



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

13TH TAP STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

17 APRIL 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
John Lutz	TAF Deployment Manager
Davide Pifferi	Joint Sector Group
Robert Parkinson	ECTAA
Michael Purcell	EIM
Willy Smeulders	EPF
Rian van der Borgt	EPF
Reiner Wilke	CCG
Mickael Varga	ERA
Svend Leirvaag	ETTSA
Simon Fletcher	UIC
Jean Costantini	UNIFE
Jan Möllmann	EPTO
Alexander Stuessi	UITP
Harald Reisinger	RNE
Itai Rabinovici	DG COMP
John Berry	DG MOVE
Dorota Szeligowska	DG MOVE
Linos Voskarides	DG MOVE

1. Adoption of agenda

The proposed agenda was adopted.

2. Minutes of previous Steering Committee (17 January 2013)

In the minutes of the 12th Steering Committee held on 17 January, the phrase "It was agreed that the IT Specifications should be transformed into Application Guides..." under point 3 in page 3 shall be amended to include the words "non-mandatory" and read "...should be transformed into non-mandatory Application Guides...".

Action: a new version should be circulated so that only the final version is published on the project's website.

3. Tariff data exchange between RUs

1. DG MOVE (PG) introduced the item. PG presented section 5 (pages 3 and 4) of the “Note to the TAP-TSI Steering Committee on issues relating to exchange of tariff data”. Commission agrees with the text proposed by CER but wants to add the phrase “without prejudice to passenger rights”, to avoid a conflict between competition rules, passenger rights and the Commission treaties. PG informed that Commission will include this proposed modification of the TAP-TSI. PG further informed that this modification is currently in the Cabinet of VP Kallas, who has not yet agreed to the proposal. TAP PM RF expressed a concern for Item 8 (conclusion) “...but may be should be formalised somehow”. DG COMP (IR) clarified this phrase and proposed an interpretative note. PG suggested a working document of the Committee instead of a formal interpretative note. RF agreed with the added phrase “...without prejudice” but raised the concern that this may postpone the issue to the future. PG explained that such formulation is rather frequent and is only there in case of future complaints. RF further requested to amend the phrase "As above (conventional tariff systems) there could be an issue related to timing concerning the advance exchange of information prior to price increase" in page 4 under "Yield management systems" and move the word “advanced” just before the word “information”, so that the phrase would read "...concerning the exchange of advance information prior to price increase".

There were no further comments from the committee. EPTO (JM) asked how further comments could be added at a later stage from his colleagues/members. PG answered that all comments for further amendments should be sent to LV. LL noted that the issue has been discussed for more than half a year and thus there should not be any changes to the agreement made at the Steering Committee today. ECTA (RP) asked to receive a revised note. PG accepted.

Action: A revised note will be prepared by LV and circulated to the members.

4. Calendar for the revision of TAP TSI

DG MOVE (PG) commented that the draft revised TAP-TSI has not yet been approved by the Commissioner. PG summarised all modifications included in the proposed TAP-TSI revision. The Steering Committee will be maintained until the end of phase 2 when the governance structure is operational. The amendment asks the Steering Committee to review the legal status of the Application Guides at the end of phase 2. For the Masterplan, Commission will use the same terminology as in the TAF-TSI. Concerning the architecture, it will be mandatory. RF asked whether the governance document would be mandatory. PG replied that Commission would like to include it in the TSI but not necessarily be a compulsory document. The consolidated Master Plan will be added to the TAP-TSI as an annex and published on ERA website. DG MOVE will draft a “non-paper” for the proposed revision of the TAP-TSI and send it to the Steering Committee members.

Action: A “non-paper” will be prepared by LV and circulated to the Steering Committee members.

5. Masterplan Update

The Project Manager (RF) made a presentation and an update on the current status. RF commented that, the project team made an analysis and proposes to indicate for each function the date by which about 80% of RUs can implement that function. ET TSA (SL)

