



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

Standing working group Technology (WG Tech)

58th Session

Draft Minutes

10 – 11 June 2026
(Berne, hybrid meeting)

Table of contents

	Page
Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat	3
Election of the Chair	3
1. Approval of the agenda.....	3
2. Information from the OTIF Secretariat, including results of the 18 th session of the Committee of Technical Experts (the Committee).....	3
3. For review.....	4
3.1 Draft proposal for a new UTP Telematics.....	4
4. For discussion.....	6
4.1 Two-tier approach to technical interoperability	6
4.2 Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons)	7
4.3 Applying OTIF technical rules domestically.....	8
4.4 Use of electronic signatures on certificates issued under the APTU or ATMF UR.....	9
4.5 Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR	10
4.6 Draft proposal for modification of the uniform format of certificates (Annex C to the ATMF UR)	11
5. Developments in European Union regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by the EC and ERA)	12 11
6. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology.....	12
7. EU – OTIF equivalence table	12
8. Any other business.....	13 12
9. Next session.....	13
CLOSING REMARKS	13
ANNEXES	14
List of participants	Annex I
.....	14
Adopted Agenda	Annex II
.....	19

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

1. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** welcomed all the delegates and opened the session. He 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. In the absence of any objections, the Secretariat would use photographs taken during the session on social networks or in the Bulletin with the pictures and names of delegates. There were no objections. ([List of participants, Annex I](#))
2. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the meeting that the documents for the meeting had been published on OTIF's website on 12 May 2026 and were available under [Working Documents](#) (see section 2026).

Election of the Chair

3. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that invitation TECH-26024 of 14 April 2026 had invited Member States to submit their nominations for a candidate to chair the session by 28 April 2026. By the deadline, the UK 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 UK chair the session. There were no comments or objections. Mr Puri accepted the nomination and WG Tech unanimously elected the UK, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, to chair the session.
4. The **Chair** thanked the participants for their confidence in him and encouraged active contributions during the session.

1. Approval of the agenda

5. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that the provisional agenda had been circulated with invitation circular TECH-26024 of 14 April 2026 and noted that no proposals for modification had been received in advance. He informed the meeting that, following the 18th session of the Committee, it was proposed to add an item concerning the follow-up to the draft document on the uniform format of certificates. The **Chair** was of the view that this subject should be added as a new agenda item 4.6.
6. In the absence of further comments or objections, the **Chair** concluded that WG Tech 58 adopted the agenda with the change proposed at the session ([Annex II – Adopted agenda](#)).

2. Information from the OTIF Secretariat, including results of the 18th session of the Committee of Technical Experts (the Committee)

7. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** reminded the meeting that the minutes of WG Tech 57 had been approved in writing and were available on OTIF's website¹.
8. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the meeting of [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 and to contact the Secretariat with any questions. In addition, the Secretariat highlighted an ongoing [call for seconded national experts](#), aimed at the staff of national ministries or authorities who would devote part of their time to

¹ [Activities > Technical Interoperability > Working Group Tech > Reports](#)

working for OTIF on agreed objectives, while remaining employed by their home authority. The deadline for applications for the next round of secondments was 30 November 2026.

9. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department then reported on the new series 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 the possible revision of Article 7 of the CUV UR. He also 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 were 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, where possible, to support progress at national level.
10. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the meeting of the outcomes of the Committee session, which had taken place immediately prior to this session of WG Tech. The Committee had adopted the revised UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS, as well as a minor modification to the UTP TAF. It had also approved two application guides for the UTP LOC&PAS and PRM, an explanatory document concerning ECM certification and the amendments to the handbook. The proposal on the uniform format of certificates had not been adopted.
11. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department presented the tasks the Committee had assigned to WG Tech, including monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR, preparing a joint survey on applying OTIF technical rules domestically, continuing the work on covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons), considering a possible two-tier approach to technical interoperability, the use of digital alternatives to handwritten signatures for certificates and evaluating the notification procedures.

