



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail

WG TECH

46th Session

Draft Minutes

[Comments received from: CER, CH](#)

Hybrid meeting, 16.6.2022

WG TECH 46 SUMMARY

16 JUNE 2022

- 1. The United Kingdom, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, was elected to chair the session.**
- 2. The agenda submitted in document TECH-22021 dated 20 April 2022 was approved.**
- 3. The Secretariat presented the latest developments in OTIF.**
- 4. For discussion**

WG TECH 46 reviewed and discussed the working documents that had been prepared for the session. The Chair invited delegates to send the OTIF Secretariat any additional comments, should they have any.

In particular:

- 4.1. Next steps in monitoring and assessing the implementation of APTU and ATMF by Contracting States (TECH-22024 of 18 May 2022)
 - WG TECH noted CTE’s decision that Member States and regional organisations that apply the APTU and ATMF UR should designate one or two focal points for the exchange of information related to the APTU and ATMF UR.
 - WG TECH took note of CTE’s request to develop approaches to monitoring and assessment as part of the second step. CTE asked the OTIF Secretariat to prepare an updated version of the working document for review by WG TECH 47, taking into account the suggestions provided at the meeting.
 - 4.2. WG TECH took note of letter LAW-22004-JUR1 of 2 February 2022 with an advisory opinion of the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation (JUR). WG TECH welcomed the information and had no further comments.
 - 4.3. Development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF):
 - a) Development of Annex C: A harmonised procedure for issuing safety certificates
 - WG TECH reviewed draft document TECH-22022 of 18 May 2022, provided comments on it and requested the Secretariat to prepare a new version for the next session.
 - b) Analysis of the necessary links between the EST UR and the CSM on risk evaluation and assessment
 - WG TECH reviewed document TECH-22023 of 18 May 2022 and was of the view that the UTP GEN-G should be revised in order to clarify that its scope should also cover risk evaluation and assessments relating to the safety management system in the scope of the EST UR, in particular by taking over the relevant European Union requirements which currently appear in the right-hand column only.
 - WG TECH requested the Secretariat to draft the necessary changes to UTP GEN-G in a working document for the next session.
 - 4.4. Updates of the UTP application guides
 - a) Draft application guide for UTP WAG (TECH-22014 of 18 May 2022)
 - b) Draft application guide for UTP NOI (TECH-22020 of 18 May 2022)
 - WG TECH noted the explanations concerning the drafting of UTP application guides set out in document TECH-22026 of 18 May 2022.
 - WG TECH reviewed the two draft application guides prepared by the Secretariat, provided comments and requested the Secretariat to prepare new versions for the next meeting.
- 5. 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 the European Commission concerning developments with regard to the TSI revision package 2022 and the envisaged deadlines preceding the RISC decision in

November 2022. It also took note of ERA's presentation on its activities which were relevant for OTIF, in particular its exchange of information with several non-EU OTIF [CMS](#).

6. The cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology was reviewed.

7. The EU – OTIF equivalence table was reviewed.

8. Any other business

None

9. Next session (WG TECH 47):

Bern/hybrid, 7 September 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, particularly those attending the session for the first time: Mr Sylvain Cozette from France, Mr Mustafa Kirmizigül and Ms Burcu Çilgi from Türkiye. 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 trust they had placed in him.

2 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the provisional agenda for WG TECH 46 had been submitted in the invitation letter TECH-22021 dated 20 April 2022.

WG TECH 46 adopted the agenda submitted in document TECH-22021 ([Annex II – Adopted agenda](#)).

3 INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the minutes of the 45th WG TECH meeting had been approved in writing and were available on OTIF's website¹.

It also reported on the main results and decisions of the 14th session of the Committee of Technical Experts (CTE 14), including the mandate that was given to WG TECH:

- To review UTP GEN-E and, if relevant, to propose modifications or new provisions.
- To update the application guides to UTPs.
- To analyse the feasibility of developing specific UTP provisions for interchangeable coaches (to replace the former technical requirements for RIC coaches).
- To provide a progress report on the development of annexes to the EST UR concerning harmonised procedures for issuing safety certificates, as well as the necessary links between the EST UR and UTP GEN-G (by modifying UTP GEN-G).
- To provide a progress report on the next step in monitoring and assessing implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR.
- To provide an update on developments concerning the Future Railway Mobile Communication System (FRMCS) and their relevance for OTIF.

