



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail

# WG TECH

## 49th Session

## Draft Minutes

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

Bern, hybrid meeting, 15.6.2023

## **WG TECH 49 SUMMARY**

### **15 JUNE 2023**

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

- 1. The agenda submitted in document TECH-23016 of 19 April 2023 was approved.**
- 2. The Secretariat presented the latest developments in OTIF and said that the minutes of the previous meeting had been approved by exchange of e-mails.**
- 3. WG TECH considered the planning of its work in view of the results of CTE 15.**
- 4. For discussion**

WG TECH 49 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 they might have after the meeting by mid-July.

In particular, the following was discussed or agreed with regard to the various items for discussion:

- 4.1. Draft Annex D to the EST UR (Appendix H to COTIF) concerning supervision:
  - WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23018 of 17 May 2023. There were no specific comments or suggestions for improvement. WG TECH requested the Secretariat to submit the document again to the next session.
  - WG TECH welcomed GB's and CH's proposal to give a presentation at a future session of their experience with supervision and coordination between supervision authorities.
- 4.2. Update to the application guide for the UTP LOC&PAS:
  - WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23015 of 17 May 2023. It suggested that the working document be updated for the next session by clarifying that:
    - the Contracting State, rather than the competent authority, should ensure the availability of the tunnel emergency plan;
    - if neither the UTP nor the national rules provide an adequate basis for full assessment, CSs could request additional technical information;
    - interfaces between subsystems should be checked on the basis of UTPs or other specifications in the absence of UTPs. If a vehicle had EU networks in its area of use, these other specifications would be TSIs;
    - the text on gauge compatibility checks should distinguish between vehicle gauge and infrastructure gauge;
    - the infrastructure managers may impose restrictions on using magnetic track brakes.
- 4.3. Explanatory document on the UTP TCRC:
  - WG TECH reviewed, commented on and modified working document TECH-23019 of 17 May 2023. It suggested that the working document be updated for the next session by:
    - clarifying that the railway undertaking should ensure that the vehicles it uses in international traffic, rather than all the vehicles it uses, comply with the conditions set out in the ATMF UR;
    - clarifying the wording according to which each vehicle should be in “good condition” and “within their specified maintenance interval”, as the word ‘good’ was ambiguous and maintenance was not necessarily carried out at specific intervals.
- 4.4. Draft revision of UTPs (WAG, Noise and TCRC)

WG TECH 49 reviewed and discussed the working documents prepared by the Secretariat that had been prepared for the session. In particular, the following were discussed:

- With regard to the UTP WAG, WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23020 of 17 May 2023 and requested the Secretariat to update the document for the next session. In particular:

- WG TECH took note of the proposal from Norway to integrate its specific cases and noted that Norway would provide the Secretariat with relevant texts for this purpose.
  - WG TECH requested that a presentation be given at the next meeting to explain the changes related to transition regimes described in Appendix A of the UTP draft.
- With regard to the UTP NOI, WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23021 of 17 May 2023 and requested the Secretariat to update the document for the next session. In particular:
- WG TECH took note of the proposal from Norway to integrate its specific cases and noted that Norway would provide the Secretariat with relevant texts for this purpose.
- With regard to the UTP TCRC, WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23022 of 17 May 2023 and requested the Secretariat to update the document for the next session.

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

WG TECH welcomed ERA's presentation on the latest developments concerning the European Vehicle Register (EVR) and possible future developments. In particular, the EU Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) would discuss a non-paper on possible modifications to the EVR at its session in June 2023.

WG TECH also took note of the information on the TSI revision package 2022, as voted on by RISC in March 2023. It was anticipated that the TSI revision package would be adopted in July 2023.

**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 50):**

Gümligen/Bern, hybrid, 7-8 September 2023.

## 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 49<sup>th</sup> 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.

### ELECTION OF CHAIR

The **Secretariat** proposed the United Kingdom (Mr Vaibhav Puri) to chair the session. There were no other proposals. Mr Puri accepted the nomination. 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.

### 1 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the provisional agenda for WG TECH 49 had been submitted in the invitation letter TECH-23016 of 19 April 2023. There were no proposals for modification.

The **Chair** concluded that WG TECH 49 approved the agenda as submitted ([Annex II – Approved agenda](#)).

### 2 INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT

The **Secretariat** reminded the meeting that the minutes of the 48<sup>th</sup> WG TECH meeting had been approved in writing and were available on OTIF's website<sup>1</sup>.

The **Secretariat** gave an overview of relevant official communication since the previous session. It drew the meeting's attention to OTIF's circular letter (TECH-22038) concerning the request to nominate focal points for the exchange of information related to the APTU and ATMF UR. It noted that the focal points from AF, AL, AM, AZ, BE, DK, DZ, EE, LI, GE, IQ, IR, IT, JO, LB, LU, MC, ME, PK, PT and RO had not yet been nominated. The Secretariat kindly reminded these states to designate their focal points at their earliest convenience.

