

TAP TSI

Telematics Applications for Passenger Services
Technical Specifications for Interoperability

MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT **Reporting Month: September 2011**

Project: TAP Phase One

Release: 1 – To TAP Steering Committee

Date: 2 October 2011

Author: Rütger Fenkes (Project Manager)

Owner: TAP Phase One Project Team

Client: TAP Steering Committee

Document Ref: 20111002 TAP Phase One_Report September
2011_final

Version No: Final (v1.0)

1 Monthly Progress History

1.1 Document Location

This document will be uploaded to the Steering Committee folder of the project extranet (members' area).

1.2 Revision History

Date of this revision: 2 October 2011

Date of next revision: 4 October 2011 (meeting of the Steering Committee)

Revision date	Previous revision date	Summary of Changes	Changes marked
1 Oct 2011	30 Sep 2011	Contents enhancements and wording modifications by Project Team	None

1.3 Approvals

This document requires the following approvals.

Name/ Entity	Title/ Remark	Approval	Date of Issue	Version
Project Team	Project Manager, Work Stream Leaders, Project Assistant	done	2 Oct 2011	v0.1
TAP Steering Committee	All members	Pending	4 Oct 2011	Final (v1.0)

1.4 Distribution

This document is distributed to:

Name/ Entity	Title/ Remark	Date of Issue	Version
TAP Steering Committee	All members	2 Oct 2011	Final (v1.0)
Project Team; UIC and Ticket Vendor project coordinators	All members of the Project Team Michael Stevns (UIC) Klaus Kreher (Ticket Vendors)	2 Oct 2011	Final (v1.0)
Organisations represented in SteCo	Circulation tbd by Steering Committee members	Tbd	Final (v1.0)

2 Table of Contents

	Page
1 Monthly Progress History	2
2 Table of Contents	3
3 Purpose	4
4 Management Summary	4
5 Follow-ups from Previous Reports	5
6 Activities since Last Monthly Report	6
7 Activities Completed in Reporting Month	8
8 Issues and Risks Occurred, Proposed Mitigation	9
9 Work Planned in Upcoming Reporting Month	10
10 Activities to be Completed in Upcoming Reporting Month	11
11 Budget Status	12
12 Suggested Agenda Items for Next Steering Committee Meeting	12

Progress Report

3 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to report, on a monthly basis, the status and progress of the Phase One project to the Steering Committee (SteCo) and interested stakeholders.

The following reporting goals have been approved by the SteCo in the kick-off meeting with the Project Team on 8 July 2011:

- Ensure all SteCo members and stakeholders are kept up to date with progress at regular, short intervals
 - Allow the Project Manager to raise issues in-between SteCo meetings and to make better use of SteCo members' time constraints
 - Highlight where SteCo action is required and help focus upcoming SteCo meetings
 - Explain in more detail the project achievements and next steps
-

4 Management Summary

Whilst the **grant contract** is still **not signed**, September saw good progress in the **work streams working to plan. Legacy surveys** have been **closed**¹. Despite limited response, some **valuable initial findings** have been extracted and complemented with input from the first rounds of Expert Group meetings.

The RU/ IM work stream identified several **TAF TSI messages** that would need **to be modified** in order **to accommodate passenger RU requirements**. The order of magnitude and feasibility are currently being assessed in the jointly staffed Expert Groups.

The retail experts have pointed out **practical issues with** some of the Technical Documents. Notably, **B.1 to B.3** (tariff data) are not considered suitable for state-of-the-art data exchange. The team is currently investigating how to best address this. Eventually, alternatives to realising the objectives of the Regulation in the area of tariff data exchange may have to be elaborated.

The Project Team is aware that there are **multiple initiatives outside of the Phase One** project that are more or less related to TAP TSI, but not under the responsibility and control of the Project Team. The **team is keen to liaise** with any such initiative and asks the Steering Committee to inform of any need to interact.

The project **website** (<http://tap-tsi.uic.org>) **and extranet** have gone **live**. Traffic shows growing interest by a diverse audience.

