



OTIF

Organisation intergouvernementale pour les transports internationaux ferroviaires
Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr
Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail

Committee of Technical Experts

18th Session

Minutes

9 June 2026 (Berne, hybrid meeting)

Table of contents

	Page
Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat	3
Election of the Chair	3
1. Adoption of the agenda	3
2. Presence and quorum	3
3. Items for information	4
3.1 General information from the OTIF Secretariat	4
3.2 Report from the CTE's working group Tech (WG Tech)	5
4. Modification of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee of Technical Experts	5
5. Items concerning the adoption of binding provisions	7
5.1 Modification of the UTP WAG	7
5.2 Modification of the UTP LOC&PAS	8
5.3 Modification of the Uniform format of certificates	8
5.4 Modification of Appendix I to the UTP TAF	9
6. Items concerning approval of non-binding guidance and recommendations	10
6.1 Modification of the Guide for the application of the UTP LOC&PAS	10
6.2 Modification of the Guide for the application of the UTP PRM	11
6.3 Modification of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules	11
6.4 Explanatory document concerning ECM certification	12
7. Further items for consideration	13
7.1 Digitalisation and the role of OTIF	13
7.2 Developments related to telematics and the UTP TAF	14
7.3 Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR	15
7.4 Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (multi-system wagons)	15
7.5 Applying OTIF technical rules domestically	16
8. Work programme of the Committee	17
9. Stakeholder engagement	17
10. Any other business	18
11. Next session	18
Closing remarks	19
ANNEXES	20
Adopted Agenda Annex I	20
List of participants Annex II	21

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

1. The **Secretary General** opened the session and welcomed the participants.
2. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** informed participants that the session would be recorded for the purpose of drafting the minutes of the meeting. The recordings would be deleted once the minutes had been finalised.
3. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the meeting that the documents for the meeting had been published on OTIF's website in two batches on 16 February and 13 April 2026 and were available under [Working Documents](#) (see section 2026). He also informed the meeting that before the session, the OTIF Secretariat had prepared Room document 1 that had been sent to registered participants by email on 2 June 2026 and that it would be attached to the list of decisions of the 18th session of the Committee of Technical Experts (hereinafter: the Committee) that would be made available on OTIF's website under [Decisions](#).

Election of the Chair

4. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that in accordance with Article 10 of the CTE's Rules of Procedure, the Committee elects the Chair from among its members and that the established practice was to elect the Chair for each meeting. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department further recalled that invitation TECH-26001 of 19 January 2026 had invited Member States to submit their nominations for a candidate to chair the session. By the deadline of 13 April 2026, the United Kingdom had submitted the nomination of Mr Vaibhav Puri. No other nominations had been received. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department therefore proposed that the United Kingdom should chair the session. The Committee unanimously elected the United Kingdom, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, to chair the session.

1. Adoption of the agenda

5. The **Chair** recalled that the Secretariat had circulated the invitation on 19 January with a provisional agenda. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** informed delegates that no requests for amendments to the proposed agenda had been received prior to the session. On this basis, he proposed that the Committee adopt the agenda as submitted. There were no proposals, comments, questions or objections.

Decision

- (1) The Committee of Technical Experts adopted the agenda [as set out in [Annex I](#)].

2. Presence and quorum

6. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that there were 43 APTU and ATMF contracting states, of which 42 had the right to vote, as Afghanistan's voting rights had been suspended. Consequently, the quorum for the Committee was one half of 42, i.e. 21 contracting states present or represented.
7. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the Committee that on behalf of the European Union (EU), the European Commission (EC) had informed the Secretary General, in a letter dated 25 February 2026, that the EU would exercise its voting rights at the session, with a number of votes corresponding to the 25 EU Member States that apply the APTU and ATMF UR. He indicated that the letter had been published together with the working documents and that when the EU voted, EU Member States must not vote in their own right. He further indicated that seven

non-EU contracting states (CH, DZ, MA, NO, RS, TR and the UK) with voting rights were present or represented, so that in total, 32 contracting states were present or represented for the purposes of voting. The quorum was therefore attained ([List of participants, Annex II](#)).

3. Items for information

3.1 General information from the OTIF Secretariat

8. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** informed the Committee that the UTPs adopted by the Committee at its previous session had all entered into force on 1 January 2026. Delegates were reminded that all depositary notifications and current and past versions of the UTPs were available on OTIF's website.
9. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department announced that there were [two vacancies in the OTIF Secretariat](#): one post for a senior policy advisor or policy advisor in the Technical Interoperability Department, and one post for a senior legal advisor or legal advisor in the Legal and External Affairs Department. Both vacancy notices were published on OTIF's website, and delegations were invited to disseminate this information. In addition, he highlighted an ongoing [call for seconded national experts](#), aimed at staff of national ministries or authorities who would devote part of their time to working for OTIF on agreed objectives, while remaining employed by their home authority.
10. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department then reported on the new concept of online roundtable meetings, explaining that these were informal, events held in English only that were open to Member States, sector organisations and experts, and were designed to address specific topics in international railway law and related areas. Two roundtables had been held so far: one on the modifications to COTIF adopted by the 12th and 13th General Assemblies, focusing on the status of approvals and possible support to accelerate national procedures, and a second on the CUV UR, concentrating on liability for loss or damage caused by a railway vehicle and practices relevant to possible revision of Article 7 of the CUV UR.
11. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department presented the current status of approvals of the texts adopted by the 12th and 13th General Assemblies. With regard to the 12th General Assembly, there were 18 approvals, and with regard to the 13th General Assembly, there were 14 approvals. However, 22 approvals are required for the amendments to the APTU and ATMF UR to enter into force and 32 for the COTIF-related approvals, including the EST UR. Delegates from states not yet on the list of states that had approved the amendments were invited to support progress at national level.
12. In reply to a question from the Chair, the **Secretary General** confirmed that further roundtables were envisaged, mentioning, as one example under consideration, a meeting on the most recent developments on matters concerning RID. He explained that both previous roundtables had been very successful, with the second attracting more than 60 participants, who had discussed issues concerning liability in the event of damage caused by a wagon and technical regulations. The Secretary General invited contracting states to propose topics for future roundtables and confirmed that the Secretariat would be pleased to receive and consider such suggestions.
13. **HU** welcomed the roundtables, in particular the one on liability. HU explained that experience from accident investigations had shown that legal and technical questions around liability often required lengthy and complex analysis, and therefore suggested additional, possibly more detailed roundtable meetings on this topic. The **Secretary General** noted this positive feedback, explained that the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation would continue work on these aspects of the law, and reiterated that Member States were always invited to bring relevant

topics to the various committees or working groups, or, where a broader audience was necessary, to propose them as roundtable themes.