### 3 PLANNING THE WORK OF WG TECH IN VIEW OF THE RESULTS OF CTE 15

The **Chair** informed the meeting of the positive results of the CTE session and welcomed the preparatory work of WG TECH and the Secretariat in this regard.

The **Secretariat** reported on the main results and decisions of CTE 15, including the mandate WG TECH had been given to develop the following documents:

- Proposals for the revision of UTPs, with priority being given to UTPs relevant to freight wagons. In this context, the Secretariat had drafted amendments to the following UTPs for review by WG TECH 49: WAG, Noise and TCRC;
- Proposals to update the application guides to UTPs. In this regard, the Secretariat had prepared amendments to the application guide for UTP LOC&PAS and the explanatory document on UTP TCRC;

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://otif.org/fileadmin/new/2-Activities/2E-Technical-Interoperability/2Eb-Working-Group-Tech/2Eb1\\_Report/WG-TECH-48-final-minutes.pdf](http://otif.org/fileadmin/new/2-Activities/2E-Technical-Interoperability/2Eb-Working-Group-Tech/2Eb1_Report/WG-TECH-48-final-minutes.pdf)

- A progress report on the development of Annexes to the EST UR, particularly with regard to a Common Safety Method on supervision to be applied by Supervision Authorities. In this regard, the Secretariat had drafted Annex D to the EST UR; and
- The next step in monitoring and assessing implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR.

CTE 15 had also mandated WG TECH to deal with any other subjects it deemed necessary and report its findings to CTE.

The **Chair** noted that WG TECH had considered the planning of its work in view of the results of CTE 15 and that there were no remarks.

## 4 FOR DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Draft Annex D to the EST UR concerning supervision

Document: [TECH-23018](#) Draft document version 1

The **Secretariat** presented document TECH-23018 of 17 May 2023, its scope, context and main content. The document was aligned with the provisions of the EU Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2018/761 of 16 February 2018 (CSM on supervision). The Secretariat noted that supervision authorities would be required to apply this Annex when supervising railway undertakings (RUs), while its application to infrastructure managers (IMs) was only recommended.

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

**GB** welcomed the document and supported its content. With regard to Annex 2 on the framework for coordinated and joint supervision, GB emphasised the importance of cooperation and of sharing experience and best practice, not only between supervision bodies, but also at OTIF meetings. GB offered to share its own experience on supervision and coordination with other supervision authorities. GB also wondered about the role of WG TECH in the context of cooperation and coordination of supervision bodies, and whether this exchange of knowledge should be encouraged in future WG TECH meetings.

The **Secretariat** concurred with GB that sharing experience would provide valuable insights for the development of Annex D to the EST UR. It also supported the idea that non-EU OTIF CSs could share their experience with WG TECH.

**CH** agreed with GB and the Secretariat and also offered to share its experience with WG TECH.

**NB Rail** informed the meeting that at EU level, national safety authorities (NSAs) regularly met to share their experience with supervision. NB Rail considered this very useful. NB Rail thought that sharing such experience at WG TECH level would be beneficial and instructive for the competent authorities and RUs.

**CER** concurred with NB Rail.

**RS** requested clarification regarding the difference in the application of CSM for supervision between IMs and RUs. As far as it understood the EST UR, all actors involved in international traffic should have a Safety Management System (SMS), and it therefore wondered whether IMs should be subject to supervision as well as RUs.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that in accordance with Article 3 § 3 of the EST UR, all RUs and IMs involved in international traffic had to have implemented their SMS and had to ensure its correct application. In addition, Article 6 § 2 of the EST UR stipulated that correct application of the SMS by the RUs had to be supervised by the Supervision Authority. However, there was no reference to supervision of the IMs. Referring to the EST UR Explanatory Report<sup>2</sup>, the Secretariat further explained that the infrastructure was often mainly used for domestic traffic and that the General Assembly therefore considered it disproportionate to impose the supervision of IMs. Arrangements for supervising the IMs' activities could

---

<sup>2</sup> Final Document of the 13<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, Annex 6, Appendix H (EST), Amendments to the consolidated Explanatory Report of COTIF (pages 92-107, notably pages 105 and 106); <http://otif.org/fileadmin/new/2-Activities/2A-General-Assembly/2AbFinalDocument/SG-18088-AG13-e-final-document-Add.pdf>

therefore be decided at national level. The explanatory report also emphasised that the EST UR are aligned with Article 8 of the ATMF UR, which stipulates that the admission, supervision and maintenance of infrastructure remains the subject of the provisions in force in each State. Nevertheless, the report also noted that, instead of mandatory provisions, it might be useful and proportionate to recommend methods and best practices for the assessment of infrastructure managers. **RS** thanked the Secretariat for the comprehensive explanation.

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

- WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23018 of 17 May 2023. There were no specific comments or suggestions for improvement. WG TECH requested the Secretariat to submit the document again to the next session.
- WG TECH welcomed GB's and CH's proposal to give a presentation at a future session of their experience with supervision and coordination between supervision authorities.