¹ Exception: Ticket Vendor survey due to close on 4 October

5 Follow-ups from Previous Reports

Brief status update on issues and risks highlighted in the August report:

Issues and Risks (see August report, Chapter 8)	Status (as of 30 September 2011)
Grant only awarded almost two months after publication of the Regulation; grant contract negotiations still ongoing – at least 1/3 of the formal Phase One project will now be undertaken prior to the grant signature, with a risk that it will not be possible for the UIC to receive co-funding for all the team work done	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant contract still not signed • Retroactive date (12 May 2011) for eligible costs accepted by DG MOVE • UIC and its partners are asked to provide the necessary documents to the Commission asap
Insufficient quality of RU contact details in ERADIS database poses the risk that a significant number of stakeholders does not receive Project Team communications at all, or in a timely manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM² invited to present to the next RISC³ in November; MS⁴ will be asked to provide contacts of implicated RUs and to keep national stakeholders informed • ERA has been informed of the issue
Insufficient involvement of the stakeholders outlined in § 7.2.2.1 5. of the Regulation: currently no Expert Group members from these companies, hardly any response to legacy surveys and no solid contact list for future project communication purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UITP, EPTO have been encouraged to provide written input and feedback if attending meetings is not feasible • PM will give a presentation to EPTO on 1 November and to the German public transport operators (VDV) on 6 October • PM offers to present to UITP, PTAs and other stakeholder groups
Stakeholders' confidentiality concerns to provide information in the legacy surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team reminded stakeholders of § 7.2.2.1 6. (stakeholders shall provide information as and when requested by the Project Team) • Project Team contracts will contain a confidentiality clause
Unclear who is officially mandated to provide information on TAF TSI and who is the official voice when discussing common elements and governance for maintaining codings, references etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue closed; different layers of liaison between TAP and TAF established • Joint TAP/ TAF SteCo meeting envisaged on issues not solved
Several TAF TSI messages, implementation guides etc. are still incomplete. It is not yet all clear which baseline the RU/ IM work stream needs to work to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close interaction between different layers of the TAP and TAF project organisations established • Sense of urgency mutually understood
Risk of slow mobilisation of steering-level representatives to identify and assess future governance options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-on-one meetings of Project Team members with some steering-level representatives initiated

² Project Manager

³ Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee of the EU Member States

⁴ Member States of the EU

6 Activities since Last Monthly Report

In the reporting period – with the summer holiday season over and project formation completed – the project gathered substantial speed. The following **overall project management and stakeholder engagement** activities have been carried out:

- Finalisation and launch of the project website and extranet; ongoing addition of contents
- Initial and follow-up information of stakeholder groups⁵
- One-on-one communications with Steering Committee members and interested parties
- Review of media considered suitable for publishing articles, viewpoints etc. on TAP TSI or specific associated topics
- Bi-weekly Project Team meetings, additional teleconferences
- Day-to-day management of the project and heterogeneous stakeholder interests

Within the work streams, the following key activities have been executed:

1. RU/ IM

- Online survey on railway operational management legacy issues has been closed on 22 September
 - Response from approx. 30 companies: 2/3 RUs, 1/3 IMs, limited response from non-incumbent RUs
 - Following the extended deadline for responses, the report is now being drafted
- Second round of Expert Group meetings took place 20 to 22 September; participation was 10-15 experts per group
 - EG 1 started work on the Path Request Message, based on TAF. Several changes have been proposed that include changing elements, adding elements, changing element status, correcting errors. Experts are asked to assess these changes until next meeting on October 18
 - EG 2 started work on Train Ready Message, based on TAF. Some changes have been proposed that include changing elements, adding elements, changing element status, correcting errors. Experts are asked to assess these changes until the next meeting on 20 October
 - EG 3 started work on the Architecture and location reference files. The general architecture Peer-to-Peer, including SMs, IMs, RUs via Common Interface and reference files on locations, companies and common meta data - similar to TAF - is confirmed by EG 3. Various input questions to EG1, 2 and the Retail work stream are raised, necessary for describing architecture and reference files. Will be dealt with within in the Project Team
- Intensive liaison with the TAF TSI community continued: TAF Chairs in all EG meetings, RU/IM work stream leader attending TAF IM Cluster

⁵ E.g. OSJD seminar on telematics, input to EPTO assembly, rail sector and Ticket Vendor mirror groups

2. Retail system specifications and architecture

- Results of the retail online surveys have been collected and analysed
 - 16 RUs answered the Schedules questionnaire, 15 the Tariffs one, 17 the Reservation one, 14 the Fulfilment one
 - All bar one responses are from incumbent RUs
 - First findings have been summarised in a draft report; for confidentiality reasons no information is given on what exactly each RU answered
 - Although the deadline has expired respondents are still welcome; members of UITP and EPTO have been encouraged to answer at least the most significant questions
- The four Expert Groups (Schedules, Tariffs, Reservation, Fulfilment) had their kick-off meetings on 5, 7, 8 and 9 September
 - 12 - 15 experts, representing RUs and TVs, attended
 - Following presentation of the Regulation and its requirements, first issues and opportunities have been discussed
- A first draft report on the retail legacy systems has been distributed on 25 September to all nominated experts for each of the four groups
- Collection of existing user guides has started
- The retail architecture work stream had its kick-off meeting on 23 September
 - 12 experts (8 RU, 4 Ticket Vendors)
 - Presentation of TAP Phase One
 - Scope of work stream
 - Boundary discussion with respect to Retail Specifications and Full-Service Model work streams
 - First ideas and opportunities identified
 - Deadline for expert input on issues and opportunities was 30 September