CTE 14 had also mandated WG TECH to deal with any other subjects it deemed necessary and report its findings to CTE.

¹ http://otif.org/fileadmin/new/2-Activities/2E-Technical-Interoperability/2Eb-Working-Group-Tech/2Eb1_Report/WG%20TECH%2045%20final%20minutes.pdf

The **Chair** suggested that at its November meeting, WG TECH should discuss the draft CTE working plan for 2023/2024, taking into account the latest developments concerning the EU's TSI revision package 2022 and bearing in mind its relevance for COTIF and the UTPs.

4 FOR DISCUSSION

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

Document: [TECH-22024](#) Discussion document (dated 18.5.2022)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that CTE 14 had taken note of the progress report on monitoring and assessment of the implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR by CSs in the form of a [report on the first step](#). The Secretariat pointed out the decision of CTE 14 according to which each Member State and regional organisation that applies the APTU and ATMF UR should designate one or two focal points for the exchange of information related to those appendices. With regard to the second step, CTE 14 requested WG TECH to develop questionnaires in order to:

- a) Obtain a better view of how vehicles are used in international traffic and of traffic volumes by involving the sector's representative bodies (e.g. CER, ERFA, UIP and UIC);
- b) Understand how, in practice, assessing entities apply the rules and procedures for assessing vehicles or vehicle types to ascertain whether they comply with the UTPs;
- c) Understand how, in practice, competent authorities apply the rules and procedures for issuing vehicle admissions;
- d) Obtain a view on whether compliance with the UTPs is relevant with regard to authorisation for national use in the CSs.

The Secretariat then presented the discussion document. It referred to point 3 of the document, which was structured into four parts, reflecting each of the subjects under letters a) to d) above. In the discussion document, the Secretariat formulated possible questions and asked how the information should be gathered and which stakeholders should be involved in the work. It pointed out the outcome of the discussion at CTE 14, which had revealed that the questionnaire approach might not be the only way of obtaining information and that bilateral contacts could in some cases provide better insight into the subject.

GB suggested that the Secretariat's impressions concerning implementation would also be valuable. It suggested adding two questions; the first question would ask what could be done to encourage international railway traffic more, bearing in mind the links between COTIF and national rules, so that international railway traffic, particularly freight, would become more appealing to users. The second question should help understand the need for further support in order to raise awareness of COTIF within the CSs.

The **Secretariat** suggested adding the question related to encouraging international railway traffic to all four parts. In relation to the awareness of COTIF, it suggested asking whether additional training or explanations of COTIF would be of help to CSs.

UIC suggested including questions related to international railway passenger traffic and passenger coaches in the second step, bearing in mind their increasing importance in international railway traffic. The **Secretariat** supported adding these questions.

ERA supported GB and UIC and highlighted the potential benefits of bilateral meetings with CSs. These, in conjunction with enabling remote participation in WG TECH hybrid meetings, would encourage CSs to be more involved in the work of OTIF, and might encourage them to provide feedback on the second step of monitoring and assessment.

FR supported the continuation of monitoring and assessment and requested clarification concerning the planning.

The **Secretariat** explained briefly that after being reviewed at the next two WG TECH meetings, the working document should be approved at CTE 15, after which the second step of monitoring and assessment

could start. In relation to the methodology, CTE could decide whether to have a new step each year and whether to focus on a particular subject. In relation to the discussion that had taken place at CTE 14 concerning the long-term strategy, the Secretariat suggested that some questions relating to this could be added to the questionnaire.

With regard to providing feedback from assessing entities at EU level, **NB Rail** suggested using the existing network of cooperation between these bodies, e.g. the NB Rail association network with regard to cooperation between notified bodies (NoBos), ERA with regard to CSM RA assessment bodies (AsBos) and ECM certification bodies.

The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat for preparing the discussion document and thanked participants for their valuable input. He summarised the discussion and concluded this subject as follows:

- WG TECH noted CTE’s decision that Member States and regional organisations that apply the APTU and ATMF UR should designate one or two focal points for the exchange of information related to the APTU and ATMF UR.
- WG TECH took note of CTE’s request to develop approaches to monitoring and assessment as part of the second step and requested the OTIF Secretariat to prepare an updated version of the working document for review by WG TECH 47, taking into account the suggestions provided at the meeting.