#### 4.2 Update to the application guide for the UTP LOC&PAS

Document: [TECH-23015](#)

Draft guide document version 1

The **Secretariat** presented document TECH-23015 dated 17 May 2023, explained its format and how to read the document. The Secretariat suggested that the discussion should focus on the modifications shown in track changes in the blue rectangles in the application guide.

**FR** noted that in the last blue rectangle of point 2.4.2 on page 18, last sentence, it was suggested that the competent authority had to ensure that a tunnel emergency plan was available. In France, this was not a task of the competent authority (i.e. the NSA) and France therefore suggested modifying the text.

**DE** informed the meeting that in Germany, tunnel emergency plans were developed under the direction of the IM, in cooperation with the emergency response services and the relevant authorities for each tunnel.

The **Secretariat** acknowledged the comments from FR and DE and suggested that the text be modified. It reminded the meeting that at EU level, legal requirements for tunnel safety were harmonised in the TSI for safety in railway tunnels. However, no equivalent UTP existed at OTIF level. The Secretariat noted that there were different national practices with regard to who was responsible for drawing up the tunnel emergency plans. With regard to the text, the Secretariat suggested modifying it to say that emergency plans should be made available by the state rather than by the competent authority. This would enable discretion as to how the responsibilities were discharged within each state. WG TECH tacitly agreed with the modification.

**GB** requested clarification with regard to the blue rectangle in point 2.3.2 on page 16, in particular the text in the penultimate paragraph. GB wondered whether in relation to the essential requirements, there might be cases where the risk assessment and evaluation carried out would not be considered acceptable. In its view, the results of risk assessment should not be called into question and should therefore be recognised by all CSs. Nevertheless, the competent authority should always have the right to request additional information or tests.

**TR** concurred with GB.

**NB Rail** was also of the view that the results of risk assessments must not be called into question. The safeguards for the quality of risk assessments were regulated by the CSM RA (UTP GEN-G), including the registration of CSM assessment bodies in ERADIS. It also agreed that when extending the area of use of a vehicle, additional tests might be required. These tests, together with the results of previous tests, should provide the competent authority with reassurance that all risk assessments in relation to the complementary admission had been considered.

The **Secretariat** agreed with GB and NB Rail and that the text should better reflect the points raised. New wording was shown on the screen. WG TECH tacitly agreed with the modification.

**GB** had another comment with regard to the second blue rectangle in point 2.3.2 on page 17. The text indicated that when interfaces between subsystems are not covered by UTPs, these interfaces had to be

checked according to TSIs for vehicles which had an area of use that included one or more EU MSs. GB suggested that the text should be reciprocal, so as to refer not only to EU requirements (TSIs) but also to any requirements that might apply in non-EU OTIF CSs.

**CH** concurred with GB and pointed out that in addition to UTPs, CH also applied [the TSIs that were currently in force. In future, it was also planning to apply the recently adopted 2022 TSI package, however this would require revision of Swiss legislation, which was expected in 2024.](#)

**RS** was of view that the reference to TSIs in the blue rectangle should be deleted, as TSIs did not apply to non-EU OTIF CSs. In relation to this, it questioned whether the term “area of use” should remain in the sentence in question, as the term might be interpreted differently in EU law and COTIF.

The **Secretariat** stated that even when UTPs did not exist for particular vehicle interfaces (such as for energy and CCS), these interfaces still needed to be checked. In the absence of UTPs, in principle, national provisions would apply to such checks. In the EU however, these interfaces were covered by the TSIs, so the TSIs would apply when checking these interfaces for any vehicles with an area of use including one or more EU MSs. The Secretariat was therefore of the view that it was justified to refer to the TSIs in the UTP, even if these TSIs were only relevant to vehicles suitable for operation in international traffic into the EU. The Secretariat proposed to add a new sentence to explain that, in the absence of UTPs, the interfaces between subsystems should be checked on the basis of national technical requirements as far as states that did not apply TSIs were concerned. WG TECH tacitly agreed.

**GB** requested clarification with regard to the second blue rectangle in point 2.4.11, third paragraph, on page 22. It was of the view that compatibility between the vehicle gauge and the network gauge(s) was part of the admission process, as it had to be ascertained that the vehicle actually fitted the network gauge(s). It expressed concern that the text in the working document could be misunderstood as allowing admission without having to check gauge compatibility. GB suggested that the text should reflect that the vehicle gauge had to be assessed and declared during the admission process. However, compatibility checks between the vehicle gauge and the gauge of particular lines were part of route compatibility checks by the RU.

The **Secretariat** agreed that, in principle, route compatibility checks between vehicles and railway lines were an operational responsibility and were not considered as part of the admission. However, in order for a vehicle to be used in a CS, the vehicle should be compatible with at least part of the network of that CS. As such, it had to be checked before admission. The Secretariat proposed to clarify this in the text and to modify the text by referring to both vehicle gauge and infrastructure gauge. The new wording was shown on the screen. WG TECH tacitly agreed.

**GB** requested clarification with regard to the first paragraph of the last blue rectangle in point 2.4.31 on page 37. It questioned whether setting conditions for using magnetic track brakes was an IM competence or a state competence, in the form of national requirements.

