WG TECH also modified the geographical scope to reflect more clearly the application of this UTP to existing lines (point 1.2), the correlation with the safety management system (2.5), made editorial changes to the preamble of the UTP (chapter 1), the UTP line categories [point 4.2.1 (2)] and to a footnote in point 5.3.1 (The rail) and lastly, amplified the left-hand column of the Maintenance file (point 4.5.1) and Maintenance plan (4.5.2).

#### **Discussion on the next steps**

**RS** (Milan Popović) preferred option 2, i.e. to postpone the UTP INF for adoption until CTE 13, in which case the CS would deal with the UTP covering infrastructure only once, rather than twice within a short period.

**CER** (Christian Chavanel) asked whether, if a new INF TSI were adopted by the EU Member States in January and made public in May 2019, it could already be taken into account in the draft proposal for the UTP covering infrastructure for CTE 12 in June 2019. In response, the **Secretariat** noted that in accordance with the CTE’s Rules of Procedure, proposals must be submitted to the members of the CTE and observers in all three working languages *not less than two months before the opening of the meeting*, i.e. by 12 April 2019 for the documents to be voted on at CTE 12. It also suggested that proposals should first be discussed at WG TECH meeting(s) before being submitted to the CTE.

In an email prior to this meeting, **FR** had informed the OTIF Secretariat that option 2 was the preferred solution for France.

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) preferred option 1. In its view, it would be better to have a UTP covering infrastructure aligned with any version of the INF TSI, rather than not having a UTP at all. Nevertheless, the UK could accept either option.

**UIP** (Gilles Peterhans) agreed with RS and preferred option 2. It noted the importance of maintaining equivalence between COTIF and EU law. It would therefore be better to align the UTP covering infrastructure with the latest INF TSI, rather than adopting a version which would not be applicable in all CS.

**UNIFE** (Sebastian Giera) preferred option 2. He expressed UNIFE’s interest in avoiding frequent updates of regulations.

**DE** (Fabian Heinrich) preferred option 2 to avoid developing prescriptions which would later be incompatible.

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that CTE 11 had mandated WG TECH to develop proposals for suitable and feasible provisions concerning infrastructure. Bearing in mind that option 2 was most likely to

be the preferred option, WG TECH should provide feedback to CTE 12, with an explanation and suggestion for the next steps.

**NB RAIL** (Francis Parmentier) agreed with the Secretariat's proposal to inform the CTE of the work and outcome of WGTECH 37, with supported justification.

The **Chair** noted that, with a mandate from CTE 11, WG TECH had developed the UTP covering infrastructure and that it was ready to be submitted to CTE 12.

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

1. WG TECH 37 discussed the modified draft UTP covering infrastructure set out in document TECH-19002 v3 dated 7.1.2019
2. WG TECH 37 made editorial modifications to the draft UTP covering infrastructure
3. Although the UTP covering infrastructure was ready to be submitted to CTE 12, WG TECH 37 suggested postponing its adoption in order to align it with the latest INF TSI, which would become available in the course of 2019. As a consequence, a proposal on the adoption of the UTP covering infrastructure would be postponed to CTE 13 in 2020

#### **b. Draft proposal for a decision to modify the NVR specification**

Documents: [TECH-19001 NVR Draft Decision](#) Draft proposal for modifications to the OTIF NVR specifications  
[TECH-19001 NVR Annex](#) Draft proposal for modifications - Annex

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that it had modified draft working document TECH-19001 version 2 at the request of WG TECH 36. It had uploaded the amended document (version 3, NVR Annex) for the attention of WG TECH 37. The Secretariat also explained that all the modifications were in track changes compared to version 2 and that they are noted in the *Amendments record* table at the beginning of the document. In addition, the Secretariat had drafted working document TECH-19001 NVR draft decision for CTE 12. The document proposed that CTE should adopt the NVR specifications set out in the Annex and should request the CSs which have not implemented their NVR or which have not provided a link to the VVR to do so without delay.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) asked that point 2.1 of the NVR Annex reflect more clearly the fact that *from 16 June 2021, NVRs would be discontinued in the EU and replaced by the central EVR*. Consequently, a similar change should be made in the decision document.

The **Secretariat** suggested adding this as a footnote.