3.2 Report from the CTE's working group Tech (WG Tech)

Document: [TECH-26002](#)

14. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced document TECH-26002. Three WG Tech meetings had taken place during this cycle: one on 19 June of the previous year in Ittigen (hosted by the Swiss Federal Office of Transport), one on 9 September in the OTIF building in Berne, and one in Brussels on 18 November hosted by the European Commission's DG MOVE.
15. The **Chair** emphasised that the Committee's substantive work builds on the efforts made in WG Tech over the previous year and thanked those delegations and organisations that had hosted and contributed to the WG Tech meetings.
16. The **UK** intervened briefly to record its appreciation of the considerable work invested in the WG Tech meetings and thanked all involved in preparing the documentation for the Committee.
17. No further questions were raised in the room or online. The **Chair** concluded that the Committee could agree the proposed decision by consensus.

Decision

- (2) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of the report of the 55th, 56th and 57th sessions of the Committee of Technical Experts' standing working group Technology, as set out in document TECH-26002.

4. Modification of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee of Technical Experts

Document: [TECH-26018](#) and Room document 1

18. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-26018, which contained the current Rules of Procedure of the Committee of Technical Experts with proposed amendments shown in track changes. There was also a cover note explaining the rationale of the proposals. He explained that this initiative stemmed from recommendations by the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation to harmonise the rules of procedure across all OTIF's organs.
19. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department recalled that, after publication of TECH-26018 in February, further refinements had been set out in a room document circulated on 2 June, and that the proposal before the Committee consisted of the original working document as modified by this room document. The additional changes were highlighted in yellow in the room document. There was no explanation concerning the proposals in the room document, so they were explained at the session.
20. One important clarification in the room document concerned representation and voting: instead of a single "head of delegation" voting for a state, the revised text now stated that, unless explicitly specified otherwise, all members of a delegation are authorised to perform relevant acts, including voting, for their state.

21. A new paragraph in Article 5 allowed the Secretary General, with the agreement of the Chair, to invite experts in particular fields to sessions of the Committee in an advisory capacity, reflecting established practice in other OTIF organs where external experts have assisted on specialised legal or technical questions.
22. Further adjustments removed the possibility for observers to request items to be placed on the agenda, limiting this right to members of the Committee, while maintaining the specific rights of standardisation bodies and representative associations under Articles 5 and 6 of the APTU UR to make proposals on UTPs. The room document also proposed alignment of the definitions and cross-references related to procedural motions and motions of order, and clarified that Article 21 should refer to “members of the Committee” rather than “representatives”.
23. A new paragraph on working groups specified that, unless the Committee decided otherwise, the chair and vice-chair of sessions of standing working groups, such as WG Tech, would be those of the most recent Committee session, reducing the need for repeated elections, while ad hoc working groups could elect their own chair and, where appropriate, one or more vice-chairs for each session, reflecting the often specialised nature of their tasks.
24. Finally, the Head of the Technical Interoperability Department proposed that the revised Rules of Procedure enter into force on 12 June 2026, i.e. after this session of the Committee and the subsequent session of WG Tech, so that these two sessions would be governed by the existing rules under which they had been convened.
25. The **Chair** thanked the Secretariat for this detailed presentation and opened the floor for questions and comments on the proposed revisions and on the draft decision.
26. The **EC** sought clarification on the newly introduced paragraph in Article 5 concerning experts invited by the Secretary General. It questioned the added value of this provision compared to the existing rules on observers and asked whether these experts should be considered observers and, if so, how potential overlap or conflict with the paragraph governing observers would be avoided. In response, the **Secretary General** and **Secretariat** explained that the new paragraph codified an established but specific practice whereby the Secretary General, with the agreement of the Chair, may call upon independent experts to support the Secretariat and the Committee in specialised work, citing previous examples from other OTIF organs, such as external academics engaged to prepare proposals on legal revisions. They underlined that such experts have no voting rights and fall within the broader definition of “observer”, but that the provision made explicit the mechanism for their invitation in a way consistent with other OTIF organs.
27. The **EC** did not oppose recourse to such experts but was not fully convinced that a separate paragraph was necessary or correctly located in the article on observers, while noting that it did not regard this as a critical issue and would not block consensus on this point. It also asked whether experts could only be invited by the Secretary General and whether the agreement of the whole Committee, rather than only the Chair, should be required; in reply, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that obtaining the Committee’s agreement for this purpose would be time consuming and impractical. Similar arrangements had functioned well across OTIF organs, and the definition of “observers” also included experts, clarifying their status. The **EC** accepted the explanations.
28. **DE** raised two textual issues. First, it pointed to issues with the title in Article 18 and suggested returning to a consistent and linguistically correct formulation across the language versions. Secondly, DE noted that both “sessions” and “meetings” still appeared in different parts of the German and English texts, and asked that the terminology be harmonised throughout in line with the intention to use “session” as the standard term. The **Secretariat** took note of both observations and undertook to review and correct the drafting accordingly, indicating that these were editorial refinements that would be integrated into the consolidated text without affecting the substance.

