



Organisation intergouvernementale pour les
transports internationaux ferroviaires

Zwischenstaatliche Organisation für den
internationalen Eisenbahnverkehr

Intergovernmental Organisation for
International Carriage by Rail

WG TECH

56th Session

Draft Minutes

Bern, Switzerland

Hybrid meeting, 09.09.2025

WG TECH 56 SUMMARY 9 SEPTEMBER 2025

The Secretary General opened the session.

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

- 1. The provisional agenda as submitted in Annex 1 to TECH-25037 of 14 July 2025 was adopted.**
- 2. The minutes of WG Tech 55, including modifications submitted by Switzerland, the Community of European Railway and Infrastructure Companies (CER) and the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA) before the session were adopted.**
- 3. The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department presented the latest developments relating to the Organisation.**
- 4. For review**

WG Tech 56 reviewed the working documents that had been prepared for the session.

The following summary reflects these discussions:

4.1. Draft proposal for modification of the UTP WAG:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25045 dated 11 August 2025.
- DE and the UK suggested minor editorial corrections.
- The UK requested clarification concerning Appendix A regarding the additional requirements for wagons already compliant with the previous UTP version (UTP WAG 2022). The EC suggested that this clarification be noted in the Handbook.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of proposing it to CTE 18 for adoption.

4.2. Draft proposal for modification of the UTP LOC&PAS:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25043 dated 11 August 2025.
- WG Tech noted that coaches as well as newly introduced personnel carriages meeting the conditions for free circulation, should not be refused in international traffic due to conflicting national technical requirements, although additional route compatibility checks might be necessary.
- WG Tech noted the importance of notifying the Secretary General of OTIF of any existing national technical rules and ensuring their transparency.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of proposing it to CTE 18 for adoption.

4.3. Draft proposal for modification of the uniform format of certificates:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25027 version 2 dated 11 August 2025 and made some minor editorial corrections.
- WG Tech noted that access to key information from the certificate was provided via vehicle registers, that the issue of certificate withdrawal was complex and that adding the URVIS number was outside the scope of WG Tech.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of proposing it to CTE 18 for adoption.

4.4. Draft proposal for modification of the guide for the application of the UTP LOC&PAS:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25028 version 2 dated 11 August 2025.

- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

4.5. Draft proposal for modification of the guide for the application of the UTP PRM:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25029 version 2 dated 11 August 2025.
- WG Tech was satisfied with the text and requested the Secretariat to prepare the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

4.6. Draft proposal for modification of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25038 version 2.1 dated 11 August 2025.
- The UK welcomed the changes concerning the mutual recognition of assessments.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

5. For discussion

5.1. ECM certification, review of change proposals by TR:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25046 dated 11 August 2025.
- WG Tech thanked TR for highlighting the issues and noted the benefit of examining and discussing the four problem areas as presented.
- WG Tech agreed that a draft guidance document based on TECH 25046 and reflecting the discussion at the meeting would be the most appropriate way to address the issues raised.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to prepare a draft guidance document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

5.2. Digitalisation and the role of OTIF:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25031 version 2 dated 11 August 2025.
- WG Tech noted suggestions to improve the text and TR's plan to issue all vehicle certificates through its national *digital railway management system*, which would include its vehicle register, within a period of two years.
- WG Tech welcomed the EC's offer to provide a status update on EVR for the next session.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.3. Developments related to telematics and the UTP TAF:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25032 version 2 dated 11 August 2025.
- The EC, the UK and CER provided contributions that had led to four options.
- WG Tech noted that there was no need for an immediate decision on the preferred option, as the work on drafting a new UTP could only begin once the TSI Telematics had been adopted.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.4. Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25033, which had been reviewed by WG Tech 55, without making any changes.
- WG Tech reviewed Annex 1, which grouped MSs based on objective and subjective indicators; there were no substantive comments.

- WG Tech noted that the draft questionnaire in Annex 2 would be considered at a later stage.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for further consideration at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.5. Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons):

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25034 version 2 dated 11 August 2025.
- WG Tech confirmed that the subject remained strategically important.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.6. Applying OTIF technical rules domestically:

- WG Tech reviewed document TECH-25035 dated 11 August 2025.
- ERA, the EC and the UK suggested some improvements to the document.
- WG Tech requested the Secretariat to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

The Chair invited delegates to send the OTIF Secretariat any further comments they might have on any of the documents under items 4 and 5 by the end of September. This deadline would enable the Secretariat to consider the comments when preparing the working documents for the 57th session of WG Tech.

6. Developments in European Union regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by the European Commission and the European Union Agency for Railways)

WG Tech noted the following information from the EC:

- TSI Telematics has been scheduled for a vote at the EU Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) meeting in November.
- The EC would provide a status update on ERA’s “REG+” project and the “ERA Ontology” at the next session of WG Tech.
- Upcoming events organised by ERA.

7. The cross-reference table of EU and OTIF terminology was noted.

WG Tech noted that, due to its stability, the terminology table should be reviewed annually and continue to be published for every WG Tech meeting.

8. The EU – OTIF equivalence table was reviewed.

9. Any other business

None.

10. Next session

18 November 2025, hybrid meeting, Brussels (hosted by the EC).

DISCUSSION

Welcome by the OTIF Secretariat

Mr Aleksandr Kuzmenko, the **Secretary General of OTIF**, opened the 56th session of WG Tech and welcomed the delegations. The session was held in a hybrid format.