3. For review

3.1 Draft proposal for a new UTP Telematics

Document: [TECH-26025](#)

12. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-26025 dated 12 May 2026.
13. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department recalled that at its 18th session, the Committee had decided that the UTP TAF should be replaced by a new UTP Telematics based on the Telematics Applications TSI (Telematics TSI) (including its annexes and relevant appendices), with no mandatory implementation deadlines and with a requirement or recommendation that new or upgraded telematics processes must comply with the UTP. The Committee had also decided that ~~the scope all telematics processes should mirror that~~ of the Telematics TSI should be included in the UTP, including passenger services, but that the part on ticketing should initially be limited to passenger timetables and connections, conditions of carriage and accessibility of ; ~~PRM-related information~~ and barcodes.
14. **NO** informed the meeting that, as a member of the EEA, it had transposed the Telematics TSI into Norwegian law as of 5 May 2026, and therefore considered itself part of the “EU telematics domain” for the purposes of the draft UTP.
15. **CH** informed the meeting that Switzerland intended to transpose the Telematics TSI into its national legislation ([Implementing provisions of the Railway Ordinance](#)) by mid-2029 and had already begun aligning with the EU telematics domain.

16. **ERA** expressed concern that the existence of multiple system authorities in parallel telematics domains could affect interoperability and requested clarification of the concept in comparison with ERTMS, for which ERA is the system authority for specifications used beyond the EU on a voluntary basis.
17. The **EC** noted that the telematics domains might involve regional variations and different levels of competence, including areas where enforcement might be extended beyond the railway sector. It underlined that ERA's system authority tasks under the Telematics TSI were diverse and that, in the OTIF context, ERA could deal with some of these tasks (relating to standards and technical documents), some other tasks could be handled at national or regional level (e.g. enforcement). It proposed analysing the issue along three axes: system authority tasks, telematics functions and geographical scope. It also recalled that ERA could provide services for non-EU Contracting States (CSs) by agreement, for example in the area of registers and company codes, where responsibility was already shared between ERA and UIC, depending on the scope of application.
18. **UIC** provided additional information on its allocation of organisation codes beyond the EU framework².
19. The **UK** noted that the current definition of "system authority" in the draft mirrored the broad set of ERA tasks under EU law. It suggested exploring a narrower, function-based definition that could allow certain system-authority functions to be performed at COTIF level (e.g. maintaining technical specifications), while ERA would continue to act as system authority for the EU telematics domain for other tasks, without assigning ERA an institutional role under COTIF.
20. The EC was of the view that a similar approach to that for registers could be taken, whereby ERA might be tasked with managing the repository of reference data and ontology for OTIF purposes.
- 19,21. **ERA** and the **EC** presented an overview of ERA's system authority tasks under the Telematics TSI, including the development and maintenance of technical documents, common ontology, reference data and ~~governance arrangements~~ monitoring and assessing compliance, and pointed out that these tasks had been summarised in a webinar and a dynamic list of frequently asked questions (FAQ) available on ERA's website³.
- 20,22. Post meeting note: under agenda item 5, ERA presented its system authority tasks as follows:

 TEL TSI & ERA's authority tasks				
TSI Article	Task	Deliverable	Deadline	State of play
Art. 8(1)(a)(c)(d), 8(2)	Stand up and publish the common central repository: metadata & data catalogue elements; link to freight-specific reference data; enable subscriptions to automated notifications	Publicly accessible central repository and notification service	02-Sept-26	Ongoing
Art. 9(2)	Define, publish and apply procedures (incl. language arrangements and deadlines) for managing requests for assignment/update of codes	Procedures manual for code assignment & updates	02-Sept-26	Ongoing
Art. 8(1)(b); 17(1); 18	Provide web applications: (i) list of PKI certification authorities; (ii) automated reporting app for implementation monitoring; (iii) self-assessment testing app and publish user manuals	Operational web apps + published user manuals	02-Mar-27	Ongoing
Art. 9(1)	Define and publish user manual describing functions of web applications for code requests	User manual (codes web apps)	02-Mar-27	Ongoing
Art. 9(3); 9(6)	Manage and assign common reference data (codes): organisation codes, location codes, ticketing code lists	Operational code assignment service	15-Mar-26	Ongoing
Art. 12(1)	Establish, publish and apply change control management procedure for harmonised specifications (Appendix C)	Published CCM procedure operational	02-Sept-26	Procedure developed

² Company Codes (RICS) | UIC - International Union of Railways <https://uic.org/support-activities/it/rics?recherche=RICS>