4.2 Mutual recognition of ECM certificates; feedback from the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation (JUR)

Document: [LAW-22004](#) Advisory opinion of JUR (dated 2.2.2022)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that it had received an advisory opinion from JUR following its examination of the question raised by WG TECH 39 concerning the mutual recognition of ECM certificates under the ATMF UR. Among other things, the opinion included the following:

- WG TECH had not precisely formulated the question to be analysed;
- JUR noted Point 1 of ATMF Annex A, which stated that: “*The equivalence between ECM certificates...shall be limited to the purpose and scope of ATMF UR*”;
- JUR also noted that the interaction between ATMF UR and EU law applies to the whole ATMF UR, including the ECM certificates. When it comes to international traffic between the EU and the non-EU OTIF CSs, COTIF ECM rules might only apply to the entire (international) traffic if the EU ECM rules and COTIF ECM rules are fully equivalent;
- For a more in-depth advisory opinion, WG TECH would need to formulate questions precisely on the basis of practical concerns and provide a summary of the subject matter and reasons for the request.

The **Secretariat** also informed the meeting that CTE 14 acknowledged the advisory opinion provided by JUR without any further remarks. It pointed out the possibility of obtaining a more in-depth advisory opinion if necessary.

The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat and opened the discussion.

GB reminded the meeting that it had initiated the question of recognition of the ECM certificates and thanked JUR for their advisory opinion and the OTIF Secretariat for its assistance in the process. It also reaffirmed the understanding that under COTIF, all Contracting States would recognise the certificates of ECMs assigned to vehicles operating in international traffic between the EU and the non-EU Contracting States. In GB’s view, no further analysis was needed.

FR welcomed the opinion of JUR.

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

WG TECH took note of letter LAW-22004-JUR1 of 2 February 2022, which contained an advisory opinion from the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation (JUR). WG TECH welcomed the information and had no further comments.

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

- a) Annex C: A harmonised procedure for issuing safety certificates

Documents: [TECH-22022](#) Working document (dated 18.5.2022)

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting of the scope, content and main elements of the working document, which were based on document TECH-21035 submitted to WG TECH 45 by RS.

The **Chair** thanked RS for raising the subject and the Secretariat for preparing the document and opened the discussion.

In reply to GB's question about the planning, the **Secretariat** indicated that draft Annex C to the EST UR would be submitted to CTE 15, following WG TECH's recommendation, as was the case with draft Annexes A and B to the EST UR, which had been submitted to CTE 14. Nevertheless, CTE could only adopt these Annexes to EST UR after the EST UR had entered into force, i.e. twelve months after two-thirds of the OTIF Member States had approved them².

With regard to "additional agreements" (Article 2 § 3), the **European Commission** (hereinafter: **the EC**) remarked that it may be necessary to clarify that additional agreements cannot be made between one of the EU Member States and one or more non-EU OTIF CS. Additional agreements involving EU Member States could only be concluded by the EU and not by individual EU Member States.

The **Secretariat** was not convinced that the matter raised by the EC needed to be addressed in COTIF texts. Deciding who was competent to enter into additional agreements – the EU Member States or the Union on their behalf – was an internal EU matter. The EU should also be able to modify these competences internally, without having to modify COTIF. The Secretariat suggested that the subject could be discussed further if there were more developed ideas from the EC concerning the wording. The procedure for issuing single safety certificates according to EU law was an internal EU matter. Nevertheless, it was important that documentary evidence related to safety certificates was mutually accepted, whether it was issued in accordance with EU law or COTIF.

In the context of the discussion, the **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that, under the EST UR, safety certificates would not automatically be mutually recognised. However, based on additional bilateral agreements, two or more states could agree to mutually accept each other's safety certificates. It also informed the meeting that CTE 14 had reviewed draft Annex A to the EST UR and had included the possibility of mutually accepting the Safety Management System (SMS) of railway undertakings. Nevertheless, to obtain a safety certificate, the applicant would also have to comply with the national safety rules, which are not harmonised at OTIF level.

RS wondered whether a safety certificate template existed in the EU and whether it might be useful to incorporate something similar in the future Annex C to the EST UR. The **Secretariat** supported the suggestion and invited ERA and the EC to provide additional information to the next meeting regarding the certification process within the EU, including the content and format (template) of the safety certificates issued by ERA.