Mr Bas Leermakers, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department**, who, together with Ms Maria Price and Mr Dragan Nešić, represented OTIF's Technical Interoperability Department, informed delegations that the session would be recorded for the purpose of drafting the minutes. The recording would not be made public and would be deleted after the minutes were adopted. If there were no 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.

The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the meeting that the slides presenting each agenda item would be sent to all delegates following the meeting.

The list of delegates is attached to these minutes as [Annex I](#).

ELECTION OF CHAIR

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** recalled Article 10 of the RoP of the CTE, concerning the election of the Chair. The Secretariat proposed the UK (Mr Vaibhav Puri) to chair the meeting. Mr Puri accepted the nomination. He noted that no other nominations for Chair had been received before the deadline of 25 August 2025. WG Tech unanimously elected the UK, in the shape of Mr Vaibhav Puri, to chair the meeting.

The **Chair** thanked the delegates for their confidence in entrusting him with the role of chairing WG Tech. He welcomed all participants, both in person and remotely and invited them to present themselves briefly.

1 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

After the **Chair** ascertained that there were no comments on the provisional agenda that had been submitted with the invitation letter TECH-25037 of 14 July 2025, WG Tech 56 adopted the agenda ([Annex II – Adopted agenda](#)).

2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS SESSION

Document: [WG Tech 55 Draft Minutes](#)

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** informed the meeting that delegates who had attended the 55th session of WG Tech had been sent the draft minutes on 21 July 2025. The draft minutes had been modified according to proposals from CH, CER and ERA and uploaded on 11 August 2025 for the attention of WG Tech 56.

The **Chair** noted that there were no comments and concluded that the minutes of the 55th session of WG Tech were adopted.

3 INFORMATION FROM THE OTIF SECRETARIAT

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** provided an update on relevant information since the 55th session of WG Tech, as follows:

- Depositary notification NOT-25016 of 18 July 2025 concerning the adoption of new consolidated versions of UTP LOC&PAS, UTP PRM, UTP Marking and UTP INF, as well as modifications to Appendix I to the UTP TAF adopted by CTE 17 had been sent. These consolidated and modified

texts would enter into force on 1 January 2026, unless one quarter of the Member States lodged any objections before the deadline of 18 November 2025.

- Version 2 of the Handbook for the implementation of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules, which had been approved by CTE 17, was now available online in French, German and English. It could be accessed and downloaded from OTIF's website: [Home > Activity > Technical Interoperability](#).

The **Chair** noted that there were no comments on the information provided.

4 FOR REVIEW:

WG Tech reviewed and discussed the working documents that had been prepared for the session. The **Chair** invited delegates to send the OTIF Secretariat any further comments they might have on any of the documents under item 4 by the end of September. This deadline would enable the Secretariat to consider the comments when preparing the working documents for the 57th session of WG Tech.

4.1 Draft proposal for modification of the UTP WAG

Document: [TECH-25045](#) Working document

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented draft working document TECH-25045 dated 11 August 2025, which reflected the amendments to WAG TSI adopted by the RISC on 3 July 2025. Modifications were shown in track changes and differences between the UTP and TSI in full width texts were highlighted for easy reference. He explained that, in addition to the amendments already included in the earlier version (TECH-25026 dated 21 May 2025), the draft introduced specifications for devices to secure semi-trailers (hitches). He reminded the meeting that the amendments to UTP WAG had been initiated to migrate vehicle-related requirements from RID to the UTP and TSI and that UTP WAG needed to be adopted at CTE 18 at the latest, to allow entry into force on 1 January 2027.

The **EC** thanked the Secretariat for highlighting the differences between the draft UTP and the TSI in yellow, which made the text easier to review.

DE suggested an editorial correction in point 6.1.2, noting that an asterisk was missing from the footnote on page 50, and requested clarification on why Table A.2 (Specific transition regime) referred to a fixed date of 1 January 2028 rather than to "one year after the entry into force". The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that a fixed date of 1 January 2028 was preferred in order to avoid possible ambiguity if there were any subsequent amendments.

The **UK** suggested an editorial correction to change "build" into "built" in the third paragraph of point 4.2.2.4 on page 54. It requested clarification on page 84 of Appendix A with regard to the additional requirements for wagons already compliant with the previous UTP version (UTP WAG 2022). The **EC** suggested that clarification concerning the transition between different versions of the UTP be included in the Handbook.

The **UK** also asked why OTIF used the term "unique vehicle number" instead of "European vehicle number", when referring to the "EVN" in Appendix C, point 5 (last paragraph). The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that OTIF had used the term "unique" instead of "European" to reflect COTIF's geographical scope, which extended beyond Europe, although the concept was the same as the European vehicle number and the same acronym "EVN" was used.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion. He noted that there were no further comments on document TECH-25045 dated 11 August 2025. Consequently, the Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of proposing it to CTE 18 for adoption.

4.2 Draft proposal for modification of the UTP LOC&PAS

Document: [TECH-25043](#)

Working document

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25043 dated 11 August 2025. Modifications were shown in track changes and differences between the UTP and TSI in full width texts were highlighted. He explained that the draft introduced new requirements related to vehicles for personnel accompanying trains carrying equipment, as well as updated references to standards in Appendix J (J-1), together with editorial corrections.

At the request of the UK, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that to avoid duplication of the text, the specific cases for EU CSs were not reproduced in the UTP. Instead, references to specific cases in the TSI were included in point 7.1.1.6., meaning they were also part of the scope of the UTP.