³ Link : <https://www.era.europa.eu/content/era-webinar-telematics-applications-tsi>

Article	Task	Deliverable	Deadline	State of play
Art. 11(1)-(3)	Establish & publish template to collect network-specific data requirements; receive submissions from IMs; update harmonised specs or recommend specific cases	Template; consolidated assessment; spec updates/recommendations	02-Sept-26	Ongoing
Art. 17(4)	Publish aggregated implementation figures per MS & Union level (linked to network size; market share in tkm/pkm)	Public dashboards/summary reports	02-Mar-27	Not started
Art. 18(1)-(9)	Operate compliance assessment web app; issue declarations; publish list of presumed-compliant apps; perform evaluations on justified doubts/requests; set procedures & deadlines	Operational compliance regime + published lists	02-Mar-27	Not started
Art. 20(4)	Publish details of designated National Contact Points (NCPs) communicated by MS	Public list of NCPs	02-Dec-26	Ongoing
Art. 23	Prepare recommendation to Commission to update TSI by objectives (reflect developments, convert national requirements, close open points, update references, transition to EN standards) and conduct impact assessment	Formal recommendation + impact assessment	31-Dec-28	Call for experts started

21,23. The **UK** referred to Article 2 § 3 (left-hand column) and requested clarification. In its view, the intention of this provision was to ensure that the UTP would not affect application of the Telematics TSI on EU territory. Both the **UK** and the **EC** suggested that this provision could be simplified or possibly deleted, bearing in mind that the TSI provision in the right-hand column served a different purpose (defining where the TSI ceases to apply on EU territory), whereas the UTP applies to international traffic between OTIF CSs.

22,24. **CER** noted two distinct issues: the concept and functions of a system authority and the drafting of Article 2 § 3. It emphasised that these issues should be considered separately in order to ensure clarity. Furthermore, it invited the Secretariat to consider explicitly addressing the relationship between the UTP and the ERA ontology (Article 8) and to avoid incompatibility between different ontologies. The **EC** suggested that references to “ERA ontology” could be replaced by references to ERA technical documents that describe the ERA ontology. This way, the ontology would be treated similarly to references to ERA technical documents in the UTP TAF and subsequent updates.

Conclusion

- NO and CH informed the meeting that the Telematics TSI and related aspects ~~had been~~ would be incorporated into their national legislation and agreements with the EU;
- WG Tech agreed that the Secretariat should continue to refine the draft UTP Telematics, in coordination with ERA and the EC;
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to break down the tasks and functions of the “system authority” and allocate them in a way compatible with COTIF’s institutional framework, while maintaining interoperability and equivalence with the EU regime;
- WG Tech suggested that rather than using the term “ERA ontology”, the text could refer to the relevant ERA technical documents;
- WG Tech agreed that the UTP should be drafted so that EU actors would automatically comply with it by complying with the EU framework.

4. For discussion

4.1 Two-tier approach to technical interoperability

Document: [TECH-26026](#)

23,25. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented document TECH-26026 dated 12 May 2026.

~~24~~26. **NO** considered that both simplified and more advanced forms of international traffic could already be achieved within the existing COTIF framework, depending on how railway undertakings organise cooperation. He questioned whether it was necessary to introduce distinct tiers.

~~25~~27. The **UK** recognised the value of better understanding why some CSs face difficulties in applying the current framework and supported further work in principle. It emphasised the importance of identifying the specific provisions that create challenges and gathering input from the CSs concerned.

~~26~~28. The **EC** considered that, before introducing any modification to the legal framework, it would be important to identify any concrete obstacles faced by specific CSs. It suggested focusing on better explaining how existing OTIF provisions could already be applied in a simplified and modular manner, in particular with regard to freight wagons. It also stressed that efforts should focus on promoting the benefits of the existing system rather than relaxing requirements.

~~27~~29. **CER** supported the objective of facilitating international freight traffic and highlighted the importance of focusing on practical and operational aspects. It emphasised the need for clarity in the application of existing provisions and the need to avoid unnecessary complexity.