The **Secretariat** agreed that the text was ambiguous and should be improved. It suggested a text to reflect the fact that IMs should provide information regarding the applicable rules, constraints and conditions for using track brakes. However, the text should not suggest that IMs may set the rules.

**CER** suggested that the application guides for UTPs should be more concise, and pointed out that certain parts of UTPs were self-explanatory.

The **Secretariat** clarified that in each case where the UTP was in a two-column layout, this meant there was a difference between the TSI and the UTP. The purpose of the text in the blue rectangles was to explain these differences.

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

- WG TECH had reviewed working document TECH-23015 of 17 May 2023. It suggested that the working document be updated for the next session by clarifying that:
  - the Contracting State, rather than the competent authority, should ensure the availability of the tunnel emergency plan;

- if neither the UTP nor the national rules provide an adequate basis for full assessment, CSs could request additional technical information;
- interfaces between subsystems should be checked on the basis of UTPs or other specifications in the absence of UTPs. If a vehicle had EU networks in its area of use, these other specifications would be TSIs;
- the text on gauge compatibility checks should distinguish between vehicle gauge and infrastructure gauge;
- the infrastructure managers may impose restrictions on using magnetic track brakes.

### 4.3 Explanatory document on the UTP TCRC

Document: [TECH-23019](#) Draft explanatory document version 1

The **Secretariat** presented document TECH-23019 dated 17 May 2023, explained its content, main elements and how to read the document. The document concerned the UTP TCRC, which had entered into force on 1 April 2021.

**GB** suggested that the text in the first paragraph, point 2.1, on page 4 could be more precise. As it read, the text suggested that any vehicle used by an RU had to be admitted to international traffic. However, in reality, only vehicles that were actually used by RUs in international traffic had to be admitted. Vehicles used only domestically were not concerned by COTIF. It also recommended including a paragraph that would reflect the relationship between route compatibility and safe integration. In this context, it suggested that ERA's safe integration guide<sup>3</sup> might be a useful reference. In its view, the explanatory document should focus not only on UTP compliance and compatibility, but also on other aspects related to safe integration.

**RS** concurred with GB and suggested that vehicles should also be duly registered in the vehicle register.

**NB Rail** was of the opinion that including texts concerning safety integration in the guide on the UTP TCRC would risk mixing aspects related to the admission of vehicles with aspects related to the use of vehicles. The UTP TCRC only concerned the use of vehicles.

The **Secretariat** agreed with GB that the text should be modified to say that only vehicles used in international traffic had to comply with the conditions set out in the ATMF UR. With regard to the safety integration aspects, the Secretariat noted that route compatibility checks were only carried out after a vehicle had been admitted to international traffic. It therefore suggested that it might not be necessary to include the safety integration aspects. It added that once vehicles were admitted, it was the responsibility of the keeper to request that the vehicles be registered in the respective registers.

**UIC** asked why the term "maintenance interval" was used (point 3, first indent, page 5). The term "interval" suggested that maintenance had to be time-related, but it might also relate to the condition of a vehicle, for example.

In the same indent of the text, **HU** requested clarification of the term "good condition". It was of the view that the term was ambiguous.

**RS** suggested that the terms "maintenance interval" and "good condition" could be replaced with terms used in other OTIF documents (ECM rules, ATMF UR, etc.).

The **Secretariat** agreed with UIC, HU and the solution proposed by RS. It suggested aligning the terminology of the explanatory document with other OTIF documents and submitting it to the next WG TECH. WG TECH tacitly agreed.

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

- WG TECH had reviewed, commented on and modified working document TECH-23019 of 17 May 2023. It suggested that the working document be updated for the next session by:

---

<sup>3</sup> Clarification Note on Safe Integration, ERA 1209/063 V 1.0, ERA, 14.1.2020, <https://www.era.europa.eu/system/files/2022-11/ERA1209-063%20Clarification%20note%20on%20safe%20integration.pdf>



- clarifying that the railway undertaking should ensure that the vehicles it uses in international traffic, rather than all the vehicles it uses, comply with the conditions set out in the ATMF UR;
- clarifying the wording according to which each vehicle should be in “good condition” and “within their specified maintenance interval”, as the word “good” was ambiguous and maintenance was not necessarily carried out at specific intervals.

#### 4.4 Draft revision of UTPs

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that it had prepared draft modifications to three UTPs: UTP WAG, which entered into force on 1.1.2022, UTP Noise, which entered into force on 1.4.2021 and UTP TCRC, which entered into force on 1.1.2022. The modifications were based on the respective TSIs as voted on by the EU Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) at the end of March 2023 and provided to the Secretariat by the European Commission.

##### Draft revision of UTP WAG

Document: [TECH-23020](#)

Working document, version 1, dated 17.5.2023

The **Secretariat** informed the meeting that the draft modifications to the UTP WAG were shown in track changes on the basis of the UTP WAG 2022.