The **EC** noted that vehicles already admitted that complied with point 7.1.1.6. should not be refused due to conflicting national rules, as these rules should have been notified or harmonised.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** concurred and added that in practice, additional assessments or route compatibility checks might still be necessary. He also noted that all national technical requirements that had been notified to the Secretary General of OTIF were published on OTIF's website. He emphasised the importance of notification to ensure transparency.

TR informed the meeting that its national technical requirements were aligned with COTIF, the UTPs and TSIs and that there were therefore no conflicts, and that its intention was to ensure the full harmonisation of railway rules with those applied in other OTIF MSs.

The **Chair** summarised the discussion and noted that there were no further comments on the document. The Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of proposing it to CTE 18 for adoption.

4.3 Draft proposal for modification of the uniform format of certificates

Document: [TECH-25027](#)

Working document, version 2

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25027 dated 11 August 2025 and noted that most of the changes compared to the previous version were indicated in track changes and were mostly editorial. He reminded the meeting that the revision of the rules would allow the use of digital certificates in addition to paper certificates, would specify in more detail the technical (Annex 2) and administrative (Annex 3) information to be included and would ensure consistency with route compatibility checks (UTP TCRC). Once they had entered into force, the new rules would repeal and replace the existing rules.

The **UK** asked why the term “prototype” in Article 11 § 1 had been replaced by “first item of rolling stock [...]”. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that the word “prototype” was not used anywhere else in COTIF and could be misunderstood. The intention was to refer to the first production unit of rolling stock built according to type. The text was updated accordingly.

ERA suggested that the introduction on page 3 be revised to read “placed on the market” instead of “placed into service”. It also requested clarification on what was meant by “access to and verification of certificates through national portals” (Article 5 § 8) and questioned whether the Certificate of Operation would automatically become invalid when the vehicle was permanently withdrawn from service (Article 7 § 3), noting the potential for abuse by railway undertakings wanting to avoid old rolling stock being used by competitors. In addition, ERA asked whether the URVIS number should be included in the certificate.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** explained that access to certificate data was normally provided through vehicle registers, which were accessible to all the relevant authorities. The text in Article 5 had been modified to reflect this. He acknowledged the possible undesirable effects or even abuse that might result from the permanent withdrawal of vehicles from service. The rules should be clear and neutral. He suggested giving this matter further consideration. With regard to the suggestion to include

the URVIS number in the provisions, he suggested that this should not be pursued, as the URVIS number was not mandatory and was linked to a different area of law that was not linked to technical interoperability.

The **EC** wondered whether requiring certificates to be issued in at least one OTIF working language (English, French, German) was proportionate (Article 5 § 6). The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** confirmed that this requirement reflected existing rules.

NO thanked the Secretariat for making it explicit that Article 1 § 3 applied to non-EU CSs that apply EU law and noted that the same interpretation would apply to Annex 1. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** suggested adding a footnote in Annex 1 to make the same explicit statement.

The **Chair** summarised the main points and, as there were no additional comments, concluded that the Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of proposing it to CTE 18 for adoption.

4.4 Draft proposal for modification of the guide for the application of the UTP LOC&PAS

Document: [TECH-25028](#) Working document, version 2

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented the draft working document TECH-25028 dated 11 August 2025. He noted that all the proposed changes from version 1 had been accepted and that the new changes were indicated in track changes in version 2.

The **UK** thanked the Secretariat for the work on the document and noted that the clarification explaining the differences between the various versions of the UTP and their application was very useful.

The **Chair** noted that there were no additional comments, and asked the Secretariat to reissue the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

4.5 Draft proposal for modification of the guide for the application of the UTP PRM

Document: [TECH-25029](#) Working document, version 2

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced draft working document TECH-25029 dated 11 August 2025. He noted that all the proposed changes from version 1 had been accepted and that the new changes were indicated in track changes in version 2.

The **Chair** noted that there were no comments. He asked the Secretariat to reissue the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

4.6 Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules

Document: [TECH-25038](#) Working document, version 2.1

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented draft document TECH-25038 dated 11 August 2025. He explained that version 2.1 included additional clarification on the EST UR, a new diagram providing an overview of all the rules based on the APTU and ATMF UR and additional information concerning the role of the CSM assessment bodies. All the changes were indicated in track changes.

The **UK** welcomed the changes in point 6.2.5 concerning the mutual recognition of assessments for the purpose of the international use of vehicles, regardless of where they were carried out.

CER noted that the number of vehicle admissions was likely to increase due to modularity and the frequent modifications to existing vehicles. It indicated that this could put additional pressure on the vehicle admission system and suggested considering alternative approaches, such as “entities in charge of changes” managing limited assessments, rather than processing all changes through formal authorisations or admissions.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** shared CER's view and noted that the issue was strategic and suggested exploring collective approaches, such as shared or partial assessments, to balance safety and operational flexibility.

The **UK** also highlighted the value of “universal assessments”, such as those carried out by the Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB), to prevent duplication of local risk evaluations. The UK offered to share its experience at a future meeting of WG Tech.

ERA agreed with the points raised and highlighted the potential to streamline processes and the benefit of collective risk assessment to avoid duplication and improve cost efficiency. ERA indicated that it would share this point internally.

The **Chair** noted that there were no other comments. He concluded that the Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for approval.