Conclusion

- WG Tech invited the Secretariat to prepare a new paper for a future session:
 - explaining, on the basis of the existing legal framework, how CSs can already use OTIF rules in a modular way to support freight wagon interoperability with varying levels of ambition;
 - identifying clearly the incentives and benefits for states of applying UTP WAG Appendix C and other existing tools, i.e. the Handbook, as a “first step”;
 - illustrating, where possible, the potential opportunities for new and emerging corridors (e.g. the “Middle Corridor” and connections between the GCC area and Europe), including efforts to quantify traffic potential where data are available;

4.2 Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons)

Document: [TECH-26027](#)

~~28~~30. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented document TECH-26027 dated 12 May 2026.

~~29~~31. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department underlined that more information from the GCC railways was still needed concerning their technical specifications and expectations for vehicles that would run between their networks and the OTIF area. He noted that Türkiye had a key role in several initiatives, and the Secretariat expressed its readiness to support Türkiye and other CSs technically.

~~30~~32. The **EC** informed the meeting that it now promoted COTIF as the primary framework for international rail traffic beyond the EU, rather than promoting application of EU law. The EC suggested that a first step should be to clarify, together with the CSs directly concerned (notably Türkiye and its neighbours), how they envisaged traffic to develop and what vehicle concepts were required. It indicated that any further technical work, particularly on reflecting “GCC wagons” in the UTP WAG or Appendix C, would require resources and should focus on the requirements and commitments of those CSs.

Conclusion

- WG Tech invited the Secretariat to engage with Türkiye and other relevant CSs to understand better their plans for the development of new corridors and future traffic and the expected technical requirements for wagons and to explore how OTIF could support these developments;

- WG Tech invited the Secretariat to explore, together with interested CSs and the EU, which initiatives and legal options (including regional arrangements and possible future GCC regional membership of OTIF) could be proposed to promote connectivity with and potential membership of ~~as an attractive “offer”~~ to the GCC states;
- WG Tech asked the Secretariat to report on this work to a future session, as well as on the possibility of integrating suitable requirements into the UTP WAG and/or Appendix C;
- WG Tech took note of the information provided by the EC concerning the promotion of COTIF as a framework for international rail traffic beyond the EU.

4.3 Applying OTIF technical rules domestically

Document: [TECH-26028](#)

- ~~31.~~[33.](#) The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented document TECH-26028 dated 12 May 2026.
- ~~32.~~[34.](#) The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department invited non-EU CSs to provide feedback on the usefulness of the concept and to indicate their interest in its further development and possible application.
- ~~33.~~[35.](#) **HU** asked how this related to the EU’s fourth railway package, noting that Hungary applied the EU framework to international traffic but used different rules for light rail and local vehicles. The **EC** recalled that light rail and certain local lines were excluded from the scope of the EU Interoperability and Safety Directives, and that corresponding national rules were a competence of the EU MSs.
- ~~34.~~[36.](#) The **EC** suggested focusing the concept on vehicle design rules, echoing its earlier comments on the two-tier approach, and saw potential in highlighting that domestic use of UTP design rules could simplify later admission for international use. It was in favour of promoting transparency and existing frameworks.
- ~~35.~~[37.](#) **ERA** pointed out that not all non-EU CSs had notified their national technical requirements to OTIF. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that the Secretariat had previously reminded CSs of this obligation through the Committee, but that its instruments were limited to reminders and the publication of rules it received from the CSs.
- ~~36.~~[38.](#) The **UK** considered that the proposal could address real issues of fragmented and unclear national standards and that domestic use of UTPs could reduce duplication and support interoperability indirectly. However, incorporating international law into a domestic legal framework would be challenging, as the UTPs were not designed for that purpose. It stressed that incentives for voluntary use were key, including possible mutual recognition arrangements for domestic approvals between interested states. The UK also noted that transparency with regard to which UTPs were applied domestically, and how, would be important; simple reporting tools or templates might help.
- ~~37.~~[39.](#) **TR** informed the meeting that Türkiye applied both TSIs and UTPs across its entire mainline railway network and did not distinguish domestically between “international” and “national” lines. It offered to share its national legislation, in which UTPs and TSIs are referenced, with the Secretariat.