**NO** asked whether specific cases for its network could be included in point 7.3.2 of the UTP WAG. It reminded the meeting that Norway was not a member of the EU but was associated with the EU through the Agreement on the European Economic Area (EEA Agreement). Its specific cases were included in the EEA Agreement, but not in the WAG TSI. The UTP referred to the specific cases in the TSI, but not to the specific cases in the EEA Agreement. Norway therefore requested that its specific cases be included in the UTP.

**CH** supported the modifications shown in the document. ~~It concurred with~~ As a non-EU State that applied the TSIs, CH mentioned that its specific cases were not included in the TSIs either, but in Annex I of the Land Transport Agreement between Switzerland and the EU. NO and confirmed that it would have similar proposals with regard to the Switzerland currently had specific cases for the TSI LOC&PAS and for the TSI ENE included in the Land Transport Agreement. It also recently notified specific cases for the TSI INF, but these were not yet in the Land Transport Agreement. If relevant, Swiss specific cases in force (in the EU-CH Land Transport Agreement) could be included or referred to specific cases for Switzerland in the UTP LOC&PAS and the UTP INF at a later stage. -in the future That would be a similar approach to that of Norway.

The **Secretariat** supported the approach suggested by **NO**. It acknowledged that the EEA Agreement provided the legal application of Norway’s specific case within the EU and other parties to the EEA Agreement, but not beyond. Including Norway’s specific cases in the UTP WAG would ensure their legal applicability within COTIF and its non-EU OTIF CSs. The Secretariat also informed the meeting that Norway had contacted the Secretariat before the meeting and that it had agreed to provide the text concerning its specific case. The Secretariat would include the text in the working documents for the next WG TECH.

**GB** noted that there were significant changes compared to the UTP version that was in force, notably concerning so-called “transition regimes”. It was difficult to understand fully the implications of these changes. It therefore suggested that it would be useful to have a presentation of the transition regimes as described in Appendix A of the UTP draft. Such a presentation would help understand the changes in the EU context and their impact.

The **Secretariat** agreed that the texts on transition regimes were complex. It agreed to prepare a presentation that would explain the changes, bearing in mind that the Secretariat was not the author of the changes.

### Draft revision of UTP NOI

Document: [TECH-23021](#)

Working document, version 1, dated 17.5.2023

The **Secretariat** presented the main changes to the UTP NOI, which were shown in track changes.

In line with its previous suggestion with regard to the specific case in UTP WAG, **NO** suggested including its specific network cases in point 7.3.2 of the UTP NOI.

There were no other remarks.

### Draft revision of UTP TCRC

Document: [TECH-23022](#)

Working document, version 1, dated 17.5.2023

The **Secretariat** presented the main changes to the document, which were shown in track changes. There were no comments. The Secretariat proposed updating the working document to align the definitions of “maintenance interval” and “good condition” with the same approach as it would use for the explanatory document.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion under point 4.4 and noted that WG TECH 49 had reviewed and discussed the working documents the Secretariat had prepared for the session. In particular, the following were discussed:

- With regard to the UTP WAG, WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23020 of 17 May 2023 and requested the Secretariat to update the document for the next session. In particular:
  - WG TECH took note of the proposal from Norway to integrate its specific cases and noted that Norway would provide the Secretariat with relevant texts for this purpose.
  - WG TECH requested that a presentation be given at the next meeting to explain the changes related to transition regimes described in Appendix A of the UTP draft.
- With regard to the UTP NOI, WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23021 of 17 May 2023 and requested the Secretariat to update the document for the next session. In particular:
  - WG TECH took note of the proposal from Norway to integrate its specific cases and noted that Norway would provide the Secretariat with relevant texts for this purpose.
- With regard to the UTP TCRC, WG TECH reviewed working document TECH-23022 of 17 May 2023 and requested the Secretariat to update the document for the next session.

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

### 5.1 Status update on the European Vehicle Register, including transitional measures.

**This topic was presented by ERA** (Mr Antonio D'Agostino and Mr Javier Vicente Fajardo)

ERA presented an overview of the current status of the European Vehicle Register (EVR) and future developments. Mr D'Agostino pointed out that there were challenges in migrating the data from the MSs' NVRs to the EVR. ERA's objective was to facilitate the connection between registers and the transfer of data. One of the objectives was to create a link between ERADIS and the EVR so that EVR could automatically retrieve data from ERADIS concerning ECMs for example, including the validity of their certificates.

The **Secretariat** welcomed the presentation. It raised two questions related to use cases involving non-EU OTIF CSs. Firstly, when an EU vehicle that was registered in the EVR was used outside the EU, it asked how the relevant parties (competent authorities, RUs, IMs etc.) in that non-EU OTIF CS could have access to the EVR data for that vehicle. Secondly, it asked how vehicles from non-EU OTIF CSs used in international traffic into the EU could be registered in the EVR.

**ERA** confirmed that the EVR currently had restricted access. It informed the meeting of the ongoing work with the European Commission (EC) to address the issue of access to the EVR. The EC was expected to present a non-paper on possible modifications to the EVR Decision at the next RISC meeting in June 2023. This would be followed up by a new ERA working party. It was anticipated that the non-paper would include proposals to make the EVR data public, and to designate ERA as a Registration Entity. ERA also mentioned that the concept of European Vehicle Number (EVN) would need to evolve, as the pool of possible new EVNs was being depleted, which in future would lead to problems assigning EVNs to new vehicles.