The **Chair** noted that WG TECH had made editorial modifications to the draft NVR specification at the meeting and that all of them were shown on the screen in track changes. He summarised the discussion and concluded that:

1. WG TECH 37 discussed the modified draft NVR specification set out in document TECH-19001 dated 7.1.2019
2. WG TECH 37 made editorial modifications to the draft NVR specification
3. WG TECH 37 agreed to submit this document to CTE 12 with a proposal for decision

#### **c. Draft explanatory document concerning National Technical Requirements**

Document: [TECH-18023 v3](#) Analysis of the need for further action

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that it had modified draft working document TECH-18023 version 2 at the request of WG TECH 36. It had uploaded the amended document (version 3) for the attention of WG TECH 37. The Secretariat explained that new and modified text compared to version 2 was indicated in track changes.

In an email to the OTIF Secretariat prior to this meeting, **FR** had highlighted that it was important to ensure that the requirements concerning technical compatibility between vehicles and the infrastructure were transparent, and supported the proposal that the CTE would remind the CSs of their obligation to notify their national rules.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) informed the meeting of the progress of the work on reducing national rules in the EU. Some EU Member States had gone through the process, but others had not yet notified their NTRs or streamlined their rules. This made it difficult for ERA to notify all rules to OTIF. From the EC's perspective, national rules hindered intra-EU railway traffic.

The **Secretariat** noted the difficulty and suggested that EU OTIF MS could continue to notify their NTRs via ERA using the established practice.

**DE** (Fabian Heinrich) pointed out the differences between the NTRs and specific cases, as explained in point 2 of the amended document, and suggested a modification to reflect this more clearly.

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) reminded the meeting of GB's particular approach in terms of specific cases.

**UNIFE** (Sebastian Giera) noted that there are some specific cases in UTPs which refer to other (specific) national requirements, stored locally.

**NB RAIL** (Francis Parmentier) agreed with DE and provided further details. He agreed with UNIFE that the specific cases may refer to NTRs, but it was not possible for NTRs to refer to specific cases. He also wondered whether the further explanation of the competences of the assessing entities was necessary (point 2.2).

The **Secretariat** suggested an interpretation of point 2 in the context of the whole document, i.e. in the context of the analysis that had been carried out. To make matters clearer, it suggested some editorial improvements to the document.

The **Chair** noted that WG TECH, with a mandate from CTE 11, analysed the need for further action concerning NTR. The **Chair** also noted that WG TECH made editorial modifications to the document at the meeting and that all of them were shown on the screen in track changes. It concluded this item as follows:

1. WG TECH 37 discussed document TECH-18023 v3 dated 7.1.2019
2. Editorial changes were made in Chapter 2
3. Chapter 5 point 1 was modified to reflect more clearly the correlation between UTPs and NTRs, open points and specific cases
4. WG TECH 37 agreed to submit the paper and explain the conclusions to CTE 12 and ask CTE to remind the CS of their obligation to notify.

## **6. DEVELOPMENTS IN EU REGULATIONS THAT ARE OF RELEVANCE TO COTIF (PRESENTED BY ERA AND DG MOVE)**

### **a. Fourth Railway Package TSI package – Status of revision process and ensuring continued compatibility with COTIF after adoption**

The **EC** (Alice Polo) informed the meeting that “*the package*” had been discussed at RISC 84 (January 2019). The following proposals had been voted on: LOC&PAS TSI, WAG TSI, INF TSI, NOI TSI, ENE TSI, SRT TSI, CCS TSI, ERATV and RINF. All of them would be modified by one decision document with the relevant annexes on each TSI. Due to the open points still remaining (such as *basic design characteristics, a procedure for the route compatibility, etc.*) and due to different opinions among the EU MS, the following subjects would be discussed at RISC 85 (April 2019): ECM and OPE TSI.

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting of the partial revision of Appendices APTU and ATMF (entering into force on 1.3.2019), which introduced the concepts of *area of use* and *route compatibility*, the aim of which was to ensure continued compatibility with EU law. In general terms the OTIF Secretariat's focus with respect to developments in EU law was to work with the EU Member States and EU institutions to



ensure that new EU provisions would be compatible with COTIF. Any legal developments should be of use to all the OTIF MS or potential future members of OTIF. In connection with this, the Secretariat stressed the need for open and connected protocols for registers (e.g. RINF and EVR). In this respect further European integration of centralised registers risked creating barriers to traffic between the EU and non-EU OTIF CS.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) confirmed that although the legal basis for RINF and EVR existed, additional explanations for proper development and implementation of the RINF and EVR systems should also be provided. This process had already started in the EU.