Conclusion

- WG Tech invited the Secretariat to:
 - analyse practices (including the experiences of Türkiye and the UK) in connection with incorporating UTPs and TSIs into domestic legislation;
 - explore, in coordination with other OTIF organs, the development of non-binding guidance, model structures or recommendations on the voluntary domestic application

of UTPs to vehicle design, emphasising transparency and the potential to facilitate later admission to international traffic;

- continue to encourage CSs to notify their national technical requirements relevant to the APTU and ATMF UR.

4.4 Use of electronic signatures on certificates issued under the APTU or ATMF UR

Document: [TECH-26029](#)

~~38.~~[40.](#) The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced document TECH-26029 dated 12 May 2026.

~~39.~~[41.](#) **TR** presented its Digital Railway Management System (DRMS), which was being developed by its Directorate General for Regulation of Transport Services. The system aimed to centralise and digitise statutory railway functions, including design type certificates, certificates of operation, allocation of vehicle numbers, ECM authorisation and supervision of railway undertakings and other actors. It explained that DRMS was designed as a national supervisory and advisory support tool, which could be integrated with sector actors' systems, and could provide direct controlled access where actors do not have their own digital tools. The project sought to transfer registration, inspection, certification and reporting processes onto a digital platform, integrating with national e-government services, electronic signatures and the European Railway Agency Database of Interoperability and Safety (ERADIS). The expected benefits included centralisation, faster processing, transparency and traceability, compliance with legal and international standards, enhanced security and data integrity, reduction of paper and manual workload and improved data-driven decision-making.

~~40.~~[42.](#) With regard to certificates, Türkiye explained that current OTIF-related certificates (such as ECM conformity certificates) still relied on wet signatures and stamps, which could delay circulation, entail risks of forgery and create archiving burdens. Türkiye proposed introducing electronic signatures and dynamic QR codes for certificates, enabling instant verification of validity and scope through a national trust system. By scanning the QR code, users would be able to verify whether a certificate was valid and view key data (e.g. validity dates and vehicle numbers). It also explained that the legal validity of secure electronic signatures in Türkiye was based on national legislation (Law No. 5070 on Electronic Signatures and implementing regulations on official correspondence).

~~41.~~[43.](#) The **EC** recalled the EU framework on electronic identification and trust services (eIDAS Regulation) and suggested that Türkiye might explore aligning its system with EU requirements for trust services. **CER** drew attention to Article 14 of the eIDAS Regulation, which allowed for the conclusion of agreements with non-EU CSs concerning the recognition of their trust service schemes. The **EC** confirmed this and pointed out that no such agreements were currently in place, but that DG CONNECT and DG MOVE were ready to engage with interested non-EU CSs.

~~42.~~[44.](#) **ERA** confirmed that it had received Türkiye's request for a technical discussion on linking DRMS to ERA systems, including ERADIS, and intended to organise a meeting on this topic, bearing in mind the joint OTIF–ERA responsibility for certain registers.

~~43.~~[45.](#) **GE** informed the meeting that it was also developing a digital platform for safety certification, ECM certification, authorisation of railway undertakings and infrastructure managers, safety-critical staff and other functions, with support for qualified electronic signatures. It further indicated that it was implementing railway sector reform in three phases, with the third phase introducing an interoperability system and a new legislative framework. **TR** expressed its readiness to cooperate with GE on the development of digital systems, which GE welcomed.

~~44.~~[46.](#) The **UK** underlined that any OTIF guidance should be technology-neutral and focus on functional outcomes. It suggested that trust could often be achieved through secure registers such as ERADIS rather than by prescribing signature formats and stressed that OTIF rules should not

create additional barriers or burdens, particularly for states at a less advanced stage of digitalisation, while ensuring that mutual recognition within OTIF is maintained.

[45.47.](#) The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** asked TR to clarify the user experience of the QR system (e.g. language of the verification interface). **TR** indicated that verification currently functioned in Turkish and that details on international use would need further consideration.

[46.48.](#) The **EC** emphasised that the EU had no intention of exporting eIDAS requirements into COTIF or imposing them on non-EU CSs. However, OTIF's functional requirements for electronic signatures should not add obligations beyond those already applicable in the EU, in order to avoid further burdens being placed on EU actors. It supported drafting OTIF rules at the level of functional requirements and ensuring compatibility with the EU framework.