With regard to the process for registering vehicles entering the EU from non-EU OTIF CSs, **ERA** explained that according to the current legal provisions, vehicles entering the EU would have to be registered in the first EU MS they entered, unless they were registered in a vehicle register connected to the EVR or ECVVR. However, the option to use ECVVR would not be available after June 2024, after which date all vehicles would have to be registered in the EVR.

The **representative of the EC** concurred with ERA and clarified that relevant vehicle data necessary for operations would become publicly available. Furthermore, ERA would become a Registration Entity not only for the vehicles it had authorised, but also for vehicles that are used in international traffic and that enter the EU from non-EU OTIF CS.

**CER** reminded the meeting about the extensive discussions in OTIF meetings regarding the use of the EVR by non-EU OTIF CSs. It welcomed the preparation of the non-paper and underlined the importance of finding a solution to the impending depletion of new EVNs.

**TR** wondered about the possibility of using a national software tool for vehicle registration instead of the NVR system. In this context, it asked whether other Contracting States had a similar approach, so that TR could their experience. Lastly, TR requested clarification on whether there were any specifications for aligning and connecting these separate registers.

The **Secretariat** replied that COTIF required each CS to have a vehicle register in which the relevant vehicle data would be available to the relevant entities of other CSs. Furthermore, COTIF harmonised the structure of the data in the vehicle registers for all CSs. However, COTIF did not provide rules on the IT architecture of vehicle registers. CSs had to decide either to use their own NVR or to would enter into an agreement with the EU to use the EVR.

**GB** welcomed the work on the non-paper and wondered if the non-paper could be shared with WG TECH. It informed the meeting that its NVR had a broader purpose compared to the EVR, including to provide relevant data for operational purposes. According to GB, these additional features made the exchange of data more complex. In its view, the issue at this stage was not only about decentralised registers, but also about access, data sharing, and minimising the need to re-register vehicle data.

From a technical point of view, **ERA** said that there were some EU MS that also used their NVRs for additional purposes. In this case, machine-to-machine communication between these NVRs and the EVR could facilitate the transfer of vehicle data. This was something ERA wanted to consider in the future. **ERA** explained its data strategy, which focused on the principle of “the single source of truth”. This meant that the EVR should be considered as the single reference database for railway vehicles that operate in Europe. The EVR should be developed to support railway operations, and should create conditions to become an open source of data to third countries whose vehicles cross the EU. The vehicle data had to be available, be of good quality and be secure.

With regard to third country access to the EVR, **ERA** made two points. Firstly, access would depend on who was requesting it. Certain vehicle data used for reference would be open to all, but other data would be accessible based on the requirements and role of the requester. The second point was that in order for ERA to make a decision on access rights, it would need to consult the European Commission in the event that there are special international agreements. Consequently, a bilateral service level agreement would be established.

**ERA** (Christoph Kaupat) informed the meeting that the dissemination campaign with regard to the EVR was ongoing in the West Balkans, with two training sessions already completed in RS and BA and two more scheduled to take place in AL and MK.

**NB Rail** asked whether the future interface between the EVR and ERADIS could be explained in more detail. It informed the meeting of the wider discussion within the “Cooperation of the ECM Certification Bodies (CCB)”, which involved both non-EU and EU certification bodies. In this discussion, the main challenge had been to check the certificates of ECMs against each registered vehicle, the data for which was in two different registers. One idea had been to use the VAT number. However, the discussion had been put on hold until further developments in the ERA working group.

**ERA** replied that it saw difficulties in using the VAT number as a form of identification, as the form of VAT numbers was not harmonised across all states. ERA explained that the ERADIS database was currently the main source of identification and that it was anticipated that these data could be connected to the EVR.

The **Chair** thanked Mr D'Agostino and Mr Fajardo for providing the latest update on EVR developments. He noted that machine-to-machine (M2M) communication was a step towards a solution to data exchange and connectivity. He noted that the demonstration of the EVR tool would have to be postponed owing to the lack of time. The Chair proposed that it be presented at the next WG TECH, which ERA agreed to do.

## 5.2 Status update on the revision of TSIs.

The **representative of the EC** gave an update on the TSI revision package. On 30 March 2023, the RISC had reviewed and voted on the package. In accordance with the EU's procedures, the texts would be translated and prepared for publication. Depending when the work was completed, the revised TSIs were expected to be adopted and published in the EU Official Journal in July 2023 or later. With regard to the application guides for the revised TSIs, they were already being revised and would be finalised and published on ERA's website after final adoption of the TSI revision package. With regard to the draft update and revision of the TAF/TAP TSI, the ERA recommendation was under review and the EC would submit it for discussion at RISC later in 2023 and subsequently for a vote in 2024.