ERA informed the meeting that it was trialling the safety certification process with anonymised applications. ERA confirmed that it could try to prepare the requested presentation for the next meeting. The **EC** supported ERA.

GB noted that safety certificates were available at the European Railway Agency Database of Interoperability and Safety (ERADIS).

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

- WG TECH reviewed draft document TECH-22022 of 18 May 2022;
- Delegates provided comments at the session;

² As of 25 May 2022, the EST UR had been approved by ten Member States: Finland, Switzerland, Germany, France, Hungary, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Slovakia and Estonia.

- The Secretariat was invited to prepare a new version of the working document for review by WG TECH 47.
- b) Analysis of the necessary links between EST UR and the CSM on risk evaluation and assessment

Documents: [TECH-22023](#) Working document (dated 18.5.2022)

The **Secretariat** presented the document. It reminded the meeting that the current version of UTP GEN-G, concerning a common safety method for risk evaluation and assessment (CSM RA) did not cover provisions related to Safety Management Systems (SMS). With the introduction of the EST UR, the concept of SMS would be introduced into COTIF. As a result, the parts of the UTP GEN-G that are in the right-hand column, related to SMS in the EU regulation, would become relevant for OTIF as well. The Secretariat suggested that in order to be applied within the scope of the EST UR, the UTP GEN-G would need to be revised.

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

NB Rail remarked that currently, according to the scope of UTP GEN-G as laid down in Article 2, changes to the railway system of a technical, operational or organisational nature were already covered. In NB Rail's understanding, this meant that the current UTP GEN-G already covered railway operations, and hence SMS as well. It requested further clarification on this subject.

The **Secretariat** replied that UTP GEN-G was applicable only within the scope of the APTU and ATMF UR, which did not fully cover the operational safety of railways or SMS. At the same time, there were some operational aspects in the scope of the APTU and ATMF UR, such as train composition. The UTP GEN-G could therefore be applied in that context. The Secretariat reminded the meeting that some requirements concerning the SMS were in the right-hand column only, meaning that they were part of the EU rules, but not part of COTIF. Point 6.3 of the UTP GEN-G was shown on the screen as an example.

In response to NB Rail, the **Chair** suggested that there was a subtle distinction between SMS and the CSM RA. Firstly, there was the application of the CSM RA in relation to organisational, technical or operational changes. Secondly, there was the requirement for the SMS of a company to have procedures in place to ensure that that company can effectively apply the CSM RA. The two were interlinked and one of the modifications that had to be made to the UTP GEN-G was to include the references to the SMS.

The **Chair** thanked participants for the constructive debate, summarised the discussion and concluded this item as follows:

- WG TECH took note of document TECH-22023 and was of the view that the UTP GEN-G should be revised in order to:
 - Clarify that its scope should also cover risk evaluation and assessments relating to the safety management system in the scope of the EST UR;
 - Take over the European Union requirements for risk evaluation and assessments relating to the safety management system, which currently appeared in the right-hand column only.
- WG TECH requested the Secretariat to draft the necessary changes in a working document for the next session.

4.4 Updates of the UTP application guides

Document: [TECH-22026](#) Information (dated 18.5.2022)

In response to a request from CTE, the **Secretariat** had prepared proposals to update two UTP application guides (AGs). It presented the AGs and their format and explained how the documents were being modified.

The Secretariat explained that the UTP AGs were based on the latest version of the TSI AGs. They included blue rectangles to highlight differences compared with the TSI AGs. These blue rectangles were copied from the current UTP AGs and the texts in them were modified using track change mode. In addition,

compared to the current UTP AGs, some new blue rectangles were added. All texts that were not in blue rectangles were carried over from the latest TSI AGs.

FR supported updating the UTP AGs as proposed by the Secretariat.

The **Chair** noted that there were no further general comments and concluded that WG TECH took note of the explanations concerning the drafting of modifications to the UTP AGs, set out in document TECH-22026 of 18 May 2022.

a) Application guide for UTP WAG

Documents: [TECH-22014](#) Working document (dated 18.5.2022)

The **Secretariat** suggested that the discussion should focus on the modifications made in track changes in the blue rectangles in the UTP AG.

The **Chair** noted that there were no objections to the suggested approach.