The **Chair** thanked the EC for this information and noted that “*the package*” (excluding OPE TSI) had been adopted at EU level at the end of January 2019.

#### **b. Entity in Charge of Maintenance (ECM) regulation – status of revision process and ensuring continued compatibility with COTIF after adoption**

The **EC** (Alice Polo) informed the meeting that the EU intends to extend the scope of ECM certification to all vehicles, with some exceptions. She also informed the meeting that a revised text of the ECM regulation would probably be put to a vote at EU level in April 2019. In addition, **ERA** (Christoph Kaupat) clarified that for RUs that carry out the maintenance of their rolling stock in-house, certification could be done through the Safety Management System (SMS).

**DE** (Fabian Heinrich) wondered whether the draft revised text of the ECM regulation still anticipated monitoring ECM certification bodies at EU level (by ERA).

**NB RAIL** (Francis Parmentier) reminded the meeting that although a company could have an SMS, this did not mean that it included all the requirements necessary for the ECMs.

The **Secretariat** noted that the monitoring or supervising of national competent authorities by a central body, such as ERA in the EU, was not possible in the scope of COTIF. COTIF was a treaty between sovereign states. The Member States were required to ensure that the provisions of COTIF were applied at national level.

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) understood the intention of the concept of *route compatibility* in the EU, but he questioned whether MS were able to apply this concept.

The **Chair** thanked the EC and ERA for the information. He suggested that the EU’s development of the ECM specification and the next steps should be discussed at future WG TECH meetings. The Chair concluded this item as follows.

1. WG TECH 37 was informed that the EU intends to extend the scope of ECM certification to all vehicles, with some exceptions. For RUs that carry out the maintenance of their rolling stock in-house, certification could be done through the Safety Management System. A vote on the revised text is expected at EU level in April 2019
2. WG TECH 37 noted that the consequences of the EU’s extension of the scope of ECM to COTIF was not clear and should be analysed and taken into account.

#### **c. UTP TAF: ERA document describing the objective of the CCM Changes approved by the ERA Change control board TAF TSI (see doc: TECH-18026-WGT35)**

Document: [TECH-18037](#)

Draft proposal for modifications to the UTP TAF

**ERA** (Christoph Kaupat) informed the meeting that after it had updated the Technical Documents and references in Appendix I of the TAF TSI in 2018, ERA had drafted and submitted the change request to modify Appendix I of UTP TAF to the OTIF Secretariat. Based on this request, and following the process for the approval of modifications related to Technical Documents of UTP TAF agreed at WG TECH 35<sup>1</sup>, the OTIF Secretariat had prepared document TECH-18037-WGT37-6 setting out a draft proposal for modifications to Appendix I to the UTP TAF for adoption by CTE 12. ERA then presented the

<sup>1</sup> A formalised process for the approval of modifications related to Technical Documents of UTP TAF referred to in Appendix I and which do not affect the core text of the UTP [Agenda item 6a, WG TECH 35, 11-12 September 2018, Bern (Ittigen)]

modifications in detail. The Secretariat requested ERA to provide the OTIF Secretariat with the correct data and reference to its Technical Document, once it had been published.

The **Chair** summarised and concluded this point as follows:

1. WG TECH 37 discussed document TECH-18037 dated 7.1.2019
2. The document will be submitted to CTE 12 with a proposal for decision.

## 7. FOR DISCUSSION:

### a. Development of EU centralised vehicle register (EVR) and consequences for the European Vehicle Register and its connection to the National Vehicle Registers (NVRs)

Document: [TECH-18035](#)

Document for discussion

Based on the decision of WG TECH 36, in order to facilitate the discussion concerning registers, the **Secretariat** had prepared the relevant document for discussion, together with DG MOVE and ERA. The document described the development of the EU centralised Vehicle Register (EVR), which will be operational from mid-2021, and reflected on the consequences for connectivity and data exchange with other existing NVRs of the non-EU CSs. It also looked at several possible scenarios, supported by a quick SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis, to ensure that in the future, the relevant vehicle data could continue to be exchanged between the CSs. The following scenarios were presented:

1. All states will use a common EU/OTIF centralised vehicle register
2. All EU states will use the EVR and all non-EU CSs will use their own NVR, which should then be connected to the EVR
3. All EU states and some non-EU CSs will use the EVR and some non-EU CSs will use their own NVR, which should then be connected to the EVR
4. Two connected central registers: one centralised OTIF vehicle register to be used by all non-EU CSs and the EU centralised EVR to be used by all EU states.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) preferred scenario 1. She reminded the meeting that once the ECVVR is disconnected, it would no longer be updated and maintained by ERA.