5 FOR DISCUSSION

WG Tech 56 reviewed and discussed the working documents listed below that had been prepared for the session. The **Chair** invited delegates to send the OTIF Secretariat any further comments they might have on any of the documents under item 5 by the end of September. This deadline would allow the Secretariat to consider the comments when preparing the working documents for the 57th session of WG Tech.

5.1 ECM certification, review of change proposals by TR

Document: [TECH-25046](#)

Working document

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** reminded the meeting that at its previous session, TR had presented to WG Tech its experience with applying the ECM Regulation. The presentation, which had been supported by a working document, revolved around four areas where TR had experienced practical problems. For each problem area, TR had also proposed one or more solutions. Due to the lack of time WG Tech had not been able to discuss the proposal in detail and it had been agreed to consider the proposal at this session.

TR outlined the problems and explained that the aim of the proposed solutions was to support application of the ECM Regulation, contribute to the implementation of COTIF and enhance railway safety. TR explained that, except for the fourth change proposal, the suggested changes were already in force at national level in the form of national rules. It said that it was open to alternative solutions and was prepared to update its national rules if necessary.

Following TR's introduction, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25046 dated 11 August 2025, which the Secretariat had prepared in cooperation with TR. The document addressed the four key problem areas. It described the issues encountered by TR, outlined TR's proposed solutions and included feedback that the Secretariat had received on these proposals after the previous session.

TR thanked the Secretariat for preparing the working document and asked that a presentation they had prepared be shared with the participants after the meeting, instead of presenting it at the session.

CH welcomed the document. It noted that CH had provided feedback and supported the conclusions and proposed way forward in section VI.

The **UK** thanked TR for highlighting the issue and welcomed the document. It supported the proposed solutions in section VI. It was of the view that preparing guidance would be more appropriate than modifying the rules, bearing in mind the ECM business models and allocated responsibilities. The UK highlighted the need to monitor whether feedback from TR or other CSs would lead to better understanding and improved system performance.

Problem area 1: lack of transparency in outsourcing

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented problem area 1. ECM certificates did not indicate whether maintenance was performed in-house or by third parties, making it difficult for vehicle keepers to assess whether an ECM has in-house capabilities to perform maintenance or whether it relies on third parties.

He suggested that the scope of the maintenance delivery function may differ among workshops, and one ECM might outsource work to several workshops. An ECM might also change its outsourcing practices during the period of validity of its ECM certificate. For these reasons, it might not be practicable to detail in each ECM certificate whether and how the ECM outsources its activities.

There was no further feedback on this problem area.

Problem area 2: insufficient oversight of subcontractors

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented problem area 2. The ECM Regulation did not require certification bodies to confirm the competence of companies to whom ECMs outsourced the maintenance delivery function. There was concern that there was not enough oversight of the competence of these companies.

To remedy the situation, **TR** proposed that certification bodies should confirm the competence of any such organisation. In this regard, **TR** also informed the meeting that under its national rules, ECMs should demonstrate how their subcontractors comply with the requirements and the certification body should confirm the adequacy of that demonstration. This had led to a considerable decrease in the number of incidents and accidents.

CER suggested that subcontracting to certified companies only was the most effective path to ensure safety and maintain control over the maintenance process.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** emphasised that certification bodies had a critical role. In particular, ECMs that outsourced functions had to be assessed for their ability to ensure that any outsourced activity was carried out competently and in accordance with the rules. The competent authorities remained responsible for supervising the railway system and this included overseeing the results of applying the ECM Regulation, whilst respecting the independence of the certification body. He also emphasised the importance of coordination and sharing of best practices among certification bodies.

The **EC** noted that ECMs could outsource maintenance functions but could not outsource responsibilities. ECMs remained fully accountable for ensuring that any outsourced activities were conducted competently and safely.

Problem area 3: risks during change of ECM

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented problem area 3. It concerned the perceived difficulties in verifying that the technical state of a vehicle matched its documentation when the ECM of a vehicle was changed. The issue concerned the availability of information and who was responsible for keeping it up to date and distributing it, particularly when a vehicle was deregistered for a while.

CER underscored the importance of ensuring continuity and updating maintenance records when there was a change of ECM, in order to prevent safety risks. It noted that this would become increasingly critical as the number of ECMs and outsourced maintenance functions continued to grow.

The **UK** was of the view that guidance might be useful for problem areas concerning ECMs' outsourcing activities (i.e. problem area 1), ECM certification bodies (problem area 2) and communication between ECMs and keepers (problem area 3). It emphasised the importance of monitoring how such potential guidance could be promoted and whether it has effectively helped to improve the situation.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** reiterated that under the ATMF UR, the keeper was ultimately responsible for the regulatory compliance of the vehicle. The ECM was an entity assigned by the keeper; therefore, effective communication between them was essential and the keeper was responsible for relaying information between the former and the current ECM. He further explained that

when performing maintenance, ECMs should not modify a vehicle without informing the keeper and had to notify the keeper of any regulatory compliance issues they identified.

Problem area 4: poor traceability in annual reports

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented problem area 4. The main issue identified by TR was the lack of detail in ECM annual reports, which were an essential source of information for keepers, certification bodies and, when necessary, competent authorities. This lack of detail hindered the ability to trace maintenance activities to individual vehicles and negatively impacted accident analysis and the improvement of regulations.

TR added that the reports provided insufficient information on the maintenance development function and was of the view that clearer reporting obligations and defined content would encourage ECMs to enhance and develop their services.