**ERA** (Christoph Kaupat) invited participants to attend the ERA webinars on the TSI revision package scheduled for 6 July 2023. The links to these webinars were published on ERA's website under <https://www.era.europa.eu/content/era-webinars-2023-programme>. The webinars were also recorded, and could be viewed later.

**GB** wondered when the revised TSIs would enter into force. The **representative of the EC** explained that the TSIs would enter into force 20 days after being published in the Official Journal of the EU, unless otherwise specified in the adopted documents.

The **Chair** thanked the representatives of the EC and ERA for their input and concluded item 5 as follows:

- WG TECH welcomed ERA's presentation on the latest developments concerning the European Vehicle Register (EVR) and possible future developments. In particular, the EU Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) would discuss a non-paper on possible modifications to the EVR at its session in June 2023.
- WG TECH also took note of the information on the TSI revision package 2022, as voted on by RISC in March 2023. It was anticipated that the TSI revision package would be adopted in July 2023.

## 6 CROSS REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: [TECH-17049](#)

Working document dated 17.5.2023

The **Secretariat** presented document TECH-17049. Compared to the version issued for WG TECH 48, a correspondence between the terms “the admission of infrastructure” and “the authorisation (of infrastructure)” was added. In addition, editorial corrections had also been made.

**WG TECH** took note of the document without further comment.

## 7 EU – OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: [TECH-18024](#)

Working document dated 17.5.2023

The **Secretariat** presented document TECH-18024. Compared with the version issued for WG TECH 48, the *Comments* column had been updated to reflect the status update discussion on the revision of the UTPs (WAG, NOI, GEN-E, GEN-G, TAF and TCRC) and ATMF Annex B on Derogations. The columns related to references to EU legislation had also been updated to reflect the updates to the EU legal texts that had been voted on by RISC in March 2023. In addition, editorial corrections had also been made.

**GB** pointed out the value of the table and its usefulness in reviewing TSI updates and identifying relevant requirements in UTPs and COTIF.

**WG TECH** took note of the document without further comment.

## 8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

## 9 NEXT SESSIONS

It is planned to hold the following sessions in a hybrid format; if new travel restrictions are imposed, the sessions will be held remotely:

- 6<sup>th</sup> Joint Coordinating Group of Experts (JCGE) on 6 September 2023 in Bern
- 50<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH on 7 and 8 September 2023 in Gümligen/Bern
- 51<sup>st</sup> session of WG TECH on 14 and 15 November 2023 in London
- 16<sup>th</sup> session of the CTE on 11 and 12 June 2024 in Bern
- 52<sup>nd</sup> session of WG TECH on 13 June 2024 in Gümligen/Bern

## CLOSING REMARKS

The **Chair** thanked all participants for the productive discussion and thanked the OTIF Secretariat for preparing all the documents on time.

On behalf of the delegates, the **Secretariat** thanked the Chair for his excellent work in chairing the 49<sup>th</sup> session of WG TECH.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

## ANNEX I

**I. Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments****Algérie/Algérien/Algeria**

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Herrad <b>Okba</b>	Sous directeur des transports ferroviaires Ministère des Transports Elbier Alger
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Farid <b>Halliche</b>	Directeur central transport fret Société nationale transport ferroviaire (SNTF)
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Sofiane <b>Aibeche</b>	Directeur central contrôle de gestion Société nationale transport ferroviaire (SNTF)

**Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany**

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Philipp <b>Unger</b>	Technischer Regierungsrat Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
----------------------	----------------------	--

**Autriche/Österreich/Austria**

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Thomas <b>Helnwein</b>	Amtssachverständiger Bundesministerium für Klimaschutz, Umwelt, Energie, Mobilität, Innovation und Technologie
----------------------	------------------------	--

**Belgique/Belgien/Belgium**

M./Hr./Mr. S'est excusé. Hat sich entschuldigt. Sent apologies.	Luc <b>Opsomer</b>	Advisor Railway Safety Team Rolling Stock (RS) Belgian National Railway Safety Authority (NSA BE)
--	--------------------	---

**Bosnie et Herzégovine/  
Bosnien und Herzegowina/  
Bosnia and Herzegovina**

M./Hr./Mr. in person	Mirko <b>Vulić</b>	Senior Expert Associate Railways Regulatory Board (Regulatorni Odbor Željeznica)
-------------------------	--------------------	--

**Croatie/Kroatien/Croatia**

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Darjan <b>Konjić</b>	Senior Expert Advisor Ministry of Sea, Transport and Infrastructure
----------------------	----------------------	--

**France/Frankreich/France**

M<sup>me</sup>/Fr./Ms Ophélie **Riquet**  
in person

Chargée de mission action internationale dans le domaine de l'interopérabilité et de la sécurité ferroviaires  
Ministère de la Transition écologique et de la Cohésion des territoires  
Direction générale des infrastructures, des transports et des mobilités (DGITM)

M./Hr./Mr. Sylvain **Cozette**  
in person

Chargé d'affaires  
Autorité française de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)

M./Hr./Mr. Julien **Roger**  
remote

Chargé d'affaires réglementaires et juridiques  
Autorité française de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)