In relation to the blue rectangle in point 2 of the UTP WAG AG, **GB** requested clarification on how the following statement should be understood: ‘Contracting States should not require reassessment of the parameters that had been already assessed against either the TSI or the UTP’. In its view, the requirements concerning the acceptance of procedural documentation, as stipulated in Article 3a of the ATMF UR, were somewhat different. If the conditions listed under letters a) to e) of Article 3a § 1 or § 2 were met, the situation was clear and the vehicle had to be accepted in international traffic by all CSs. However, if the conditions listed under letters a) to e) were not met, there was a difference between the provisions that applied to EU and non-EU CSs. In such cases, non-EU CSs would apply Article 6 § 4 of the ATMF UR, whereas EU CSs would apply EU law. To make the provisions clearer, **GB** suggested that the difference should be considered and further explained in the UTP AGs.

The **Secretariat** thanked **GB** for the remark and agreed with **GB** that the acceptance of procedural documentation should be clarified further. In its view, all admissions and assessments in the scope of COTIF should be interpreted within that framework and not in accordance with other legislation. In this regard, the UTP AG should not therefore suggest, for example, that UTP assessments should be considered (or not) for national or EU authorisations. However, for those vehicles which are not in full compliance with all the UTPs, the results of parameters already assessed should be accepted by the Competent Authorities, in accordance with Article 6 § 4b.

NB Rail reminded the meeting about the two levels related to the acceptance of assessments. The first level concerned the collection of evidence and assessments. This concerned the objective assessment of conformity against requirements (e.g. tests) and evidence of compliance (e.g. test reports). The second level concerned the certificates. Even if certificates could not be mutually accepted, e.g. because they had no legal basis, the evidence could still be used to issue different certificates, with different legal bases. In **NB Rail**’s view, applicants could either combine certificates within a single document or provide two certificates, depending on their requirements and in relation to the competences of the certification body (i.e. competences in accordance with COTIF or EU law).

GB suggested that the text in the blue rectangles on pages 9 and 16 should be made clearer. With regard to the blue rectangle on page 17, **GB** suggested modifying the text to include the concept of *safe integration of the subsystem* in relation to what was already written concerning safe operations. **GB** offered to assist the Secretariat in drafting texts for the next meeting.

The **Chair** remarked that there were no further comments and concluded that WG TECH noted the improvements throughout the text, that **GB** would provide an update as agreed and asked the Secretariat to modify the texts in line with the discussion.

b) Application guide for UTP NOI

Documents: [TECH-22020](#)

Working document (dated 18.5.2022)

The **Secretariat** suggested that WG TECH take a similar approach to discussing the UTP NOI AG as it had done for the UTP WAG AG, i.e. to focus on the modifications made in track changes in blue rectangles.

The **Chair** noted that there were no objections to the Secretariat's suggestion. He remarked that the same observations made in relation to UTP WAG AG would be valid for UTP NOI AG as well. He then asked the meeting whether there were any further comments.

CH welcomed the UTP NOI AG and [pointed out](#) ~~reminded the meeting of its particular implementation rules concerning the CH specific case on~~ quieter routes ~~that~~ applied to the entire Swiss railway network.

ERA welcomed the UTP NOI AG. It informed the meeting that, in view of the fact that NOI TSI was expected to be adopted before the end of the year, the NOI TSI AG, which was used as a basis for UTP NOI AG, would be updated as well.

The **Chair** remarked that there were no further comments and concluded that WG TECH had reviewed the application guide, provided comments and requested the Secretariat to prepare a new version for the next meeting.

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

The **EC** gave a progress report with regard to the TSI revision package 2022. The work of the topical working groups (TWGs) had been carried out as planned in order to obtain ERA's recommendations by the end of June 2022. At its November 2022 meeting, the EC's Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) should review and adopt the TSI revision proposals. Once the TSIs had been revised, the update of the relevant TSI application guides would start.

ERA informed the meeting of its international activities that involved several non-EU OTIF MS: DZ, MA, TN, LB and JO (EUMedRail Project), as well as AL, BA, ME, NM, RS and TR (IPA Project).

The **Secretariat** thanked ERA for involving the OTIF Secretariat in these activities and for ERA's efforts to promote OTIF membership.

GB asked for a status update concerning TAF and TAP TSIs and the development of the Digital Automatic Coupling (DAC) system.