29. The **EC** then turned to the time limits for the distribution of working documents. Referring to Article 9, it proposed that the current eight-week deadline for working documents not containing proposals for binding provisions be extended to twelve weeks, explaining that, under the present schedule, it could adopt the EU position only a few days before the Committee session, which created difficulties both in terms of the EU's internal procedures and for the Committee and Secretariat. The **Secretariat** recalled that, at the EC's earlier request, the deadline for documents concerning binding provisions, which was previously two months, had already been extended to sixteen weeks, which had required significant adjustments to the Committee/WG Tech cycle and had placed substantial pressure on the Secretariat's drafting and in-house translation resources. It expressed concern that formally lengthening the deadline for all other working documents would be difficult to manage.
30. As a compromise, the **Secretariat** proposed to provide an informal English version of relevant working documents approximately eleven weeks before the session, noting that this version might still be adjusted in light of issues identified during translation into French and German, while maintaining the formal eight-week deadline in the Rules of Procedure. The **EC** welcomed this solution, indicating that early sight of the English drafts would facilitate the timely preparation of EU positions without requiring a formal change to the rules.
31. The **EC** also requested clarification of why the new provision relating to chairs and vice-chairs would not apply to ad hoc working groups. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that, for standing working groups such as WG Tech, it was both efficient and consistent if the chair and vice-chair are the same as those of the Committee, unless the Committee decided otherwise, whereas ad hoc working groups created for very specific technical topics might appropriately elect their own chairs, potentially experts with particular subject matter knowledge, as had happened in the case of the former safety subgroup that had been chaired by an EC representative. The **EC** accepted this explanation.
32. After these exchanges, and following confirmation from the EC and DE that their questions had been satisfactorily addressed and that they did not wish to oppose the proposal, the **Chair** noted that no further delegations wished to take the floor. The Chair therefore invited the Committee to proceed to the decision and, seeing no objections in the room or online, concluded that the Committee could adopt the revised Rules of Procedure and the associated decision by consensus.

Decisions

- (3) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26018-CTE18-4 concerning the revision of its Rules of Procedure, including the annexed provisions recommended by the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation on harmonising the Rules of Procedure across all OTIF organs.
- (4) The Committee of Technical Experts approved the modifications to its Rules of Procedure of 13 June 2023 as set out in the annex to document TECH-26018-CTE18-4, as modified at the session, and adopted the Rules of Procedure as a consolidated new version. The date of entry into force shall be **12 June 2026**.

5. Items concerning the adoption of binding provisions

5.1 Modification of the UTP WAG

Document: [TECH-26003](#), [Annex 1](#), [Annex 2](#) and Room document 1

33. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-26003, explaining that it contained a proposal to revise the Uniform Technical Prescription for the subsystem rolling stock – freight wagons (UTP WAG), incorporating amendments developed in

WG Tech and set out in Annex 2. He underlined that the main purpose was to maintain alignment with the corresponding EU WAG TSI by adding new provisions concerning devices to secure semi-trailers to wagons (hitches) and related markings, adding new requirements concerning spark arresters for fire safety, wagon equipment and the related marking required on wagons intended for the carriage of dangerous goods and by updating the references to standards.

34. The **Chair** invited comments; delegations indicated support for the proposal and did not request additional changes beyond those already reflected in the working document and Room document 1, and no delegation asked for a nominal vote.

Decisions

- (5) The Committee of Technical Experts approved amendments to the Uniform Technical Prescription applicable to the subsystem rolling stock – freight wagons UTP WAG and adopted the consolidated version of the UTP WAG as set out in Annex 2 to document TECH 26003-CTE18-5.1 of 16 February 2026, as modified at the session.
- (6) The Committee of Technical Experts repealed the UTP WAG adopted at its 16th session (11-12 June 2024), which entered into force on 1 January 2025. This repeal takes effect upon the entry into force of the revised UTP WAG.

5.2 Modification of the UTP LOC&PAS

Document: [TECH-26004](#), [Annex 1](#), [Annex 2](#) and Room document 1

35. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced document TECH-26004 and recalled that WG Tech had examined the draft twice before submission to the Committee. He explained that the proposed revision of the UTP LOC&PAS added new definitions and requirements for personnel carriages in order to facilitate their free circulation in international traffic and also updated references to standards. He further presented one minor amendment to the proposal, as set out in the room document.
36. No delegations raised substantive comments or questions on the proposal. After the Secretariat had displayed the amendment in the room document on the screen, the **Chair** noted that the change was limited and invited comments, but none were made.

Decisions

- (7) The Committee of Technical Experts approved the proposed amendments to the UTP applicable to the subsystem “rolling stock – locomotives and passenger rolling stock” (UTP LOC&PAS) and adopted a consolidated new version of the UTP LOC&PAS as set out in Annex 2 to document TECH-26004-CTE18-5.2 of 16 February 2026, as modified at the session.
- (8) The Committee of Technical Experts repealed the UTP LOC&PAS it adopted at its 17th session (17-18 June 2025), which entered into force on 1 January 2026. This repeal takes effect upon the entry into force of the revised UTP LOC&PAS.

5.3 Modification of the Uniform format of certificates

Document: [TECH-26005](#)

37. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-26005, explaining that the proposal was to replace the 2012 uniform format of certificates, which was based on paper certificates only. The aim of the new text was to support digitalisation by allowing for digital certificates and by requiring that certificates be accompanied by structured data harmonised with the EU register of authorised types of vehicles. This harmonisation was intended

to facilitate a consistent approach to route compatibility checks by ensuring that information on vehicle types would be compatible with infrastructure-related information. The proposed provisions also covered authentication of paper and digital certificates, rules on access rights, and the handling of modifications, suspension, withdrawal and archiving of certificates.

38. **TR** stressed the importance of this agenda item for its national digital railway management system.
39. The **EC**, speaking on behalf of the EU, stated that the proposed annex was not considered fully compatible with EU law and the EU's strategic objectives. As an example, it highlighted that the use of the term "certificate" in the draft OTIF provisions could create confusion, as this term is used for different legal purposes in the EU framework. It indicated that other issues of alignment would also need to be examined and that the extent of changes required to ensure compatibility with EU law would necessitate substantial further work, which could not realistically be carried out in the format of the Committee session. On that basis, the EC announced that the EU would not support adoption of the proposed Annex C and proposed that the draft be returned to WG Tech for further review, in particular to verify and improve its alignment with the relevant EU acquis. The EC, speaking on its own behalf, acknowledged the need to strengthen its own contribution to WG Tech so that EU positions could be prepared earlier and more smoothly, and proposed closer liaison between the OTIF Secretariat and European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) in preparation for the September meeting of WG Tech.
40. **ERA** confirmed its readiness to work closely with the OTIF Secretariat and the EC on the outstanding issues. ERA noted that its analysis had identified a series of points requiring clarification or further checking against EU law, including the treatment of Annex I, methods for signing certificates, language regimes, and the precise identification of the documents and processes referred to in various provisions. It further pointed to questions concerning intellectual property rights, access for entities with a legitimate interest, and authentication requirements for paper versus digital certificates, and explained that addressing these matters would require input from services beyond ERA itself. ERA reiterated its commitment to support further work so that a revised proposal could be brought back for adoption, ideally at the next session of the Committee.
41. No delegation raised any substantive objections to the analysis presented by the EC and ERA, and no delegation spoke in favour of proceeding to adopt the proposal at this session. The **Chair** observed that, in light of the EU's stated position and the absence of support for adoption, the Committee was not in a position to approve the proposed Annex C and that a further cycle of technical and legal work in WG Tech would be necessary.
42. The **Chair** concluded that the proposal could not be adopted at this stage and that the matter should be referred back to WG Tech so that it could prepare a revised text for a future session of the Committee.