Conclusion

- WG Tech thanked Türkiye for the presentation on its national QR code-based digital verification system and noted Georgia's plans to develop a digital railway platform including the use of electronic signatures;
- WG Tech invited the Secretariat to collect further information on national digital signature and trust service schemes, including their interaction with secure registers such as ERADIS;
- WG Tech invited CSs to share their experience with electronic signatures and encouraged Türkiye, Georgia and any other interested CSs to pursue bilateral discussions with ERA and the EC on the compatibility of their systems with the EU's trust-service framework, and to keep the Secretariat informed;
- WG Tech noted that the increasing use of electronic signatures and seals raises questions about the mutual recognition of certificates under the ATMF UR and highlighted the importance of a technology-neutral approach based on functional requirements;
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to develop proposals for a future session for functional, technology-neutral guidance on electronic signatures and seals under the APTU and ATMF UR, taking into account the need for mutual recognition without causing further burdens for EU actors.

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

(No document)

[47.49.](#) The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled that in 2025, the Committee had approved a methodology for monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR, including grouping CSs and offering targeted support. He reported that an overview of all CSs had been produced, using objective and subjective indicators, and CSs had been grouped accordingly. He further indicated that bilateral contacts and support for CSs in groups B and C were being pursued as far as resources allowed.

[48.50.](#) In addition, the Head of the Technical Interoperability Department explained the planned development of a questionnaire and checklist on the national transposition and application of the ATMF UR and other Appendices to COTIF. This work would be carried out in coordination with other OTIF organs as part of a broader survey on the implementation of COTIF and its domestic application.

[51.](#) **CER** suggested that the planned questionnaire [be used to identify problems to the implementation of the APTU and ATMF UR.](#)

[49.52.](#) The **EC** suggested that the [planned questionnaire](#) could also collect information on existing and potential international traffic volumes between neighbouring CSs, in order to understand better

where application of the ATMF UR and other technical rules would have the greatest impact. The Secretariat took note [of both suggestions](#).

Conclusion

- WG Tech took note of the status of the work and encouraged the Secretariat to continue developing the questionnaire, including, where feasible, questions on existing and potential international traffic and on the challenges faced by CSs in applying the ATMF UR.

4.6 Draft proposal for modification of the uniform format of certificates (Annex C to the ATMF UR)

Document: [TECH-26006](#) (submitted to the 18th session of the Committee of Technical Experts)

~~50.~~[53.](#) The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled the background to the draft proposal on the uniform format of certificates, which had been prepared as a new Annex C to the ATMF UR and submitted to the 18th session of the Committee. The proposal aimed to:

- define and structure the content of design type certificates and certificates of operation;
- lay down procedures for issuing, updating, suspending and withdrawing such certificates, including in digital form;
- ensure consistent data content aligned with the European Register of Authorised Types of Vehicles (ERATV) and the UTP on train composition and route compatibility checks (UTP TCRC), so that data on vehicles outside the EU would be suitable for future digital route compatibility checks.

~~51.~~[54.](#) The **Committee** had not approved the proposal and had requested WG Tech to re-examine it, in particular regarding its compatibility with EU law, and to report back. Concerns had been raised about differing meanings of certain terms (e.g. “certificate”) in the EU and COTIF frameworks, possible overlaps with EU vehicle authorisation documents, and the degree of maturity of certain annexes.

~~52.~~[55.](#) In this regard, **ERA** informed WG Tech that:

- from an EU perspective, there were differences between the proposed OTIF templates and those used in EU law for vehicle authorisation and type certificates (Regulation (EU) 2018/545, Articles 48 and 49);
- some elements of the proposal touched on horizontal domains (e.g. intellectual property, access rights, paper vs. digital certificates) that went beyond ERA’s core mandate;
- regarding the language regime, unlike in the OTIF framework, EU rules allow applicants to request authorisations in any EU official language;
- ERA and the EC were of the view that further bilateral analysis with the Secretariat would be required before detailed comments could be submitted.

~~53.~~[56.](#) The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** underlined that the core objective of the proposal was the structured capture of relevant technical data for vehicle types, in alignment with EU registers and the UTP TCRC, to enable future digital route compatibility checks. He would welcome detailed written comments from ERA and the EC, so that a revised text could be prepared.

