

Distr.: Restricted  
30 April 2021  
English  
Original: English, French and  
Russian

---

## **Working Party on Rail Transport**

### **Group of Experts on Permanent Identification of Railway Rolling Stock**

#### **Third session**

Geneva, 6–7 May 2021

Item 3 (c) of the provisional agenda

#### **Development of the Unique Rail Vehicle Identification System: Technological component**

### **PIRRS Questionnaire – results**

#### **Submitted by the Secretariat**

## **I. Introduction**

1. Based on document ECE/TRANS/SC.2/PIRRS/2020/11 and discussions at the second session of the Group of Experts, the results of the Questionnaire are identified below according to the summary set out in ECE/TRANS/SC.2/PIRRS/2020/8.

## **II. Questionnaire**

2. The Luxembourg Rail Protocol applies to all railway rolling stock from conventional passenger and freight wagons and locomotives through to trams, light rail units and other rail equipment. For brevity, all such equipment below are referred to as “assets”.

### **Q1: What is the most efficient way of marking assets with the permanent unique vehicle number (URVIS)?**

- a. Permanent Colour Code – Stencilling the URVIS number using standard rail industry colouring techniques
- b. Stamp on Existing Metal Component – Engraving the URVIS number on the asset’s fixed metal components (for example on the solebar)
- c. Separate Number Plate – Mounted on the asset itself
- d. Combination of different options: \_\_\_\_\_

e. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondents favoured option “c”.

**Q2: Should the URVIS number be accessible through:**

- a. Arabic digits visible on the asset
- b. Bar code shown on the asset
- c. QR Code or other machine-readable code (taking reader to dedicated website)
- d. RFID chip or other machine-readable system
- e. Combination of different options: \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondents identified with options “a” and “c”.

**Q3: Should the URVIS number be duplicated in different places on an asset:**

- a. Yes, it should be duplicated
- b. No, one place of marking is enough

There was no clear outcome on this question.

**Q4: It is intended that the URVIS number is a 16-digit number including one check digit**

- a. Are 16 digits enough?
  - (i) If not would you prefer 18 digits or
  - (ii) 20 digits
- b. Is one check digit sufficient or would you prefer two?

Respondents did not provide definitive answers on sub-point “a”, with some respondents identifying that one check digit is enough.

\_\_\_\_\_