asked for a clarification of this number. RF explained that the 80% corresponds to the positive answers received from all RUs. He clarified however that one answer could come from a group of RUs and he gave the example of ATOC, who was considered as one response although it has many members (26) for the number of members that responded to the request. He also commented that the approach of the TAP planning is very much like the TAF planning. He proposed that the 80/20 rule be put in the final document and asked the Steering Committee whether the decision for the Masterplan should become mandatory or not, knowing that in the case of TAF the following rule was applied: the date is mandatory for the companies that did not submit a company plan, but not mandatory for those that submitted it. ECTAA (RP) asked what will happen with the 20% who, according to the survey, cannot meet the target date. EIM (MP) stated that the Masterplan should include a statement saying that "each MS has to comply with it". RNE (HR) commented that no company should be obliged to apply it before the mentioned date. PG commented that the approach proposed by the project team seems to be discriminatory. He added that he wants to have either one date to be mandatory for everybody or a recommended date. EPTO (JM) stated that sometimes NCP did and do not contact small railways companies to inform them about their obligations. PG agreed with the 80/20 rule, the question however is whether it will be mandatory or not. RNE (HR) reminded that for the functions common to TAF and TAP (typically IM/RU functions) the text (and date) proposed in the TAP should be the same as proposed in the TAF Masterplan. UITP (AS) commented that he is more in favour for a "strong recommendation" and mentioned the example of CH. ETTSA (SL) stated that if somebody does not respect a date but has a better solution, it would be better to have this solution as well included in the package. RF raised concerns whether such a solution would be permissible under the Regulation, to which PG replied positively. RF intends to deliver the Consolidated Master Plan during the week 22-26 April.

Actions:

- RF to submit consolidated MP as soon as possible
- LV/ERA to check MP
- MP to be circulated to the whole SteCo for comments

6. Update on Phase Two transition work

The Project Manager gave a brief presentation and an update of the transition work. RNE (HR) mentioned that there can be some open points to be discussed with ERA on the transition work. RF stated that there was a delay due to unforeseen TAF work (input to TAF revision work) that had to be done. In case of additional delays, HR will convene an ad hoc meeting with the project team.

7. Overview of the current initiatives related to TAP, multimodal journey / ticketing

DG MOVE (DS) gave an update of the initiatives regarding multimodal information and travel planning services. The ITS Action Plan (2008) contains an action dedicated to the promotion of multimodal journey planner. In the scope of this action, a study "Towards a European multimodal journey planner" was completed in 2011. It was followed by the 1st Smart Mobility Challenge on multimodal journey planners. EU-wide Multimodal Travel Information Services are also one of the priority actions determined by the ITS Directive (2010), for which specifications (of functional, technical, organisational or service

provision nature) will be prepared by the end 2014. The preparatory work includes online public consultation that run between 19 December 2012 and 12 March 2013..MOVE/C3 is currently analysing the results of the public consultation. A follow-up workshop took place on the 16 April and soon the first meeting with MS experts will be organised. The results will be discussed in an informal meeting in Dublin with ITS Committee and ITS Advisory Group. CER (LL) asked about the working group with MS. DS explained how this group is working. LL and PG asked a clarification about the specifications. DS explained that such specifications are adopted as the delegated acts and that these specifications (from Unit DG MOVE C3) are less technical (can be only functional or organisational, etc.) and shorter compared to DG MOVE B2 specifications. Further to a question from CER (LL) DS commented that the development of specifications is done in cooperation with experts from the Administrations. Further to a request by ECTAA (RP) PG commented that a more detailed presentation from C3 could be foreseen for a future Steering Committee. PG suggested also that, if necessary, bilateral meetings can be held with DG MOVE C3.

Action

LV will provide C3 Dorota's details to all members of the Steering Committee.

DG MOVE (JB) gave an update on the progress of the STTP. DG MOVE works closely with DG RTD and DG CONNECT. He commented that a 6 billion € fund would be made available for transport research and will be split between the different DGs. The whole multimodal research will be realised within the 8th framework programme. JB gave also an update on the Preparatory Action (awarded to an Amadeus-led consortium) that kicked off on 2 April and that will focus on multimodal information and ticketing. This PA will be organised in two phases: first a study, potentially followed up by proofs of concept in the second phase (conditional to the results of the study). He explained why the consortium was awarded the contract in comparison with the other tenderers. EPF (WS) asked whether the passengers were included in the plans of Amadeus. ETTSA (SL) (on behalf of Amadeus) replied that yes. UIC (SF) proposed to include ERRAC in the loop of the proposals. PG proposed to inform ERRAC's secretariat. RF asked clarification on the "call on voluntary basis". JB clarified that this is part of phase 1. RF asked how is this study related to "Shift2Rail". JB replied that there is no formal connection with "Shift2Rail" but the issues are being conducted from the same unit and there will be every opportunity for 'symbiosis'. SF commented that there can be interrelations between them. EPTO (JM) asked how will urban transport be considered in this project? JB answered that this should be done in the second phase. SL (on behalf of Amadeus) confirmed that the representative bodies will be invited to join the PA's advisory board.

8. Any Other Business

None.

9. Date of next meeting

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