CER noted that while individual ECMs kept their work traceable, there was currently no comprehensive overview of all maintenance activities on a single vehicle, notably when several subcontractors were involved. It wondered whether establishing a global traceability system was feasible or even necessary.

The **UK** acknowledged the usefulness of detailed ECM annual reports. However, it also highlighted the need to stabilise the reporting burden on ECMs and suggested that additional guidance could clarify which information was most relevant and how the reporting mechanism should operate in practice.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** suggested that the existing rules provided a basis for competent authorities, in cooperation with certification bodies, to require the level of detail they require for effective audits, supervision and surveillance. This approach allowed them to achieve an appropriate balance without creating an excessive burden on ECMs.

The **EC** welcomed TR's valuable contribution and thanked the Secretariat for incorporating ERA's suggestions and comments. It also confirmed the availability of the EC and ERA for bilateral discussions with all non-EU CSs. The EC also pointed out that TR could take part in ERA's meetings on the "cooperation of ECM certification bodies", where both EU and non-EU participants could share their concerns and exchange practices and experience.

The **Chair** thanked TR for highlighting the issues and noted that all the participating CSs appreciated this work. He emphasised that the subjects were relevant and complex and should be closely monitored.

The **Chair** noted that there were no other comments. He summarised the discussion and concluded that WG Tech agreed that an explanatory document, based on document TECH-25046 and reflecting the discussion at the meeting, would be the most appropriate way to address the issues raised. The draft guidance should:

- Clarify ECM responsibilities for outsourced functions.
- Define the role of the certification body in auditing an ECM's management of subcontractors or outsourced functions.
- Explain the distribution of responsibilities between keepers and ECMs under the ATMF UR, including for vehicle re-registration after modification.
- Specify the level of detail required in ECM annual reports to ensure effective oversight.

The Secretariat was requested to prepare a draft explanatory document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.2 Digitalisation and the role of OTIF

Document: [TECH-25031](#)

Working document, version 2

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** introduced working document TECH-25031 dated 11 August 2025. All the changes compared to the previous version were indicated in track changes.

He explained that the document was intended to provide CTE with a coordinated overview of OTIF's remit and responsibilities regarding digitalisation, rather than proposing specific actions or next steps.

ERA suggested some additional points for consideration, including the “simplicity of and accessibility to passenger information and ticketing” (point 7). With regard to capacity management (point 10), it welcomed the statement: “optimised use of rail infrastructure can be achieved [...]”, but was of the view that digitalisation should not be used as a reason to delay or avoid investment in infrastructure. In the same point, it suggested clarifying the exchange of information between IMs. ERA also suggested additional topics to be addressed, such as data latency, backup solutions in case digital services were unavailable, and ensuring that passenger and goods streams remained independent of data streams. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** thanked ERA for its input and confirmed that its suggestions would be considered.

TR informed the meeting that it planned to issue all vehicle certificates digitally through its national “digital railway management system”. It indicated that the system was intended to be connected to the EVR (European vehicle register) and become operational within two years. The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** welcomed the information and invited TR to provide further information on the project. He stressed the importance of ensuring the compatibility of and accessibility to digital registers across CSs and with ERA's EVR and suggested that TR give a presentation on the project at a future session.

The **EC** welcomed TR's project and highlighted its commitment to assist non-EU CSs to link their NVRs to the EVR. It acknowledged that the project might require technical fine-tuning and confirmed its support for ERA in accelerating the development. The EC asked to be kept updated on discussions between TR and ERA, so that it could provide guidance where necessary and assist in advancing the project. The EC also proposed providing a status update on the EVR at the next session.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** thanked the EC and suggested that the status update on EVR could also cover ERA's “REG+” project and an explanation of how the system would operate internationally for vehicles circulating between EU and non-EU CSs. He also emphasised that the Secretariat was interested in being actively engaged in the discussion about registers.

The **Chair** noted that there were no other comments. He concluded that the Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.3 Developments related to telematics and the UTP TAF

Document: [TECH-25032](#)

Working document version 2

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25032 dated 11 August 2025. Modifications compared to the previous version were shown in track changes, except for Annex 2, which had been replaced without track changes. He then outlined three possible options for a way forward, aligned with the six processes outlined in the draft TSI Telematics¹:

- Option 1: revise UTP TAF to cover TSI Telematics provisions relevant to freight telematics only.
- Option 2: replace UTP TAF with a new UTP Telematics covering both freight and passenger telematics, where passenger telematics would be optional.
- Option 3: repeal UTP TAF. CTE would instead issue recommended practices that would cover all subjects covered in TSI Telematics.

The **EC** underlined the value of UTP TAF and was not in favour of repealing it, as this would compromise the ability to enhance cross-border digitalisation, while creating additional work with limited benefit. It

¹ The six processes outlined in the draft TSI Telematics: 1) capacity management, 2) train preparation, 3) traffic management, 4) management of freight wagons and their load, 5) rail ticketing and 6) rail passenger travel information. The processes from 1 – 4 apply to both passenger and freight services, while 5 and 6 only concern passenger services.

suggested an intermediate approach (option 1A) to extend UTP TAF to include processes that were relevant to both freight and passenger services, such as traffic and capacity management, but excluding ticketing and passenger information. Possible extension to include passenger ticketing and information could be considered at a later stage, once the implications for CIV, and possibly CIM, had been clarified. The **Chair** noted this as a variant of option 1, which included passenger-related telematics, but excluded ticketing.