Decisions

- (9) The Committee of Technical Experts did not approve the amendments to the uniform format of certificates as set out in document TECH-26005-CTE18-5.3 of 16 February 2026.
- (10) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the WG Tech to reexamine the proposals, in particular their compatibility with EU law, and report its findings to the next session.

5.4 Modification of Appendix I to the UTP TAF

Document: [TECH-26006](#)

43. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that the UTP TAF lays down the requirements for communication processes between railway undertakings and infrastructure managers, the use of databases to track trains and wagon movements and the provision of

information to freight customers. He explained that the latest consolidated version of the UTP TAF had entered into force on 1 January 2023 and that Appendix I, which lists references to the relevant ERA technical documents, had subsequently been amended three times, most recently with effect from 1 January 2026. He emphasised that Appendix I must be kept aligned with the corresponding references in the EU's TAF TSI in order to maintain equivalence and ensure that the IT provisions remain properly enshrined in COTIF.

44. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department described the coordination process established since 2020 (see [TECH-20020-WGT40-5e](#)), whereby ERA informs the OTIF Secretariat about agreed changes to the TAF TSI technical documents, after which the Secretariat prepares proposals for the Committee of Technical Experts to update Appendix I accordingly. He reported that, on 15 December 2025, ERA had published the latest set of TAF TSI change requests forming maintenance release 3.5.2 of technical document ERA TD 105 "TAF TSI – Annex D.2: Appendix F – TAF TSI Data and Message Model".
45. No delegation raised any comments on or objections to the technical content of maintenance release 3.5.2 or the proposed update of Appendix I. The Committee noted that the underlying UTP TAF text adopted at the 14th session remained in force and that only Appendix I would be updated to reflect the new version and date of ERA TD 105.

Decisions

- (11) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26006-CTE18-5.4, describing the changes to ERA's technical documents referred to in Appendix I to the Uniform Technical Prescription concerning Telematics Applications for Freight Services (UTP TAF).
- (12) The Committee of Technical Experts adopted amendments to Appendix I to the UTP TAF, as set out in the Annex to document TECH-26006-CTE18-5.4. These amendments concern the UTP TAF adopted at the 14th session (14–15 June 2022), which entered into force on 1 January 2023, and its Appendix I, which was last amended with effect from 1 January 2026.

6. Items concerning approval of non-binding guidance and recommendations

6.1 Modification of the Guide for the application of the UTP LOC&PAS

Document: [TECH-26007](#)

46. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that the Guide for the application of the UTP LOC & PAS was derived from the ERA application guide to the corresponding TSI, with OTIF-specific additions shown in blue boxes and quotations from the TSI (normally also valid for the UTP) shown in yellow boxes. It was explained that the OTIF guide itself is in English only because the source ERA guide exists in English only, but that French and German versions would be prepared and published if ERA later produced those language versions. He also briefly explained the structure of the guide, stressing that reading only the blue boxes shows the specific differences between TSI and UTP, while reading the full text provides general guidance on applying both.
47. **ERA** drew attention to a minor editorial error at the end of page 91, where the heading "7.1.4 Rules for the extension [...]" had been duplicated at the end of a paragraph. The Secretariat corrected this error on screen during the meeting, and indicated that the corresponding change would be reflected in the final text. A footnote in the list of decisions would explain that a minor editorial correction had been made at the session.

48. No delegation raised any further issues, and there were no objections to the approval of the guide as amended.

Decisions

- (13) The Committee of Technical Experts approved the English version of the Guide for the application of the Uniform Technical Prescription applicable to the subsystem rolling stock – locomotives and passenger rolling stock UTP LOC&PAS of 1 January 2026, as set out in document TECH-26007-CTE18-6.1 of 13 April 2026, as modified at the session⁽¹⁾.
- (14) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the Secretary General to prepare and publish French and German versions of the approved Guide if the source document (TSI application guide) becomes available in these languages.

6.2 Modification of the Guide for the application of the UTP PRM

Document: [TECH-26008](#)

49. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented the proposed modification of the Guide for the application of the UTP PRM, explaining that, as with the LOC&PAS guide, it was based on the ERA application guide to the corresponding PRM TSI, with OTIF-specific explanations appearing in blue boxes. It was recalled that this guide also exists in English only, and that French and German versions would be prepared and published if ERA were to issue versions in those languages.
50. Delegations were invited to comment on the proposed guide and its modifications, but no questions or substantive remarks were raised.

Decisions

- (15) The Committee of Technical Experts approved the English version of the Guide for the application of the Uniform Technical Prescription applicable to the accessibility of the rail system for persons with disabilities and persons with reduced mobility (UTP PRM) of 1 January 2026, as set out in document TECH-26008-CTE18-6.2 of 13 April 2026.
- (16) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the Secretary General to prepare and publish French and German versions of the approved Guide if the source document (TSI application guide) becomes available in these languages.

6.3 Modification of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules

Document: [TECH-26009](#) and Room document 1

51. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented the proposed third version of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF UR, recalling that the first version had been approved two years earlier and revised once. The main proposed changes concerned a clearer layout with numbered points instead of only chapters and subchapters, and new explanatory text on common safety method (CSM) assessment bodies and their rights and obligations, aligned with the explanations for entities in charge of maintenance.

¹ EN: The last sentence of section 3.2.5, which duplicated the heading of section 3.2.6, is deleted.

52. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department explained that, after the working document had been sent, some changes had to be made in order for the EU to agree with the new version. These changes were set out in the room document and mainly concerned updates of the internal cross-references and the insertion of a few clarifying phrases. The EC, speaking on behalf of the EU, thanked the Secretariat and confirmed that it supported the amendments to the handbook, including those proposed in Room document 1.
53. The UK welcomed the clarifications but cautioned against the risk that too many detailed additions could make the handbook harder to read for users seeking straightforward interpretative guidance.
54. No delegation opposed the proposed modifications, and there were no objections to approving the updated version and the mechanism for future updates.