Conclusion

- WG Tech invited ERA and the EC to provide the Secretariat with written comments detailing their concerns and suggested changes to the proposal, including the terminology and alignment with EU certificate templates;
- WG Tech invited the Secretariat to revise the proposal and submit the revised version to WG Tech 59 and subsequently to the Committee.

5. Developments in European Union regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by the EC and ERA)

~~54.~~57. ERA presented recent developments in EU railway law and its activities. It reported on the implementation of the Telematics TSI, focusing in particular on its tasks as system authority, including a webinar, a dynamic list of FAQs and an overview table of all ERA tasks under the TSI, with the associated deadlines and current status. It further reported on newly published guidance, including version 1.0 of guidance on entities in charge of maintenance (ECM), incorporating the lessons learned and findings from the first ERA report on ECM implementation. ERA also presented its analytical outputs, including a study on the harmonisation of electrification systems covering both infrastructure and vehicles, a comprehensive assessment of extreme weather impacts on rail transport, proposals to strengthen the EU's legal framework on climate resilience and the forthcoming progress report on safety and interoperability. In addition, ERA reported on the expansion of its e-learning catalogue, including modules on ERTMS, TSIs, single safety certificates, safety management systems, human and organisational factors, safety culture and vehicle maintenance. Finally, it informed the meeting of upcoming training activities, including the annual ETCS seminar and its participation in InnoTrans on a shared EU stand with DG MOVE, DG INTPA and Europe's Rail.

~~55.~~58. The EC underlined that ERA's published list of system authority tasks under the Telematics TSI constituted useful preparatory work in the context of OTIF's work on the UTP Telematics. It also noted that ERA's FAQ represented an opportunity for OTIF stakeholders to raise questions relevant to the development of the UTP Telematics and its interaction with the EU framework.

Conclusion

- WG Tech took note of the information provided by ERA and the EC.

6. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology

Document: [TECH-26031](#)

~~56.~~59. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** reminded the meeting that the cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology had last been reviewed in September 2025 and that, in line with established practice, it would be reviewed only once per year. The next review would be at the next session.

Conclusion

- WG Tech 58 took note of the information provided and noted that the table would be reviewed at WG Tech 59.

7. EU – OTIF equivalence table

Document: [TECH-26032](#)

~~57.~~60. For this item, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-26032, which tracked the relationship between each UTP and the corresponding EU texts, with changes highlighted in track changes mode. He pointed out recent updates that had been coordinated with ERA and the EC, including the adoption by CTE 18 of the revised UTP WAG and UTP LOC&PAS and the resulting adjustments to the table to reflect the current state of alignment.

Conclusion

- WG Tech took note of the updated table.

8. Any other business

~~58.~~61. Under this item, no additional substantive matters were raised beyond those dealt with under the re-ordered agenda (in particular the follow-up on the uniform format of certificates and electronic signatures).

9. Next session

~~59.~~62. WG Tech reviewed the proposed dates for the next sessions of the Committee and WG Tech, as set out in circular INST-26012 of 23 March 2026.

~~60.~~63. All meetings were scheduled to be held in a hybrid format.

~~61.~~64. WG Tech decided to hold its 59th session on 9 September 2026 in Bern. The following session, WG Tech 60, was planned for 10 November 2026, also in Bern, unless another CS offered to host it and the arrangements were agreed at WG Tech 59. Potential dates for further WG Tech meetings in September and November 2027 had been reserved in OTIF's calendar to avoid clashes with other OTIF bodies. It was agreed that any CS interested in hosting a future WG Tech session should contact the Secretariat in advance to discuss the organisational and technical requirements.

~~62.~~65. CTE 19 was planned for 8 June 2027, followed by WG Tech 61 on 9–10 June 2027, with similar arrangements to WG Tech 58.

Conclusion

- WG Tech noted that:
 - the next session, WG Tech 59, would be held on 9 September 2026 in Bern;
 - the following session, WG Tech 60, was planned for 10 November 2026, also in Bern, unless another CS offered to host it and the arrangements were agreed at WG Tech 59;
 - CTE 19 was planned for 8 June 2027, followed by WG Tech 61 on 9–10 June 2027;
 - scheduled weeks for further WG Tech meetings were 6–10 September 2027 and 15–19 November 2027, which had been reserved in OTIF's calendar to avoid clashes with other OTIF bodies.
- It was agreed that any CS interested in hosting a future session of WG Tech should contact the Secretariat in advance to discuss the organisational and technical requirements.