The **UK** expressed flexibility on all options.

CER recommended deferring a decision on the preferred option until the revised TSI Telematics was adopted at EU level.

The **EC** concurred with CER. In its view, different objectives may apply at EU level, where objectives for digitalisation might be more ambitious, whereas at OTIF level, the focus could be limited to what was necessary to facilitate international traffic. The EC therefore suggested fine-tuning the options further so that, when the time came to develop the content of the UTP, there would be a solid working basis. The EC recalled that, according to the CTE's mandate, WG Tech was tasked with preparing options for the next CTE and that substantive work on the content of the UTP would only begin in the following cycle (i.e. from 2026), following CTE's decision on the chosen option.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** confirmed that the document was being drafted for consideration by CTE and that no option needed to be selected at this stage. He noted that actual work on the UTP or related provisions would take place in the next cycle (2026/27), in line with the process as described by the EC.

Following further discussion, WG Tech revised the options initially suggested and refined them for consideration at the next meeting of WG Tech:

- Option 0: revise UTP TAF applicable to freight services only.
- Option 1: replace UTP TAF with a new UTP Telematics, excluding passenger travel information and ticketing. The processes included would apply to freight and passenger services.
- Option 2: replace UTP TAF with a new UTP Telematics (freight and passengers), including passenger travel information.
- Option 3: replace UTP TAF with a new UTP Telematics (freight and passengers), including passenger travel information and ticketing (the latter depending on compatibility with CIV).
- Option 4: repeal UTP TAF. CTE would instead issue recommended practices that would cover all processes covered in TSI Telematics.

The **Chair** noted that there was no need for an immediate decision on the option, as work on drafting a new UTP could only begin after the adoption of TSI Telematics at EU level. The Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

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

Document: [TECH-25033](#)

Working document

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25033 dated 11 August 2025, including Annex 1, comprising a scoring table of MSs according to agreed objective and subjective indicators and Annex 2, a draft questionnaire for CSs concerning the implementation and application of the ATMF UR. Annex 2 was not considered at this stage. The Secretary General requested that it be put on hold to harmonise it with similar initiatives in other OTIF committees. With regard to Annex 1, the Head of the Technical Interoperability Department informed the meeting that, due to its sensitive nature, it had been circulated only to registered participants and had not been published online. He explained that the states in Annex 1 were listed alphabetically and categorised according to objective

and subjective indicators as agreed previously. The EU MSs were not included in any group, as they were obliged to apply EU law and, following the equivalence principle, they were presumed also to meet their obligations under COTIF. Based on this categorisation, the MSs were divided into the following groups:

- 5 CSs in Group A that were actively engaged in the work of CTE, regularly attended meetings, implemented the rules, notified the relevant entities and for which no further assistance was needed unless requested.
- 1 CS in Group B1, indicating involvement in the work of CTE and scoring adequately on either the objective or subjective indicators, but not both, meeting the formal criteria while attending meetings only sporadically.
- 12 CSs in Group C, indicating low or no involvement in the work of CTE with few indicators of formal or subjective compliance and often not attending meetings or notifying competent authorities.

The Head of the Technical Interoperability Department indicated that the grouping would support targeted assistance and further cooperation with MSs. In reply to the Chair's question on the next steps and the OTIF Secretariat's support for CSs, he explained that the basic approaches were defined in the document and consisted of offering assistance to states in Groups B and C. For Group B, the focus would be to identify and address gaps, while for Group C the priority would be to establish contact and identify the reasons for delayed implementation. He added that the results provided a solid starting point for discussion and exchanges with these states.

The EC was of the view that potential questionnaires should ensure transparency and explain to CSs that it was possible to opt out of the APTU and ATMF UR, even though this might not be the preferred option. It suggested raising the awareness of CSs in Group C, particularly those in the Western Balkans, of their obligations under the Transport Community Treaty (TCT Agreement) and EU law, to facilitate the implementation of the ATMF UR. In this context, the EC highlighted Monaco and Liechtenstein and noted that these CSs might already apply COTIF without being fully aware of it. The EC offered to assist the Secretariat by providing relevant contacts for CSs in Group C through the EU External Action Services. Finally, the EC encouraged CSs to notify their national technical rules to ensure transparency, noting that rules not formally notified might remain unknown to other CSs and would hinder effective implementation of the ATMF UR.

The **Chair** noted that there were no other comments. The Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.5 Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons)

Document: [TECH-25034](#)

Working document version 2

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25034 dated 11 August 2025 and noted that only minor changes had been made compared to the previous version. He informed participants of a recent meeting with the GCC Railway Authority and UIC. He underlined the strategic importance of the subject and noted that the next steps would depend on further engagement with GCC Member States to encourage them to join OTIF. In this context, TR's central role in regional transport corridors was highlighted and contacts with Iraq regarding the reactivation of its membership were mentioned. He concluded that the document was largely complete, but suggested that it could be reissued for the next meeting of WG Tech.

The **Chair** observed that there were no comments on the document. He noted the importance of the subject and confirmed that WG Tech was supportive of the work going forward. The Secretariat was requested to issue the document again for the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

5.6 Applying OTIF technical rules domestically

Document: [TECH-25035](#)

Working document

In the context of the Secretary General's commitment to encourage states to apply COTIF domestically, the **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented working document TECH-25035 dated 11 August 2025. He noted that aligning domestic rules with international rules could simplify procedures, improve efficiency and enable documents to be used for both domestic and international operations. After updating it in accordance with the discussions, the updated version would be submitted to CTE for discussion. If the views of CTE were favourable, the Secretariat and WG Tech could prepare draft recommendations for approval by CTE on the application of or alignment with OTIF technical interoperability rules for domestic vehicle approval.