Decisions

- (17) Based on its competences set out in Article 21 § 4 of the ATMF UR, the Committee of Technical Experts approved the modifications to version 2 of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules, as set out in the annex to working document TECH-26009-CTE18-6.3 of 16 February 2026, as modified at the session.
- (18) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the Secretariat to publish the modified handbook as version 3 on OTIF's website and to share it with interested parties. The date of the new version of the handbook shall be the date of its approval.
- (19) The Committee of Technical Experts invited the Secretariat to draft further modifications to the handbook, either at its own initiative, or based on feedback that it receives from OTIF members, sector associations and other stakeholders. Substantive modifications should be submitted to a future session for approval. Editorial corrections and non-substantive modifications may be made directly by the Secretariat. All modifications and corrections should be indicated in an amendment record.

6.4 Explanatory document concerning ECM certification

Document: [TECH-26010](#)

55. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that the Secretariat and TR had jointly drafted an explanatory document focusing on selected aspects of Annex A (the ECM Regulation), and this draft had been discussed and refined over several sessions of WG Tech. The Secretariat underlined that the text was not a general commentary on the ECM Regulation but concentrated on the specific points where practice in TR had shown a need for clarification.
56. Delegations welcomed the work and no delegation requested amendments to the proposal. The Committee agreed that the document would be a useful tool to promote a harmonised understanding and application of Annex A in OTIF Member States.

Decision

- (20) The Committee of Technical Experts approved the explanatory document concerning the application of Annex A to the ATMF UR, i.e. the ECM Regulation, as set out in the annex to document TECH-26010-CTE18-6.4 of 13 April 2026 and requested the Secretariat to publish it on OTIF's website.

7. Further items for consideration

7.1 Digitalisation and the role of OTIF

Document: [TECH-26011](#)

57. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-26011. The document responded to a request from the Committee at its previous session to map the main digitalisation developments relevant to technical interoperability (including vehicle registers, telematics and other data exchanges), to describe possible roles for OTIF, and to take into account the distribution of responsibilities between OTIF, its members and organisations in the sector. He explained that OTIF had no operational role in day-to-day data exchange, but could contribute at normative level by defining data structures, semantics and interfaces in its technical rules, and by ensuring that OTIF provisions remained compatible with EU law and with international standards.
58. The **EC**, speaking on behalf of the EU, confirmed that, from its perspective, OTIF's core role in digitalisation should be to maintain compatibility between COTIF technical rules and EU requirements, while also using the COTIF framework as a common reference for developments in other regional settings, for example at the UN and OSJD. The EU proposed to adjust point 35 of the working document and the related decision text to reflect this more clearly, and suggested replacing formulations that might be read as OTIF promoting EU acquis directly.
59. The **UK** supported the idea that OTIF rules and recommended practices should be compatible with EU rules, but stressed that the needs and circumstances of non-EU Contracting States must also be taken into account.
60. **HU** asked whether specific digital topics, such as the digital automatic coupler and electronic/negotiable freight transport documents, were covered by this document; the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** clarified that these concrete solutions were not addressed in TECH-26011, but that OTIF followed EU developments on such issues and that broader legal questions on digital negotiable transport documents were being handled in other OTIF organs, notably in the context of the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation.
61. To take account of the EU's written comments and the discussion, the **Secretariat** proposed not to revise and re-issue the working document itself, but instead to record the agreed orientation in the list of decisions. The **EU** accepted this pragmatic approach, noting that it would rely on the decision text and the minutes for future work and would not insist on a re-issued working document. No delegation opposed this solution. The EU also welcomed clarification, requested by the UK, that OTIF's role was not only to ensure compatibility with EU rules, but also to "take account of the needs of non-EU Contracting States". There were no further comments or objections.

Decisions

- (21) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26011-CTE18-7.1 of 13 April 2026 concerning digitalisation and the role of OTIF and requested WG Tech and the Secretariat to take its contents into account in their work.
- (22) Instead of what was suggested in point 35 of the working document, the Committee of Technical Experts considered that its role in digitalisation was primarily to ensure that OTIF rules and practices remain compatible with EU rules and take account of the needs of non-EU Contracting States. Furthermore, OTIF should also promote its rules and practices at international level, to ensure compatibility and avoid fragmentation. It should do so by finding synergies with organisations such as UN/CEFACT, UNECE, UNESCAP and OSJD.

7.2 Developments related to telematics and the UTP TAF

Document: [TECH-26012](#)

62. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced the working document, which explained that the EU had adopted a new, integrated “TSI Telematics” covering both freight and passenger telematics processes and replacing the previous freight only TAF and passenger TAP TSIs. He recalled that OTIF’s current UTP TAF, which had entered into force in 2023, only covered telematics applications for freight, and that the EU’s developments raised questions about how OTIF should align its rules in order to maintain interoperability at legal and technical level. The paper set out several options for the future of OTIF telematics rules, ranging from minimal adjustments to a broader restructuring that would mirror the new TSI Telematics and add certain passenger-related processes.
63. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department highlighted that the TSI Telematics covered processes related to rail passenger travel information and ticketing which may be relevant for international journeys and multimodal connectivity, but that coverage of passenger-related issues in the scope of the APTU and ATMF UR was questionable. The working document therefore discussed different ways of reflecting these processes in OTIF rules. The **EC**, speaking on behalf of the EU, underlined the importance of avoiding divergent telematics regimes between EU and non-EU OTIF members and supported a solution under which OTIF would base a future “UTP Telematics” on the new TSI Telematics and its annexes, while respecting the limits of COTIF and the needs of non-EU Contracting States.
64. There was consensus that, in telematics, rigid implementation deadlines for non-EU Contracting States would not be appropriate, given differences in starting points and resources. The Committee therefore favoured an approach based on option D, as set out in the working document, without fixed implementation deadlines, but with a requirement that any new or substantially upgraded telematics processes falling under the scope of the future UTP Telematics must comply with that UTP. At the same time, the Committee considered that, in order to support seamless international passenger journeys and multimodal connectivity, it would be useful to include passenger-related processes (rail travel information and ticketing) in the new UTP Telematics as “recommended practice” only, i.e. on a voluntary basis. This approach should allow interested states and sector actors to agree common solutions, without altering the existing division of competences between OTIF and other bodies on passenger matters. The Committee invited WG Tech and the Secretariat to develop a concrete draft of such a UTP Telematics and to explore legal and editorial ways to reflect these approaches.