**Hongrie/Ungarn/Hungary**

M./Hr./Mr. György **Lengyel**  
in person

CHG Officer, Expert  
Ministry of Technology and Industry

**Italie/Italien/Italy**

M./Hr./Mr. Rocco **Cammarata**  
remote

Head of Technical Standards of Vehicles Office  
Agenzia Nazionale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie e delle Infrastrutture Stradali e Autostradali (ANSFISA)

**Jordanie/Jordanien/Jordan**

M./Hr./Mr. Zahi **Khalil**  
remote

Director General  
Jordan Hejaz Railway

**Norvège/Norwegen/Norway**

M<sup>me</sup>/Fr./Ms Pia **Strand**  
remote

Senior Adviser  
Norwegian Railway Authority

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

M./Hr./Mr. James **Le Grice**  
in person

Head of Rail Safety and Standards  
Department for Transport

M./Hr./Mr. Vaibhav **Puri**  
in person

Director of Sector Strategy  
Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB)

**Serbie/Serbien/Serbia**

M <sup>me</sup> /Fr./Ms remote	Teodora <b>Milenković</b>	Junior advisor Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure
M <sup>me</sup> /Fr./Ms in person	Nataša <b>Cerović</b>	Head of Department for Safety and Interoperability Directorate for Railways
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Milan <b>Popović</b>	Head of the department for rules and authorisation of structural subsystems Directorate for Railways

**Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland**

M <sup>me</sup> /Fr./Ms <b>Remote</b> <a href="#">in person</a>	Linda <b>Ay</b>	Project Manager Safety and Interoperability Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland - FOT
--	-----------------	---

**Türkiye/Türkiye/Türkiye**

M./Hr./Mr. <b>R</b> remote	Mustafa <b>Kirmizigül</b>	Head of Certification Department General Directorate of Transportation Services Regulation (UHDGM) Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
M./Hr./Mr. in person	Nurtekin Çağatay <b>İşten</b>	Transport and Communication Expert Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
M <sup>me</sup> /Fr./Ms in person	Serife <b>Yorulmaz</b>	General Directorate of Transportation Services Regulation (UHDGM) Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
M./Hr./Mr. in person	Altan <b>Tanriöver</b>	General Directorate of Transportation Services Regulation (UHDGM) Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure

**II. États non-membres de l'OTIF  
Nichtmitgliedstaaten der OTIF  
Non Member States of OTIF**

**Emirats Arabe Unis/  
Vereinigte Arabische Emirate/  
United Arab Emirats**

M./Hr./Mr. <b>R</b> remote	Ahmed <b>Bukhaddooy</b>	International Relations Ethihad Rail
M./Hr./Mr. <b>R</b> remote	Mohammed <b>Shammas</b>	International Relations Ethihad Rail



**III. 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 <sup>me</sup> /Fr./Ms Rremote	Alice <b>Polo</b>	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. in person	Christoph <b>Kaupat</b>	Project Officer Networks, International and IMS Unit, ERA
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Antonio <b>D'Agostino</b>	Team Leader Operational Data Unit, ERA
M./Hr./Mr. remote	Javier Vicente <b>Fajardo</b>	Project Officer

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

**CER**

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

**NB Rail**

M./Hr./Mr. remote	Francis <b>Parmentier</b>	General Manager NB Rail Association
----------------------	---------------------------	--

**OSJD**

M./Hr./Mr. in person	Radovan <b>Vopalecky</b>	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. Jozef **Fázik**  
in person

Senior advisor  
Union internationale des chemins de fer (UIC)

**V. Secrétariat  
Sekretariat  
Secretariat**


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

Head of Technical Interoperability Department

 +41 (31) 359 10 25  
Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11  
E-mail [bas.leermakers@otif.org](mailto:bas.leermakers@otif.org)


M<sup>me</sup>/Fr./Ms Maria **Price**  
in person

Expert in Technical Interoperability Department

 +41 (31) 359 10 26  
Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11  
E-mail [maria.price@otif.org](mailto:maria.price@otif.org)

M./Hr./Mr. Dragan **Nešić**  
in person

Expert in Technical Interoperability Department

 +41 (31) 359 10 24  
Fax +41 (31) 359 10 11  
E-mail [dragan.nesic@otif.org](mailto:dragan.nesic@otif.org)

**APPROVED AGENDA****ANNEX II**

Election of chair

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. Planning the work of WG TECH in view of the results of CTE 15
4. For discussion:
  - 4.1. Draft Annex D to the EST UR concerning supervision
  - 4.2. Update to the application guide for the UTP LOC&PAS
  - 4.3. Explanatory document to the UTP TCRC
  - 4.4. Draft revision of UTPs (depending on availability of final texts of revised TSIs)
5. Developments in European Union regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by the European Commission and the European Union Agency for Railways)
  - 5.1. Status update on the European Vehicle Register, including transitional measures
  - 5.2. Status update on the revision of TSIs
6. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
7. EU – OTIF equivalence table
8. Any other business
9. Next sessions