ERA welcomed the document. It suggested considering the potential reduction of efficiency and increased costs that would result from having separate domestic and international vehicle procedures (point 7), as well as the scope of EU interoperability rules with regard to segregated networks (points 3, 8, 17). It also addressed the role of OTIF in collecting and publishing declarations from CSs (point 31) and the need to use specific marking to indicate rolling stock used in domestic traffic.

The **EC** welcomed and supported the Secretariat's active approach. It suggested considering possible exemptions for vehicles and networks from interoperability and safety rules (point 19), distinctions between specific cases and national rules for domestic traffic (points 22 and 29) and clarification of "network compatibility" (point 28).

The **UK** welcomed the document and suggested considering whether the CSM for RA should also apply to domestic traffic.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** thanked the participants and indicated that the suggestions would be taken into account when updating the document.

The **Chair** referred to the proposal in the document that a voluntary scheme should create the possibility of informing CSs about specific cases applying only to domestic traffic. He noted that there were no other comments and concluded that the Secretariat was requested to update the document for review at the next session, with the aim of submitting it to CTE 18 for discussion.

6 DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPEAN UNION REGULATIONS THAT ARE OF RELEVANCE TO COTIF (PRESENTED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND THE EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR RAILWAYS)

The **EC** informed the meeting of ongoing developments related to vehicle registers and telematics. With regard to TSI Telematics, the item was scheduled for a vote at the RISC meeting in November. With regard to vehicle registers, the EC informed the meeting of new applications to use the EVR from Moldova, Serbia and the UK in relation to Northern Ireland, as well as interest from Türkiye. The EC confirmed that it was closely following these discussions with ERA to support timely implementation. The EC also informed the meeting of ERA's project to integrate existing registers into a unified platform ("REG+"). In reply to the Chair's suggestion, the **EC** confirmed that it would include "ERA Ontology" in the status update on vehicle registers in its presentation for the next meeting of WG Tech.

The **EC** introduced upcoming ERA events and training opportunities, including the European Rail Safety Days (1–3 October 2025, Krakow), the Budapest safety and interoperability workshop (16 October 2025, online), and a series of safety training courses through December 2025, as well as the ERTMS 2026 conference (21–23 April 2026, Valenciennes). It highlighted the relevance of these events for national safety experts and encouraged participation.

The **Chair** thanked the EC for providing the update and noted that, if more information were required, participants should contact the EC and ERA directly.

7 CROSS-REFERENCE TABLE OF EU AND OTIF TERMINOLOGY

Document: [TECH-17049](#)

Working document dated 11 August 2025

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented the document. There were no changes compared with the version submitted to WG Tech 55.

ERA suggested reviewing the table annually instead of at every session, given its relative stability.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** concurred with ERA and explained that the table was published as a working document in English only for each meeting, which simplified access and avoided the need for translation. It therefore suggested that it should still be published for each meeting, but that it should only be reviewed once a year.

WG Tech took note of the document without comment and agreed that, for practical reasons, the table could continue to be published for every meeting, even if it remained unchanged, while a formal review need only take place once a year.

8 EU – OTIF EQUIVALENCE TABLE

Document: [TECH-18024](#)

Working document dated 11 August 2025

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** presented the document. Compared to the version submitted to WG Tech 55, there were minor editorial corrections and an update concerning the status of documents following the decisions of CTE 17 and the ongoing work of WG Tech. All the amendments were indicated in track changes.

WG Tech took note of the document without comment.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

10 NEXT SESSIONS

The following sessions will be held in hybrid format:

- 57th session of WG Tech on 18 November 2025 in Brussels, hosted by the EC
- 18th session of CTE on 9 June 2026 in Bern
- 58th session of WG Tech on 10-11 June 2026 in Bern (two half days)
- 59th session of WG Tech on 8, 9 or 10 September 2026 (tbc)
- 60th session of WG Tech on 10 or 12 November 2026 (tbc)

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** informed the meeting that the CTE would have to be organised on one day only, instead of the usual two days. This decision had been taken by the Secretary General in order to economise, mainly on interpretation. Other OTIF committees had also been requested to shorten their sessions for the same reasons.

CLOSING REMARKS

The **Chair** thanked all participants for their constructive contributions and the Secretariat for the timely preparation of all the meeting documents.

The **Head of the Technical Interoperability Department** thanked all the participants for their participation in the meeting and the Chair for his excellent leadership during the meeting.