Decisions

- (23) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26012-CTE18-7.2 concerning the European Union’s new TSI Telematics and its consequences for the UTP TAF and noted that the TSI Telematics includes processes for rail passenger travel information and rail ticketing which may be relevant for international traffic, while recognising the limits of the scope of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules as regards passenger-related matters.
- (24) In order to support seamless international journeys and multimodal connectivity while respecting these limits, the Committee of Technical Experts decided to replace the UTP TAF with a new UTP Telematics, based on the TSI Telematics, its annex and relevant appendices, covering the following processes:
 - capacity management,
 - train preparation,
 - traffic management,
 - management of freight wagons and their load,

- rail passenger travel information and
- rail ticketing, with respect to:
 - passenger timetable and connection times,
 - conditions of carriage and accessibility for PRM,
 - barcodes.

The provisions concerning rail passenger travel information and rail ticketing in the UTP Telematics are to be categorised as recommended practice (voluntary application). For the other processes, the UTP Telematics should maintain the current legal approach of the UTP TAF for non-EU Contracting States, namely without a fixed deadline for implementation, while requiring that any new or upgraded telematics processes within its scope comply with the UTP. The Committee of Technical Experts instructed WG Tech and the Secretariat to develop a text proposal for the UTP Telematics and to identify legal and editorial solutions to mitigate the issues regarding the coverage of passenger telematics under the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules.

7.3 Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR

Document: [TECH-26013](#)

65. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-26013. He recalled that monitoring and assessing were ongoing tasks and that the document followed up on the Committee's earlier work. The paper described the Secretariat's activities so far (grouping exercise, contacts with authorities) and proposed further steps to improve more uniform application.
66. In the discussion, delegations welcomed the information and generally supported the Secretariat's gradual, cooperative approach to monitoring. It was underlined that the aim was to help states identify gaps or questions in their implementation of the ATMF UR, share experience and good practice, and, where necessary, refer issues to WG Tech or the Committee for clarification. The EC, speaking on behalf of the EU, and other delegations emphasised the value of continuing with the work already started on the basis of document TECH-25016-CTE17-6.4 and asked the Secretariat to keep WG Tech regularly informed of progress.

Decisions

- (25) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26013-CTE18-7.3 of 13 April 2026 on monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR by members of OTIF.
- (26) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the Secretariat to continue its efforts to carry out the proposed actions in points 23 to 26 of document TECH-25016-CTE17-6.4, keep WG Tech informed of its activities and report back to the next session with proposed further actions.

7.4 Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (multi-system wagons)

Document: [TECH-26014](#)

67. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-26014. The document examined the feasibility of and possible approaches to facilitating the development and use of multi-system freight wagons that could operate between the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) area and Europe, taking into account different technical systems.

68. There was support for further work on the subject.

Decisions

- (27) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26014-CTE18-7.4 concerning the feasibility of and possible approaches to facilitating the development of multi-system wagons for freight traffic by rail between the GCC area and Europe.
- (28) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the Secretariat, in coordination with WG Tech, to continue gathering relevant input and views from experts and parties to whom connecting the GCC area and Europe by rail is relevant and to report on its findings at the next session.

7.5 Applying OTIF technical rules domestically

Document: [TECH-26015](#)

69. Under this item, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-26015. He recalled that some non-EU OTIF Member States already used UTPs as part of their national railway regulations, while others restrict OTIF rules to international traffic only. The paper explained that this diversity is legally possible under COTIF, but that broader or more consistent domestic use of OTIF's technical rules could potentially reduce administrative complexity for authorities, railway undertakings and manufacturers.
70. Under this item, the **EC**, speaking on behalf of the EU, welcomed the fact that further work would be carried out in WG Tech on the basis of the approaches described in the paper, in particular the follow-up set out in points 28 to 30. However, the EU drew attention to point 24, noting that it referred to "specific cases and national technical rules (NTRs) for domestic purposes only", whereas "specific cases" and "NTRs" have a precise, harmonised meaning as terms which apply in addition to, or by derogation from, UTP specifications, not as a generic label for purely domestic requirements. To avoid confusion and misuse of these technical terms, the EU proposed to replace that wording with "requirements applying for domestic purposes only", while fully supporting continuation of the work in WG Tech.
71. The **UK** suggested a small editorial improvement, namely, to use "requirements that apply to domestic purposes only" and supported the substance of the change proposed by the EU. The UK underlined that Contracting States should remain free to use the COTIF framework voluntarily for domestic purposes but should not, by doing so, be considered to import COTIF governance for rules that apply only domestically.
72. The **Secretariat** agreed with these clarifications, confirmed that the specific terms "specific cases" and "NTRs" would be avoided in that context in future drafting, and proposed that this understanding be recorded in the minutes rather than in the formal decision text.

Decisions

- (29) The Committee of Technical Experts took note of document TECH-26015-CTE18-7.5 concerning the domestic application of OTIF's technical rules.
- (30) The Committee of Technical Experts requested the Secretariat and WG Tech to prepare draft recommendations on the application of, or alignment with OTIF's technical interoperability rules for the purpose of domestic vehicle approval and to submit such recommendations to a future session of the CTE for approval.

8. Work programme of the Committee

Document: [TECH-26016](#)

73. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented document TECH-26016. It was underlined that the proposed programme was aligned with OTIF's long-term strategy and with OTIF's 2026-2027 operational work programme.
74. The **EC**, speaking on behalf of the EU, briefly explained its proposed amendments to the text, which were visible on the screen. In paragraph 4, it suggested deleting the phrase "including the benefits of extending its application to domestic carriage" in the heading, not because it opposed such work but because this point was already covered by sub-items (b) and (c) and did not need to be repeated in the heading. Also under point 4, the EU proposed adding a reference, as a new sub-item 4(d), to further development of the TSIs and their impact on UTP requirements specific to 1520 mm gauge networks, with a view to facilitating international rail traffic along the Trans-Caspian corridor and possible future OTIF membership of states on that corridor. In paragraph 5(b), the EU recommended changing "develop" to "analyse" regarding the two-tier approach, and extending the work from freight wagons only to include passenger coaches in line with the latest UTP LOC&PAS developments. In paragraph 5(c), it proposed to change "advise" to "provide technical expertise" and to clarify that the Committee and WG Tech should take into account not only the CIM UR (freight) but also the CIV UR (passenger) in connection with future telematics work for ticketing. No delegation raised any objections to these amendments.
75. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** reminded the meeting that in order to reflect the earlier discussion under item 5.3, the development of new proposals to replace the current version of the uniform format of certificates should be added to the work programme. He then explained that the adopted three-column version of the work programme would be annexed to the list of decisions.