3. Full-service model

- Preparation and launch of an exhaustive online survey⁶ on Ticket Vendor legacy systems and areas for improving rail retailing
 - Survey validated by Ticket Vendor and railway experts
 - Early interim analysis indicates a good rate of responses although there is a bias towards Mid and Northern Europe with a weakness in responses from Southern Europe
 - The Ticket Vendor representative associations have sent a reminder to their entire membership on 27 September, specifically highlighting the need for responses from Southern Europe
- Staffing
 - Following calls for experts to the ECTAA and ETTSA members, a total of approx. 15 Ticket Vendor representatives has been nominated
 - A number of additional delegates from both the RUs and the Ticket Vendors have put their name forward to contribute to this work stream
- After an initial kick-off teleconference of the Full-Service Model Expert Group in early September, the first formal meeting is scheduled for 6 October

⁶ https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TAP_Ticket_Vendor_Survey

4. Governance

- Research started into governance methods and structures used by equivalent transport organisations and by non-transport organisations
- Meeting held with IATA
- Regular meetings held with TAF TSI representatives to understand TAF TSI governance and to investigate opportunities for integrated TAP/TAF and RU/IM governance (together with RU/ IM work stream leader and Project Manager)
- Draft working papers prepared on TAP TSI governance responsibilities and entity for Project Team review and discussion
- Meetings scheduled with senior-level CER and UIC representation for discussion on future governance options

5. Master plan

- No material activities yet

Working documents, meeting agendas, minutes etc. are available on the members' area (extranet) of the project website.

7 Activities Completed in Reporting Month

Overall project management & stakeholder engagement

- Website and extranet launched
- Team time and expenses tracking template launched

1. RU/ IM

- Legacy survey closed

2. Retail system specifications and architecture

- Collection and analysis of answers to the retail online surveys
- Kick-off meetings of the four retail Experts Groups and in retail architecture
- Drafting of the first report on the retail legacy systems

3. Full-service model

- Launch of the Ticket Vendor legacy survey
- Joint Project Team/ Ticket Vendor coordinator alignment
- Work stream kick-off teleconference

4. Governance

- Liaison established with TAF TSI to understand TAF TSI governance and to investigate RU/ IM governance opportunities
- First draft working paper on governance responsibilities and legal entity reviewed by and discussed within Project Team
- First expert interviews carried out

5. Master plan

- No activities completed yet

8 Issues and Risks Occurred, Proposed Mitigation

Summary overview of new key issues and risks that occurred in the reporting period (also see Project Team input to the Steering Committee meeting on 4 October):

Issues and Risks	Proposed Mitigation
Retail kick-off meetings highlighted some significant misconceptions of participants about TAP TSI and the Phase One scope and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use consistent wording with respect to the objectives and provisions of the Regulation, for instance by reiterating the Commission FAQs and the legal text itself • Intensify communication about the need to strike a balance between “doing nothing” and “proclaiming the ultimate revolution in rail retailing” • Work stream leaders to provide solid working papers with to help frame discussions
Following in-depth analysis, both RU and ticket vendor architecture experts point out restrictions and shortcomings of the Technical Documents as-is ⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team to assess how the information exchange architecture can best fulfil the intention of the Regulation and accommodate the Technical Documents whilst investigating potentially more far-reaching enhancements
Multitude of initiatives outside of the project that are more or less related to TAP TSI, but not under the responsibility and control of the Project Team ⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team already very actively liaising with many initiatives and identifying synergies • Steering Committee members asked to notify the team of any initiatives that may be conducive to, or have an impact on, Phase One • Bear in mind that Phase One does not mean other ongoing initiatives need to be stopped
Analyses in the RU/ IM work stream show that from a passenger RU point of view, several TAF messages should be modified – TAF may not be in a position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint impact and feasibility assessment by TAF and the RU/ IM work stream • In case issues remain, resolution joint

⁷ Notably B.1 – B.3, B.5

⁸ For instance various smart ticketing projects, bi- or multilateral retail system connectivity projects, PRM assistance booking

to accept these without negative impact on their own planning	TAP/ TAF Steering Committee
Location reference files: RU/IM work stream highlighted areas where retail work stream analysis and review is required in order to ensure consistency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close collaboration between RU/ IM and Retail work stream leaders within the Phase One team; PM supervision
Risk that additional project tasks from TAP CCM process lead to strain on budgeted project resources and loss of project focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM to inform SteCo and ERA CCM management in case extra work cannot be covered as-is in the project • Subsequently, joint assessment of options forward
Proposals from the Governance work stream and their budget implications will need to be agreed by the sector representative bodies prior to the completion of Phase One	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SteCo members asked to add appropriate agenda items to their organisations' meetings in Q1 2012