The **Chair** then closed the meeting.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ANNEX I

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

M^{me}/Fr./Ms Redha **Khebbache** Chef Département
Ministère des transports
Société Nationale des Transports Ferroviaires
Direction Contrôle de gestion et participations
Département Statistiques et contrôle des performances

M./Hr./Mr Bachir **Mokrani** Expert
Ministère des transports
Direction Générale de la Logistique et de la Mobilité
Direction des Transports ferroviaires et guidés
Sous-direction des transports guidés

Allemagne/Deutschland/Germany

M./Hr./Mr Philipp **Unger** Technischer Regierungsamtsrat
Eisenbahn-Bundesamt
Internationale Angelegenheiten - Sachgebiet 92

Arménie/Armenien/Armenia

Mme/Fr./Ms Diana **Ananyan** Chief specialist, Expert
Department for Rail and Water Transport Policy
Ministry of Territorial Administration and
Infrastructures

Autriche/Österreich/Austria

M./Hr./Mr Thomas **Helnwein** Expert, Dipl.-Ing., Amtssachverständiger
Federal Ministry of Innovation, Mobility and
Infrastructure
Directorate General IV – Transport
Directorate Railways, Department E5 – Technology

Espagne/Spainen/Spain

M./Hr./Mr Luis **del Prado Arévalo** Head of delegation
Head of Sector of transport of dangerous goods by rail
Ministry of Transport of Spain
Spanish Railway Agency (AESF)-NSA Spain

France/Frankreich/France

M./Hr./Mr Henri **Dupuis** Chargé de mission international
Établissement public de sécurité ferroviaire (EPSF)
Cellule des affaires réglementaires et juridiques

Croatie/Kroatien/Croatia

M./Hr./Mr Darjan **Konjić** Head of delegation

Senior Advisor
Ministry of the Sea, Transport and Infrastructure
Directorate for Railway Infrastructure and Transport

Hongrie/Ungarn/Hungary

M./Hr./Mr György **Lengyel**

International Regulation Administrator
Ministry of Construction and Transport
National Safety Authority

Italie/Italien/Italy

M./Hr./Mr Francesco **Traina**

Funzionario Ingegnere
Ministero delle infrastrutture e dei Trasporti
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

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

Expert
Head of Technical Standard Vehicle Office
Direzione Generale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie - Area Normativa e Standard Tecnici
Agenzia Nazionale per la Sicurezza delle Ferrovie e delle Infrastrutture Stradali e Autostradali (ANSFISA)

Luxembourg

M./Hr./Mr Cédric **Boujong**

Agrément matériel roulant / Sous-système CCS
Administration des chemins de fer - (ANS)

Maroc/Marokko/Morocco

M./Hr./Mr Hassan **Michmachi**

Expert, Chef de Département
Office National des Chemins de Fer
Département politique générale sécurité

Norvège/Norwegen/Norway

M^{me}/Fr./Ms Pia **Strand**

Senior Adviser
Department of Legal and International Affairs
Norwegian Railway Authority

Royaume-Uni/ Vereinigtes Königreich United Kingdom

M^{me}/Fr./Ms Michelle **Cole**

Department for Transport
Rail Safety and Standards

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

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

Serbia/Serbien/SerbiaM^{me}/Fr./Ms Ivana **Božić**Advisor, Expert
Ministry of Construction, Transport, and Infrastructure
Department for Railways and Intermodal Transport**Suisse/Schweiz/Switzerland**M^{me}/Fr./Ms Linda **Ay**Project Manager Safety and Interoperability
Federal Office of Transport of Switzerland – FOT**Türkiye**M./Hr./Mr Mustafa Erdem **Kırmızıgül**Head of Delegation
Head of Railway Certification Department
Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
Directorate General for Regulation of Transport ServiceM./Hr./Mr Mustafa **İmamoğlu**Expert
Railway Certification Department
Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure

II. Organisation régionale d'intégration économique
Regionale Organisation für wirtschaftliche Integration
Regional economic integration organisation

Union européenne / Europäische Union / European Union

Commission européenne/
Europäische Kommission/
European Commission

M./Hr./Mr Yann **Seimandi**Policy Officer – Digitalisation
Unit C4 (Rail Interoperability and Safety)
European Commission – Directorate General for Mobility
and Transport**ERA**M./Hr./Mr. Christoph **Kaupat**Expert
EU Agency for Railways (ERA)
Monitoring, Analysis, Research and Stakeholders Unit

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

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

**IV. Secrétariat
 Sekretariat
 Secretariat**

M./Hr./Mr in person	Bas Leermakers	Head of Technical Interoperability Department
M ^{me} /Fr./Ms in person	Maria Price	Expert in Technical Interoperability Department
M./Hr./Mr in person	Dragan Nešić	Expert in Technical Interoperability Department

ADOPTED AGENDA**ANNEX II**

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous session
3. Information from the OTIF Secretariat
4. For review:
 - 4.1. Draft proposal for modification of the UTP WAG
 - 4.2. Draft proposal for modification of the UTP LOC&PAS
 - 4.3. Draft proposal for modification of the uniform format of certificates
 - 4.4. Draft proposal for modification of the guide for the application of the UTP LOC&PAS
 - 4.5. Draft proposal for modification of the guide for the application of the UTP PRM
 - 4.6. Draft proposal for modification of the Handbook for the implementation and application of the APTU and ATMF Uniform Rules
5. For discussion:
 - 5.1. ECM certification, review of change proposals by TR
 - 5.2. Digitalisation and the role of OTIF
 - 5.3. Developments related to telematics and the UTP TAF
 - 5.4. Monitoring and assessing the implementation and application of the ATMF UR
 - 5.5. Covering additional technical systems in UTPs (GCC wagons)
 - 5.6. Applying OTIF technical rules domestically
6. Developments in European Union regulations that are of relevance to COTIF (presented by the European Commission and the European Union Agency for Railways)
7. Cross reference table of EU and OTIF terminology
8. EU – OTIF equivalence table
9. Any other business
10. Next sessions