Decision

- (31) The Committee of Technical Experts noted document TECH-26016-CTE18-8 and approved its work programme as annexed to the list of decisions.

In addition, the Committee of Technical Experts requested the WG Tech to develop new proposals to replace the current version of the uniform format of certificates.

9. Stakeholder engagement

Document: [TECH-26017](#)

76. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that in 2022, the ad hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and International Cooperation had adopted a recommendation on involving stakeholders in OTIF's work, and that in 2023 the Committee of Technical Experts had decided to apply this recommendation with certain adaptations and had established its initial list of registered stakeholders (including, for example, UIC and CER, which were present at this session on that basis). Since then, experience in that ad hoc Committee had shown that requiring consensus for the acceptance of new stakeholders using the written procedure led to very long delays and allowed a single member to block an application, so at the end of 2025, the ad hoc Committee had replaced the requirement for unanimity by a threshold of one third of its members, extended the objection period to one month and retained the option that, if more than one third objected, the application would be examined at a session.

77. The Secretariat proposed that the Committee align its practice with this revised approach, so that stakeholder registration procedures would be harmonised across OTIF organs. It stressed that the new procedure would only apply to future applications and that all stakeholders already registered under the 2023 Committee decision would retain their status without the need to reapply; the existing list would effectively be reconfirmed. No delegation raised any comments or objections.

Decisions

- (32) The Committee of Technical Experts confirmed its decision to apply the Recommendation on involving stakeholders in OTIF’s work (OTIF-22002-JUR 2) for the purpose of engaging with stakeholders within the scope of its activities.
- (33) The Committee of Technical Experts decided that for the purpose of involving stakeholders in its activities, the term “expert” includes experts in their independent professional capacity and experts as representatives of legal persons active in the international rail sector, such as carriers and infrastructure managers.
- (34) The Committee of Technical Experts decided, by derogation from points 4.3 and 4.4 of the Recommendation (OTIF-22002-JUR 2), that:
 - *The status of “registered stakeholder” in the Committee of Technical Experts shall be granted or revoked by means of a written procedure by means of which the Secretariat examines whether the application complies with the formal requirements set out in point 4.2 of the Recommendation and submits the application to the members of the Committee of Technical Experts with the Secretariat's assessment. The members of the Committee of Technical Experts shall be given at least one month from the Secretariat's submission of an application for decision to express objections. If fewer than one third of the members object, the application shall be deemed to be accepted, and the Secretariat shall add the applicant to the list of registered stakeholders and notify the members accordingly. If one third or more of the members object, the Committee of Technical Experts shall consider the application in question at its next session.*
- (35) The Committee of Technical Experts confirmed that all stakeholders currently listed in decision 7 of its 15th session (June 2023) ([OTIF-23003-CTE15](#)) shall retain their status under this revised procedure without the need to reapply.

10. Any other business

78. None.

11. Next session

79. The Committee reviewed the proposed dates for the next sessions of the Committee and WG Tech, as proposed in circular INST-26012 of 23 March 2026.
80. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** confirmed that all meetings were scheduled to be held in a hybrid format and that the WG Tech would itself decide the dates of its sessions.

Decision

- (36) The Committee of Technical Experts decided to hold its next session on 8 June 2027 in Berne.

Closing remarks

81. The **Chair** expressed his appreciation to all participants, both in person and online, for their contributions. He thanked the Secretary General, the Secretariat and the interpreters for their work.
82. On behalf of the delegates, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** thanked the Chair for his excellent work.
83. The **Chair** then closed the 18th session of the Committee.

ANNEXES

Adopted Agenda

Annex I

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Presence and quorum
3. Items for information:
 - 3.1. General information from the OTIF Secretariat
 - 3.2. Report from the CTE's working group Tech
4. Modification of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee of Technical Experts
5. Items concerning the adoption of binding provisions:
 - 5.1. Modification of the UTP WAG
 - 5.2. Modification of the UTP LOC&PAS
 - 5.3. Modification of the Uniform format of certificates
 - 5.4. Modification of Appendix I to the UTP TAF
6. Items concerning approval of non-binding guidance and recommendations:
 - 6.1. Modification of the guide for the application of the UTP LOC&PAS
 - 6.2. Modification of the guide for the application of the UTP PRM
 - 6.3. Modification of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules
 - 6.4. Explanatory document concerning ECM certification
7. Further items for consideration:
 - 7.1. Digitalisation and the role of OTIF
 - 7.2. Developments related to telematics and the UTP TAF
 - 7.3. Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR
 - 7.4. Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (multi-system wagons)
 - 7.5. Applying OTIF technical rules domestically
8. Work programme of the Committee
9. Stakeholder engagement
10. Any other business
11. Next session

List of participants

Annex II

Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments		
Algérie/Algerien/Algeria		
M./Hr./Mr	Bachir Mokrani	Sous-directeur des Transports Guidés (SDTG) Direction des Transports Ferroviaires et Guidés (DTFG), Direction Générale de la Mobilité et de la Logistique Ministère de l'Intérieur, des Collectivités Locales et des Transports
Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany		
M./Hr./Mr	Philipp Unger	Delegationsleiter Technischer Regierungsamtsrat Internationale Angelegenheiten - Sachgebiet 92 Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Azerbaïdjan/Aserbaidshan/Azerbaijan		
M./Hr./Mr	Mammad Jafarli	Lead specialist Unit on Work with International Organizations International relations department Azerbaijan Railways CJSC
Croatie/Kroatien/Croatia		
M./Hr./Mr	Darjan Konjić	Head of delegation, Senior Advisor Sector for Railway Infrastructure Directorate for Railway Infrastructure and Transport Ministry of the Sea, Transport and Infrastructure
France/Frankreich/France		
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms	Marie Dejaeger	Head of delegation Chargée des règles nationales de sécurité et interopérabilité ferroviaires DGITM Ministry of Transport
Hongrie/Ungarn/Hungary		
M./Hr./Mr	György Lengyel	Expert, International Regulation Officer Rail Safety Authority Ministry of Construction and Transport
Italie/Italien/Italy		
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms	Stefania Fabozzi	Head of delegation Engineer technical officer General Directorate of railway transport Ministero delle Infrastrutture e dei Trasporti