**UNIFE** (Sebastian Giera) was of the view that the specifications for registering vehicles in the registers are not entirely aligned between EVR and NVRs. He said that if the EU/OTIF centralised register were developed/created, further possible consequences for the non-EU NVRs should be investigated, together with feedback regarding implementation of the EVR.

**ERA** (Christoph Kaupat) took note of UNIFE's comment. In its view, one of the constraints was that the current system of NVRs and VVR allows users to search all NVRs and *consult* data in the connected registers. The future EVR would store all data centrally.

The **Secretariat** wondered how the non-EU competent authorities, RUs and IMs etc. could access the EVR. This would be necessary in order to meet the requirement of Article 13 ATMF.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) confirmed that access rights might be extended to the relevant non-EU CS or OTIF Secretariat, in accordance with the EVR Decision, points 2.8 and 3.3.

**CH** (Christophe Le Borgne) highlighted the specific features of the NVR in Switzerland and said that the current connected NVR solution was working satisfactorily. Because of this and the legal constraints, Switzerland preferred scenario 3 and would like to keep its NVR and connect it to the EVR.

The **Secretariat** summarised the current status of the discussion. According to the current rules, all CS were required to have their NVR and to provide access to all competent authorities, RUs, IMs etc., in accordance with Article 13 of ATMF. At the same time, ATMF did not require connectivity between NVRs. For several years, ERA had made standard software for NVR (sNVR) available to non EU CS to buy, and

some non-EU states had indeed purchased it. In addition, ERA managed the connection between the sNVRs in the form of the VVR. However, with the introduction of the EVR, ERA would stop updating and maintaining the VVR in June 2021. From that time, connectivity between EVR and NVRs would be interrupted, so it would no longer be possible to retrieve vehicle data. Therefore, the Secretariat suggested that the VVR function be maintained. At present, the OTIF Secretariat did not have the resources to take over the tasks currently carried out by ERA concerning the VVR.

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) was of the view that NVRs would still be needed in future, in addition to the centralised register. He wondered who could provide the interface after June 2021 and questioned whether introduction of the global VVR was justified. Bearing in mind the OTIF Secretariat's constraints in terms of providing such an interface, he wondered whether the interface should be established at public or private level, for example by UIC. From this perspective, scenario 3 was the most flexible option for further exploration.

**RS** (Milan Popović) suggested focusing on one scenario, for example scenario 3, and investigating it in more detail. He agreed with the Secretariat's concerns with regard to the VVR and was of the view that the VVR should continue to exist after June 2021.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) said that the EVR provided the possibility of adding specific fields if the non-EU CS so wished.

**CH** (Christophe Le Borgne) supported what GB had said regarding the interface and agreed that the maintenance costs of the future VVR should be investigated further.

The **Secretariat** asked the sector representatives about their experience with regard to the registers in general.

**UIC** (Josef Fázik) said that there was currently a publicly accessible GCU Wagon Database<sup>2</sup> which allows users to identify the keepers and specific wagons by entering the wagon numbers. He confirmed that the registers are necessary for business. He wondered whether the VVR in its further development would also include *the exchange* of data between the registers. It might be an interesting subject for the UIC, as the existing UIC databases are already used by all its members, including those from OTIF MS. In his view, the applications are centralised, but not the registers, so scenario 3 would be the most appropriate.

**GCC** (Kent Donaldson) said that all GCC states have the UIC railway codes. At present, all vehicles are already tracked in terms of providing data about the owner, maintenance, licencing, the RU over the border which would be responsible for using the vehicle, etc. He informed the meeting that a central register would be created for all six GCC Member States, which would be hosted in Saudi Arabia. The GCC would only be coordinating activities. If GCC were to become a member of OTIF, then scenario 3 would be the most appropriate, i.e. the GCC register would have to be connected to the registers of other members of OTIF.

**OSJD** (Radovan Vopalecky) informed the meeting that the OSJD does not have a central register for vehicle data and that there are no plans to create one. He confirmed that all RUs use their own vehicle registers and that the vehicles are used internationally on the basis of markings on the bodywork.