The **EC** explained that the proposal for revision of TAF and TAP TSIs, together with the other TSIs that are part of the TSI revision package 2022, should be reviewed and adopted at the RISC meeting in November 2022. With regard to the DAC system, although the type of DAC had been selected, the technical specifications and operational rules had not yet been developed and would not be ready by the end of 2022. The EC also informed the meeting that the TWG Freight would continue its work on DAC beyond 2022.

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

- WG TECH took note of the presentation by the European Commission concerning the developments of TSI revision package 2022 and the envisaged deadlines preceding the RISC decision in November 2022.
- WG TECH also took note of ERA's presentation on its activities which were relevant for OTIF, in particular its exchange of information with several non-EU OTIF MS.

6 CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: [TECH-17049](#) Working document for review by WG TECH 46
(dated 18.5.2022)

The document was presented by the **Secretariat**. There were no modifications compared with the version submitted to WG TECH 45.

7 EU – OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: [TECH-18024](#) Working document for review by WG TECH 46
(dated 18.5.2022)

The document was presented by the **Secretariat**. Compared to the version submitted to WG TECH 45, the following modifications had been made in the form of track changes:

- Hyperlinks to the COTIF provisions that entered into force on 1 January 2022 (UTP WAG, LOC&PAS, PRM, INF and TCRC) and on 1 April 2022 (UTP TAF).
- Update of the status of the COTIF provisions, as well as editorial improvements (UTP NOI, Marking, GEN-B, GEN-C, GEN-E, GEN-G, Vehicle Register Specifications and Annex A to ATMF UR).
- Update of EU legal references.
- Updates in the “Comments” column to reflect the status or progress of pending provisions for decision at CTE 14 (UTP TAF and Annex B to ATMF UR).
- Editorial and typographical corrections.

WG TECH took note of the document without further comment.

8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None

9 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:

- 5th Joint Coordinating Group of Experts (JCGE) on 6 September 2022 in Bern
- 47th session of WG TECH on 7 September 2022 in Bern
- 48th session of WG TECH on 15 and 16 November 2022 in Paris – provisional
- 15th session of CTE on 13 and 14 June 2023 in Bern
- 49th session of WG TECH on 15 June 2023 in Bern

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 46th hybrid session of WG TECH.

On behalf of the delegates, the **Secretariat** thanked the Chair for his excellent work in chairing the WG TECH 46 meeting.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**ANNEX I****I. Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments****Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany**

M./Hr./Mr. Philipp Unger
Technischer Regierungsrat
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt

Belgique/Belgien/Belgium

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

France/Frankreich/France

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

M./Hr./Mr. Sylvain Cozette
Chargé d'affaires
Autorité française de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)

Italie/Italien/Italy

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

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

M./Hr./Mr. Peter Coverdale
Rail Technical Standards Legislation Manager
Department for Transport

M./Hr./Mr. Vaibhav Puri
Director of Sector Strategy
Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB)

Serbie/Serbien/Serbia

M./Hr./Mr. Milan Popović
Head of the department for rules and authorisation of
structural subsystems
Directorate for Railways

Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland

M^mc/Fr./Ms. Linda Ay
Project Manager Safety and Interoperability
Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland - FOT

Türkiye/Türkiye/Türkiye

M./Hr./Mr.	Mustafa Kirmizigül	Head of Department Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure Directorate General for Regulation of Transport Service
M./Hr./Mr.	Ömer Tangül	Head of Transportation Department Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure Directorate General for Regulation of Transport
M./Hr./Mr.	Serdar Akil	Transportation and Communication Assistant Expert Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms.	Burcu Çilgi	Translator Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure Directorate General for European Union Affairs and Foreign Relations

**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.	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.	Christoph Kaupat	Project Officer Networks, International and IMS Unit, ERA
------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------

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

CER

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

NB Rail


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

UIC


M./Hr./Mr. 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. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
4. For discussion:
 - 4.1. Next step in monitoring and assessment the implementation of APTU and ATMF by Contracting States
 - 4.2. Mutual recognition of ECM certificates; feedback from the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation (JUR)
 - 4.3. Development of the Annexes to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF)
 - a) Annex C: A harmonised procedure for issuing safety certificates
 - b) Analysis of the necessary links between EST UR and the CSM on risk evaluation and assessment
 - 4.4. Updates of the UTP application guides:
 - a) Application guide for UTP WAG
 - b) Application guide for UTP NOI
5. Developments in EU regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by ERA and European Commission)
6. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
7. EU – OTIF equivalence table
8. Any other business
9. Next sessions