CLOSING REMARKS

~~63.~~66. The **Chair** thanked all the participants, both in person and online, for their contributions. He thanked the Secretary General and the Secretariat their preparations and contributions.

~~64.~~67. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** thanked all the delegates for their contributions and the Chair for leading the session.

~~65.~~68. The Chair then closed the 58th session of WG Tech.

ANNEXES

List of participants

Annex I

Gouvernements / Regierungen / Governments

Albanie/Albanien/Albania

M^{me}/Fr./Ms Eneida **Elezi**

Expert responsible for foreign affairs
IT Technology and Communication Department
Internal Support Services Directorate of the HSH
Albanian Railways/Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy

Algérie/Algerien/Algeria

M./Hr./Mr Mustapha **Bouyahiaoui**

Expert
Chargé de la sous-direction des chemins de fer
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

Arménie/Armenien/Armenia

M^{me}/Fr./Ms Arpine **Hovhannisyan**

1st day only

“IGorts” Program Specialist,
Department for Water and Railway Transport Policy
Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure
RA

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 Transports

Géorgie/Georgien/GeorgiaM^{me}/Fr./Ms Nino **Lomsadze**

Head of delegation
 Head of department
 Railway interoperability department
 LEPL – Rail Transport Agency (NSA)
 Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development

Hongrie/Ungarn/HungaryM./Hr./Mr György **Lengyel**

Expert, International Regulation Officer
 Rail Safety Authority
 Ministry of Construction and Transport

Italie/Italien/ItalyM^{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)

LuxembourgM./Hr./Mr Cédric **Boujong**

Expert,
 Agrément matériel roulant / Sous-système CCS
 Division Interopérabilité et sécurité
 Administration des chemins de fer - (ANS)

Maroc/Marokko/MoroccoM./Hr./Mr Kabbaj **Mohammed Amine**

Head of service safety regulation
 Safety and security audit
 General safety politics
 ONCF Maroc

M./Hr./Mr Saad **Elmarzouki**

Chef de Département Production Trains Voyageurs
 Département Production Trains Voyageurs
 Direction Transport Voyageurs
 Pole Pôle Voyageurs
 Office National des Chemins de Fer du Maroc

Norvège/Norwegen/NorwayM./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)

M^{me}/Fr./Ms Joanna **Relf**

Principal officer
Rail Safety Authority
Department for Infrastructure
Northern Ireland Civil Service

Serbie/Serbien/SerbiaM^{me}/Fr./Ms Vesna **Laković**2nd day only

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 Milutin **Krivokapić**2nd day only

Expert, Adviser for railway and metro vehicles
Regulations, Fixed Structural Subsystems, Railway and
Metro Vehicles
Department for Railway Safety and Interoperability,
Cableways and Metro
Directorate for Railways

Suisse/Schweiz/SwitzerlandM^{me}/Fr./Ms Linda **Ay**

Project Manager
Railway Safety and Interoperability
Safety Division
Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland - FOT

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
M./Hr./Mr	Abdulgaffar Berk	Expert, Engineer Rollingstock and maintenance department TCDD Tasimacilik AS

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 Relations and Communication Unit European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)
M./Hr./Mr.	Christoph Kaupat	Expert, Project Officer Monitoring, Analysis, Research and Stakeholders Safety Certification Unit European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)
M./Hr./Mr.	Thomas Willems 2 nd day only	Expert, Team leader— Interinstitutional relations Inter-institutional R elations and e Communication 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 the 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

Adopted Agenda**Annex II**

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
3. For review:
 - 3.1. Draft proposal for a new UTP Telematics
4. For discussion:
 - 4.1. Two-tier approach to technical interoperability
 - 4.2. Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons)
 - 4.3. Applying OTIF technical rules domestically
 - 4.4. Use of electronic signatures on certificates issued under the APTU or ATMF UR
 - 4.5. Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR
 - 4.6. Draft proposal for modification of the uniform format of certificates (Annex C to the ATMF UR)
5. Developments in European Union regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by the European Commission and the European Union Agency for Railways)
6. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
7. EU – OTIF equivalence table
8. Any other business
9. Next session