9 Work Planned in Upcoming Reporting Month

Overall project management & stakeholder engagement

- Further detailing of intermediate report contents
- Presentation of the project at various meetings of stakeholder organisations⁹
- Draft messages and storylines for articles, viewpoints etc. in specialised media
- Ongoing enhancement of website and extranet content
- Preparation of Project Team input to the SteCo meeting on 22 November

1. RU/ IM

- Third round of Expert Group meetings (18 – 20 October)
- Report from legacy survey (drafting the deliverable)
- Continue analysis of RU/ IM messages (focus on path request, path details, train running information and forecast), comparison with requirements for TAP TSI¹⁰
- Confirm changes proposed in September meetings for Path Request and Train Ready Message
- Continue definition of reference data

2. Retail system specifications and architecture

- Participation of RU retail experts to first meeting of the Full-Service Model work stream on 6 October
- Preparation, execution of and follow up to the second meeting of the retail architecture work stream on 21 October; goal: assessing the proposals versus TAP TSI Phase One requirements and constraints

⁹ EPTO Board, TAF TSI Joint Sector Group, UIC Passenger Forum, UIC eBusiness Conference, VDV

¹⁰ With respect to messages, processes, common interfaces, reference data, network architecture

- Completion of the first draft report on the retail legacy systems with issues and opportunities suggested by the experts
- Collection and analysis of existing retail user guides
- Collection of solution proposals and assessment through the prism of TAP TSI Phase One with the goal of selecting the most appropriate solution proposal(s)

3. Full-service model

- Analysis of the online survey results (planned to close on 4 October)
- Ongoing review of the other work stream findings
- Commence development of the Full-Service Model to facilitate gap analysis
- Start developing a proposal for addressing the gaps
- Preparation, execution, documentation of and follow-up to joint Ticket Vendor/ RU kick-off on 6 October

4. Governance

- Governance meeting to be arranged with financial sector representative body (discussion of lessons learned and best practices) and with Ticket Vendor steering-level representatives
- Draft working paper on governance research
- Further TAP/TAF governance meetings
- Draft working paper on TAP TSI governance scope and responsibilities and TAP TSI governance organisation membership and funding
- Meetings with senior-level CER and UIC representation

5. Master plan

- First draft of implementation planning template and approach regarding the retail work streams: required information quality and level of detail
- Alignment of harmonised template and approach to RU/ IM implementation planning between TAP and TAF

10 Activities to be Completed in Upcoming Reporting Month

Overall project management & stakeholder engagement

- Table of contents and level of detail of Intermediate Report
- Financial reporting toolset
- Planning of publications in specialised media
- Various presentations about TAP TSI to stakeholder organisations

1. RU/ IM

- Report on findings from rail operational management legacy survey

2. Retail system specifications and architecture

- Revised draft report on the retail legacy systems

3. Full-service model

- Online survey closed (planned 4 October - but may need to extend)
- Summary of first findings

4. Governance

- Draft working papers for review on TAP TSI governance responsibilities, scope and entity

5. Master plan

- Agreed RU/ IM implementation planning template and approach with TAF TSI
-

11 Budget Status

In light of the project funding still not formalised, no reporting instruments have been set up other than team time and expense tracking. Due to the ramp-up phase and the holiday season, team costs accrued so far are under-proportional compared to the elapsed project (mid-May 2011 to mid-May 2012).

The Project Team still adheres to the principles laid out in the August report that in a standard project environment work would not have started before funding availability. However, rail and Ticket Vendors together continue work in their exceptional good faith in order to meet the timetable defined in the Regulation.

Costs incurred for the website and extranet amount to approx. 10 k€ (budget: 8 k€; overrun to be compensated with savings made so far in meeting facilities and catering).

12 Suggested Agenda Items for next Steering Committee Meeting

Several topics addressed in this progress report are covered in the Project Team input to the meeting of the Steering Committee on 4 October.

Additionally, the Project Team suggests the following topics for the Steering Committee meeting on 22 November:

- Findings from RU/ IM and retail surveys and Expert Group work: Issues, opportunities, options forward, recommendations
- Full-service model work stream: Gap analysis and options forward, first recommendations
- Endorsement of the detailed Intermediate Report table of contents and suggested level of detail
- Handling of ERA Technical Documents where railway and Ticket Vendor experts consider enhancements or substitutions necessary

Other items may be suggested subject to progress made and issues identified in October.