EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT

Directorate B - European mobility network

B.2 - Single European rail area

TAP TSI

Telematics Applications for Passenger Services
Technical Specifications for Interoperability

12TH TAP STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

17 JANUARY 2013
53, AVENUE DES ARTS, BRUSSELS

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees:

Patrizio Grillo Co-chair;	DG MOVE
Libor Lochman Co-chair;	CER
Rütger Fenkes	TAP Phase 2 Project Manager
Davide Pifferi	Joint Sector Group
Robert Parkinson	ECTAA
Michael Purcell	EIM
Rian van der Borgt	EPF
Mickael Varga	ERA
Svend Leirvaag	ETTSA
Alexander Stuessi	UITP
William Bird	DG MOVE

1. Adoption of agenda

The proposed agenda was adopted.

2. Minutes of previous Steering Committee (21 November 2012)

The minutes of the previous Steering Committee held on 21 November were approved.

3. Results of the ERA – DG MOVE discussions about the legal character of Phase One deliverables

DG MOVE (PG) introduced the item. He referred to previous discussions at SteCo meetings concerning the legal status of the deliverables of phase one namely the seven IT Specifications (B50 – B56),and the documents on Architecture, Governance and the Masterplan. Previously ERA had suggested that all these documents should be mandatory and should be included in Annex to the TSI (the IT Specifications in Annex III and the Masterplan, Governance and Architecture documents in Annex V).

ERA (MV) then made a presentation which outlined the discussions which had taken place with DG MOVE. It had been agreed that the IT Specifications should actually be transformed into Application Guides which would be published on the ERA website.

Their revision would be carried out by the ERA TAP Working Party (not under CCM). RF pointed out that the governance concept produced in Phase One foresees ownership and maintenance of the Implementation Guides by the governance structure, which would operate in full respect of the TAP TSI requirements as regards involvement of stakeholders and interest groups.

In response to the question of PG, MV indicated that the last Working Party meeting had been held 1½ years previously and would need to be reconvened to discussion modifications to the Application Guides. A call for speakers would be launched to reactivate the group.

In relation to the Governance document it was proposed that the current TAP SteCo would remain in place in order to monitor the application of the TAP TSI. After a period of two years there would be a review whether the Application Guides would remain non-binding or whether they should be transformed into mandatory IT Specifications.

In relation to the (Retail) Architecture document it was reported that the Project Team had delivered additional documentation, UML diagrams had been prepared and that the deliverable was now finalised. RF reminded of explanations already given at the previous SteCo meeting that the additional (Retail) Architecture documentation produced does not constitute a new deliverable or a change to what had already been delivered, but provides elements to further improve readability of the deliverable. MV responded that ERA is quite happy with the architecture documentation and considers it fit to be annexed to the Regulation.

PG commented that the status of the documents were open to discussion by the Steering Committee.

The Commission's view was that both the Masterplan and the Architecture documents should remain mandatory (with the wording for the Master Plan being the same as that for TAF TSI whereas the Governance document should be able to be adapted without recourse to legislation.

The Project Leader (RF) made a presentation expressing that the Masterplan and references to the (Retail) Architecture Economic Evaluation should be included in Chapter 7 of the TSI. The Implementation Guides/ IT Specifications should be non-binding and should remain Implementation Guides as delivered by Phase One, able to be maintained and amended by the future governance structure. He expressed some concern on the new proposal for governance in relation to the activities of the Working Party and the overlap caused by the continuation of the SteCo in relation to the proposed Supervisory Board.

PG explained that with the Application Guides being non-mandatory it would still be necessary for there to be a body that could check that the Application Guides were being implemented correctly. A review would be carried out after 2 to 3 years. DG MOVE would not unilaterally decide at the review whether the documents should be made legally binding. ERA would monitor application and SteCo would discuss progress and the need to take action as appropriate.

MP considered that SteCo should remain until the end of phase two. Phase three would have appropriate governance as defined in phase two.

EIM (MP) asked what follow up there had been to the minuted action that ERA should circulate the legal advice that it had received to indicate that the documents had to be legally binding. MV stated that since the issue of the legal status of the documents had been resolved there was no need to circulate the documents.

Decision

It was agreed that the IT Specifications should be transformed into Application Guides maintained by the ERA TAP WP.

The Master Plan and Architecture documents should be mandatory.

The Governance document should be non-mandatory.

It was considered that the Steering Committee would remain in place until such time that the proposed governance structure was implemented, most likely that SteCo would continue to the end of phase two.

4. Timeline for Phase One adoption and TAP TSI re-publication

DG MOVE (PG) commented that in order that the amended TAP TSI could be submitted for a vote at the RISC meeting scheduled for June 5/6, the document would have to be made available by the beginning of May. Working back with consideration for the Commission's inter-service consultation procedure, the drafting process for the TSI would have to be completed by mid-February. This would fit in with the anticipated completion date of the TAP Masterplan of end April.

5. Masterplan Update

The Project Manager made a presentation on the current status.

The deadline for submission from stakeholders was 31 December 2012. To date 30 responses have been received. In some cases extensions have been requested. There has been a good number of RUs and IMs responding with a good mix of company size and geographic coverage. There has been a large number of responses from Eastern Europe. At present approximately 70% of the network is covered.

The principle deficiency has been in replies from new entrant RUs and those bodies not linked to sector associations. This is also a function of the lack of communication in Member States (per the discussion on the role of National Contact Points in the Joint TAP TAF meeting that followed)

The consolidation process has begun with the first draft expected to be completed by the end of January at which time it will be circulated to members of SteCo. The final version is expected to be completed by mid-April. Further contact will be made with outliers and to iron out inconsistencies with responses expected by the end of March.

A request was made that the Commission should stress the need for input from stakeholders when it would meet up with Member States at the RISC meeting being held on 23/24 January, particularly with respect to the role of the National Contact Points.

6. Tariff Data Exchange Between RUs

DG MOVE (WB) reported on progress on this issue. Discussions had taken place between DG MOVE and DG COMP in relation to the points made by CER on Technical Documents B1/B2/B3. The principle point made by DG COMP on reviewing the information was that the information exchanged should not be commercially sensitive in case there was any competitive advantage in having this information.

In the meantime WB had prepared a document laying out the background and issues concerned. This document was currently being scrutinised by DG COMP but would be made available once it had been cleared.

RF indicated that the CER position was that data should only be given to other RUs/third parties with which the RUs had already entered a commercial agreement. He volunteered that he would send a text on this basis to DG MOVE to be included in the document that

could then be circulated to the other members of SteCo for their comments (post-meeting note: Done).

SL expressed his concern on the use of the term 'ticket vendor' and was concerned that in an attempt to regulate, the principles of price transparency and customer choice could be compromised. He warned against creating a discriminatory regime.

DP commented that with rapidly changing prices it was a limitation of technology which would impact on transparency.

PG indicted that it would be appropriate to discuss this further once a text had been received from the project team.

It was agreed that the issue of tariff data exchange would be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.

7. Any Other Business

None.

8. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was agreed to be Wednesday 17 April (at 14.00 hrs, the joint TAF TAP meeting at 12.00 hrs) with a potential date for the subsequent meeting on Wednesday 19 June (at 10.30 hrs).