The **Chair** noted that the sector might be interested in maintaining and developing the VVR and that this should be explored further. He summarised the discussion and concluded this point as follows:

1. WG TECH 37 discussed document TECH-18035 dated 8.1.2019
2. WG TECH 37 noted that Scenario 3 (EVR and NVRs) and Scenario 1 (single OTIF/EU vehicle register) are the most favourable and should be analysed further. For scenario 3, the VVR needs to be maintained, in which case the analysis should concern the vehicle data security, maintenance of the VVR and how these costs could be covered.

## **b. Planning concerning the alignment of the UTPs with the TSIs revised in 2019**

The **Secretariat** highlighted the importance of maintaining the established equivalence between the relevant TSIs and UTPs. Bearing in mind the revision of TSIs linked to the fourth railway package, several UTPs should be modified as well. The Secretariat explained that, in view of the limited resources and the number of meetings, it would not be possible to propose amendments to all UTPs at once. It provided an

<sup>2</sup> The General Contract of Use (GCU) Wagon Database jointly organised by UIC, UIP and ERFA

overview of the UTPs and proposed that the process of revising the UTPs relating to freight wagons be given priority (UTP WAG, UTP NOI, UTP Marking), followed by the other UTPs. A diagram illustrating this was shown on the screen ([Annex IV](#), as amended at the meeting).

**CER** (Christian Chavanel) reminded the meeting that in accordance with the conclusion on agenda item 5a, the UTP covering infrastructure should be included in the first batch of UTPs to be submitted to CTE 13 in 2020. The Secretariat agreed and modified the diagram accordingly.

The **EC** (Alice Polo) clarified that the PRM TSI was not part of the “TSI Package” and would probably be put to a vote in autumn 2019.

**NB RAIL** (Francis Parmentier) agreed with the priorities but asked whether Annex A – ECM might need to be considered before 2022.

The **Secretariat** agreed that Annex A – ECM was very important in terms of COTIF, but explained that there was no decision at EU level yet and that it was difficult to anticipate when it would be adopted. However, the OTIF Secretariat was following this development closely.

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

1. WG TECH 37 agreed to prioritise the process of revising the UTPs, starting with the so-called “freight package” UTPs, including UTP INF, and then to continue with the other UTPs. However, some flexibility in this prioritisation may be required
2. The EU’s development of the ECM specification and the next steps are to be discussed at WG TECH 38.

### c. Provisional agenda for the 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts

The **Secretariat** presented proposals for the agenda of CTE 12 ([Draft agenda for CTE 12 Annex III](#)).

**GB** (Vaibhav Puri) suggested including a new item 6.3 under which the OTIF/EU mutual recognition of ECM certification bodies and other bodies would be discussed, including the status of the output of the certification process and of the organisations themselves. This item could be postponed, depending on developments in the BREXIT negotiations.

**DE** (Fabian Heinrich) asked what to expect under item 6.3 on the development of the annexes to Appendix H. The OTIF Secretariat explained that in view of the timing of the revision of the UTPs, it was important that CTE should also decide when it would be best to start the work on the annexes. The meeting supported the Secretariat’s explanation.

The **Chair** noted that WG TECH 37 discussed and approved the provisional agenda for CTE 12 with the addition requested during the meeting.

## 8. CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: [TECH-17049](#)

Table of correspondence between COTIF and EU terminology

The **Secretariat** had prepared draft working document TECH-17049-WGT37-8 dated 7.1.2019. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 36, one new term had been included (on the OTIF side):

- Table *Entities and roles*, page 14:
  - *The Registration Entity*

Following the publication of document TECH-17049 on the website, ERA had submitted an additional reference to *Registration Entity*. This reference will be added to the next version of the document.

**Conclusion:** The Secretariat presented the updated version of the cross reference terminology table. WG TECH 37 took note of the table as presented. WG TECH members were invited to give the OTIF Secretariat feedback, if necessary, before the next WG TECH meeting.

## 9. EU-OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: [TECH-18024](#)

Equivalence table EU/OTIF regulations

The **Secretariat** had prepared draft working document TECH-18024-WGT37-9 dated 7.1.2019. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 36, the changes included:

- NVR, pages 21, 22:
  - Introduction of a new reference: *Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/1614* (EIF 14.11.2018, with effect June 16, 2021), that amends and repeals 2007/756/EC
  - Far right column – Comments were reworded to reflect more clearly the latest development in the EU and to note the ongoing work by the EU and OTIF to find a solution to ensure the interchange between the EVR and the NVRs of non-EU States.
- ECM, page 23:
  - Far right column – Comments were reworded to note the ongoing developments, i.e. ERA’s “Recommendation for Commission Implementing Act on the revision of ECM Regulation”, which it submitted in 2018.