M./Hr./Mr	Francesco Traina	Deputy, Engineer officer Dipartimento per le infrastrutture e le reti di trasporto Direzione Generale per il Trasporto e le Infrastrutture Ferroviarie – Div 5 – Interoperabilità ferroviaria, trasporto merci pericolose per ferrovia, normativa di settore e rapporti con gli Organismi europei e internazionali Ministero delle infrastrutture e dei Trasporti
M./Hr./Mr	Rocco Cammarata	Head of Authorisation vehicles office Veicoli convenzionali, da manovra e mezzi d'opera Direzione Generale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie - Area Autorizzazioni Sottosistemi e Veicoli Agenzia Nazionale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie e delle Infrastrutture Stradali e Autostradali (ANSFISA)
Luxembourg		
M./Hr./Mr	Cédric Boujong	Expert, Agrément matériel roulant / Sous-système CCS Division Interopérabilité et sécurité Administration des chemins de fer - (ANS)
Maroc/Marokko/Morocco		
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms	Loubna Rharbal	Chef de département homologation et essai Département homologation et essai matériel roulant Office National des Chemins de Fer Maroc
M./Hr./Mr	Abdallah Elaouaissi	Chargé de mission AMEC matériel Roulant Service : AMEC MR (Autorisation de Mise en Exploitation Commerciale Matériel Roulant) Département : AMEC (Autorisation de Mise en Exploitation Commerciale) Direction : DSAS (Direction Sécurité et Audit Sécurité) Office National des Chemins de Fer Maroc
M./Hr./Mr	Said Belkouchi	Chef de service Réglementation et Sécurité Service Réglementation et sécurité Département Règlements et Méthodes Direction Maintenance Infrastructure Pole infrastructure et Circulation Office National des Chemins de Fer du Maroc
Norvège/Norwegen/Norway		
M./Hr./Mr	Erik Syvertsen	Head of delegation Deputy Director Department for Rail, Planning and Environment Ministry of Transport

M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Pia Strand	Deputy head of delegation Senior adviser Department of Legal and International Affairs Norwegian Railway Authority
Royaume-Uni/ Vereinigtes Königreich/ United Kingdom M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Michelle Cole	Head of delegation Head of Rail Standards Rail Interoperability Standards Department for Transport Great Minster House
M./Hr./Mr Vaibhav Puri	Expert Director of Sector Strategy and Transformation Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB)
Serbie/Serbien/Serbia M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Vesna Laković	Head of Department Department for Railways and Intermodal Transport Ministry of Construction, Transport, and Infrastructure
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Ivana Božić	Expert, Legal Advisor Department for Railways and Intermodal Transport Ministry of Construction, Transport, and Infrastructure
M./Hr./Mr Filip Šćekić	Adviser Department for Safety and Interoperability Directorate for Railways
Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Linda Ay	Project Manager Railway Safety and Interoperability Safety Division Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland - FOT
Syrie/Syrien/Syria M./Hr./Mr Ibrahim Khudro	Head of delegation Assistant Director General for Technical Affairs Syrian General Railway Corporation
M./Hr./Mr Ahmad Shawa	Deputy head of delegation Director of department for fixed installations Syrian General Railway Corporation
M./Hr./Mr Khaled Abdurrahman	Expert Assistant Director of Tools and Traction Syrian General Railway Corporation

Türkiye M./Hr./Mr Mustafa İmamoğlu	Expert Department for Certification Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
M./Hr./Mr Akil Serdar	Expert Department of Railway Certification Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
M./Hr./Mr Samet Palabiyik	Expert, Civil Engineer DG for Regulation of Transportation Services Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure

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./Hr./Mr. Yann Seimandi	Policy Officer - Digitalisation European Commission - Directorate General for Mobility and Transport Unit C4 (Rail Interoperability and Safety)
ERA M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Natalja Scacenko	Project Officer, Programme Manager Inter-institutional and Communication Unit European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)
M./Hr./Mr. Christoph Kaupat	Expert, Project Officer Monitoring, Analysis, Research and Stakeholders Unit European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)
M./Hr./Mr. Eduardo Del Rio	Expert, Project Officer Vehicle Authorisation Unit European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)

Organisations et associations internationales non gouvernementales
Nichtstaatliche internationale Organisationen und Verbände
International non-governmental Organisations or Associations

CER M./Hr./Mr. Gilles Quesnel	Head of Interoperability, Standardisation and Research Europe Department Société Nationale des Chemins de Fer (SNCF) Community of European Railway and Infrastructure Companies (CER)
OSJD M./Hr./Mr. Radovan Vopalecky	Chairman of the Commission on Infrastructure and Rolling Stock, Organization for Co-operation between Railways (OSJD)
UIC M./Hr./Mr Jozef Fázik	Expert, Chargé de mission Département Fret Union internationale des chemins de fer (UIC)

Secrétariat
Sekretariat
Secretariat

M./Hr./Mr Aleksandr Kuzmenko	Secretary General  +41 (31) 359 10 10 E-mail aleksandr.kuzmenko@otif.org
M./Hr./Mr Bas Leermakers	Head of Technical Interoperability Department  +41 (31) 359 10 25 E-mail bas.leermakers@otif.org
M./Hr./Mr Dragan Nešić	Policy Advisor  +41 (79) 359 60 60 E-mail dragan.nesic@otif.org
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms Nina Sreenivasan	General administration assistant  +41 (31) 359 10 22 E-mail nina.sreenivasan@otif.org

**Interprètes
Dolmetscher/-innen
Interpreters**

M ^{me} /Fr./Ms	Viviane Vaucher
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms	Christine van Leemput
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms	Joana Meenken
M./Hr./Mr	Benoît Kremer
M./Hr./Mr	David Ashman