**Conclusion:** The Secretariat presented the updated version of the equivalence table and asked WG TECH members to give the OTIF Secretariat feedback, if necessary, before the next WG TECH meeting.

## 10. NEXT SESSIONS

The 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts will be held on 12 and 13 June 2019 in Bern.

The 38<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH will be held on 11 and 12 September 2019 in Bern.

It was proposed to hold the 39<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH on 19 and 20 November 2019 (venue to be decided later).

## 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

## 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 37<sup>th</sup> WG TECH meeting.

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

M./Hr./Mr. Fabian **Heinrich** Referent für internationale Angelegenheiten  
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt

**Belgique/Belgien/Belgium**

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

**France/Frankreich/France**

S'est excusé.  
Hat sich entschuldigt.  
Sent apologies.

**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. Dragoş **Floroiu** Scientific Secretary  
Romanian Railway Authority - AFER

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

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

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

**Serbie/Serbien/Serbia**

M./Hr./Mr. Milan **Popović** Head of Department for Safety and Interoperability  
Directorate for Railways

**Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland**

M./Hr./Mr. Colin **Bonnet** Chef de la Section Bases scientifiques  
(1<sup>st</sup> day only) Division Sécurité  
Office fédéral des transports (OFT)

M./Hr./Mr. Christophe **Le Borgne** Chef de projet Interopérabilité et Sécurité  
Office fédéral des transports (OFT)

**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 - Rail Safety and Interoperability Unit  
Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport

**European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)**

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

Project Officer  
Executive Office and Communication Unit

**Conseil de coopération du Golfe / Golf-Kooperationsrat / Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)  
(Observers)**

M./Hr./Mr. Khalid Al **Olayan**

Director of Transport Department  
Economic and Development Affairs  
Secretariat General

M./Hr./Mr. Kent **Donaldson**

Secretariat General

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

**CER**

M./Hr./Mr. Christian **Chavanel**

Interoperability & Standardization Director  
SNCF/Direction Système & Techno Ferroviaire /  
Direction Interopérabilité & Normalisation

**NB-Rail**

M./Hr./Mr. Francis **Parmentier**

Vice Chairman  
NB-Rail

**OSJD/OSShD**

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

Chairman  
Commission on Infrastructure and Rolling Stock

**UIC**

M./Hr./Mr. Josef **Fázik** Chargé de mission, Echange des véhicules ferroviaires

**UIP**

M./Hr./Mr. Gilles **Peterhans** Secretary General

**UNIFE**

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

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

**IV.    Secrétariat  
      Sekretariat  
      Secretariat**

M./Hr./Mr. Bas **Leermakers** Head of Department

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

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 36<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH
5. Preparation of the 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts:
  - Draft proposal for a decision to adopt the UTP infrastructure
  - Draft proposal for a decision to amend the NVR specification
  - Draft explanatory document concerning National Technical Requirements
6. Developments in EU regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by ERA and DG MOVE):
  - 4<sup>th</sup> Railway Package TSI package – Status of revision process and ensuring continued compatibility with COTIF after adoption
  - Entity in Charge of Maintenance (ECM) regulation – status of revision process and ensuring continued compatibility with COTIF after adoption
  - UTP TAF: ERA document describing the objective of the CCM Changes approved by the ERA Change control board TAF TSI (see doc: TECH-18026-WGT35)
7. For discussion:
  - Development of EU centralised vehicle register (EVR) and consequences for the OTIF national vehicle registers
  - Planning concerning the alignment of the UTPs with the TSIs revised in 2019
  - Provisional agenda for the 12<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee of Technical Experts
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 12****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 the development of the NVRs in the Contracting States (presentation by OTIF)
- 5. For adoption:**
  - 5.1. Proposal for a decision to adopt the UTP infrastructure
  - 5.2. Proposal for a decision to modify the NVR specification
  - 5.3. Proposal for a decision to modify Annex 1 of the UTP TAF
- 6. For discussion:**
  - 6.1. Development of EU centralised vehicle register (EVR) and consequences for the OTIF national vehicle registers
  - 6.2. Notifications of the national technical requirements according to Article 12 APTU
  - 6.3 Committee work programme:
    - Strategy concerning the alignment of the UTPs with the TSIs revised in 2019
    - Development of the Annexes to Appendix H to COTIF
- 7. Any other business**
- 8. Next session**

