

**TAP TSI**

Telematics Applications for Passenger Services  
Technical Specifications for Interoperability



Project co-funded by the  
European Commission

# **TAP RETAIL CHANGE REQUESTS**

**Project:** TAP Phase One

Release: 1.0 – To DG MOVE, ERA, TAP Steering Committee

Date: 13 May 2012

Author: Ugo Dell’Arciprete (Work Stream Leader)

Owner: TAP Phase One Project Team

Client: DG MOVE, ERA

Document Ref: TAP Retail Change Requests

Version No: 1.0

## 1 Progress History

### 1.1 Document Location

This document will be uploaded to the “TAP TSI/TAP Retail activities/Working documents” folder of the project extranet (members’ area).

### 1.2 Revision History

Date of delivery: 13 May 2012

Revision date	Previous revision date	Summary of Changes	Changes marked
2012-05-13		Final editing	None

### 1.3 Approvals

This document requires the following approvals.

Name/ Entity	Title/ Remark	Approval	Date of Issue	Version
Retail Expert Groups	EG S, EG T, EG R, EG F	Done	Different dates	
Project Team	Project Manager, Work Stream Leaders, Project Assistant	Done	11 May 2012	1.0
TAP Steering Committee	Chairs, members and alternates		15 May 2012	1.0

### 1.4 Distribution

This document is distributed to:

Name/ Entity	Title/ Remark	Date of Issue	Version
Retail Expert Groups	EG S, EG T, EG R, EG F	14 May 2012	1.0
DG MOVE, ERA	Official recipients of the TAP Phase One deliverables	13 May 2012	1.0
TAP Steering Committee	Chairs, members and alternates	13 May 2012	1.0
Project Team; UIC and Ticket Vendor project coordinators	All members of the Project Team and the coordinators involved in the Grant Agreement between DG MOVE and UIC	13 May 2012	1.0

Interested public	On <a href="http://tap-tsi.uic.org">http://tap-tsi.uic.org</a> following TAP Steering Committee approval	tbd	
-------------------	--	-----	--

---

## 1.5 Document maintenance

This document is maintained by the Governance Entity.

Any stakeholder detecting errors or needing clarifications can contact the Governance Entity (e-mail address to be defined).

Until the Governance Entity is operational, stakeholders are invited to contact the following e-mail address: [tap-tsi@uic.org](mailto:tap-tsi@uic.org).

Proposals for additions or updates can be sent to the same e-mail addresses, and will undergo the Change Control Management process described in chapter 4.

## 2 Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Progress History</b> .....	<b>2</b>
1.1	Document Location.....	2
1.2	Revision History.....	2
1.3	Approvals.....	2
1.4	Distribution.....	2
1.5	Document maintenance.....	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Purpose</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Change requests for B.1</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1	General remarks.....	6
4.2	Specific remarks.....	6
<b>5</b>	<b>Change requests for B.2</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Change requests for B.3</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Change requests for B.4</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Change requests for B.5</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Change requests for B.6</b> .....	<b>11</b>
9.1	General remarks.....	11
9.2	Specific remarks.....	11
<b>10</b>	<b>Change requests for B.7</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Change requests for B.9</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Change requests for B.10</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Change requests involving more TDs</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Change requests for Code lists</b> .....	<b>16</b>

### **3 Purpose**

The work done during TAP Phase One to define the detailed IT specifications, as required by Commission Regulation (EU) No 454/2011, has highlighted that the TAP Technical Documents (TDs) contain a certain number of errors, some of them already present in the UIC leaflets from which the TDs have been derived, some introduced in the phase of transformation of the leaflets into TDs.

The Phase One Project Team and ERA have agreed that those errors would not be included in the retail Implementation Guides (containing the detailed IT specifications), but would rather be collected in a separate document, that will also be considered a deliverable of TAP Phase One.

This is the document in question, and the change requests (CRs) listed here will undergo the TAP CCM process. The Phase One Project Team has created separated documents further detailing the CRs presented in this document. These documents form the basis for uploading the CRs to the ERA Change Control Management workflow tool so they can be dealt with efficiently in the CCM process.

## **4 Change requests for B.1**

---

### **4.1 General remarks**

- For all points of B.1 where is stated that the RU must “send” data, the verb “send” must be replaced by “make available”. As a matter of facts, the TAP does not request the RUs to send data to anybody, they must only make them available (e.g. on an FTP server) to all actors authorised to get them.
- For all points of B.1 where is mentioned “Non reservation tickets”, this expression must be replaced by “Non-integrated reservation tickets”, since this is the official meaning of the acronym NRT as stated in the TAP glossary.
- In different positions, indications are given in the form “should”. Since the law must be unambiguous, those verbs must be replaced by “must”.

---

### **4.2 Specific remarks**

- 2.6: either here, or in Annex III of the Regulation, must be introduced the statement “Data are to be supplied not later than 15 September of year N for tariffs valid from December N as at the official annual change-of-tariff date (15th September).”
- B.2.2: specialty: If the departure or destination station is a fare reference station, the value "17-character route description" will be used for the name of departure or destination station.
- E : the entire table E is no more used, should be cancelled.

---

## 5 Change requests for B.2

- Annex 3, field 7 and Annex 5, field 6: the reference to code “ISO 3166-1 alpha-3” should be replaced by “ISO 3166-1 alpha-2”, the coding system used in all other TAP documents for countries
- Annex 6, 4<sup>th</sup> column: for elements 7 and 9 the value “2” must be replaced by “3” (this is necessary to allow the indication of a number of hours > 9, plus ± sign). For element 7 in column “Pos. Of char.” the value “18-19” must be replaced by “18-20”. All following values in this column must be augmented by 1 (element 9 already has 3 positions)
- Annex 7, 4<sup>th</sup> column: for element 19 the value “3” must be replaced by “4” (this is the length of the border point codes in referenced code list B.2.9) In column “Pos. Of char.” the value “85-87” must be replaced by “85-88”. All following values in this column must be augmented by 1
- Annex 8, field 6 and Annex 8b, fields 6 and 8: the name of the station is defined as 20 alphanumeric, but this length is not standard in the locations database. Provisionally the IG requires to use the 17 characters name, that is standard in the locations database, followed by three blanks, but for a better automated management of data it should be evaluated the possibility of modifying the definition of this field to 17 characters.

---

## 6 Change requests for B.3

- Page 11: the technical Document B.3 states “In order to facilitate the access to the data made available by each individual RU as far as possible, it is necessary to give clearly-defined names to the files. The name shall be composed of the four-character table designations defined in the appendices to this Technical Document, and the four-digit Company code of the data originating RU”. In contrast with this standard, the name of the header file is defined with a three-character table designation as TCVxxxx (xxxx being the four-digit Company code). It is proposed to keep this name as is for compatibility with B.1, and add “(except the header file which has a three-character table designation)”
- Page 62: the table of facilities must be cancelled from here, there is already the reference to Code list B.3.4, keeping the table here risks inconsistencies
- Page 63: the table of train categories must be cancelled from here, there is already the reference to Code list B.3.3, keeping the table here risks inconsistencies.

## **7 Change requests for B.4**

- the following segments are never used in B.4, should be marked as “Not applicable”
  - ERI Application error information
  - ADS Address
  - CON Contact information
  - ERI Application error information
  - NME Name

## **8 Change requests for B.5**

- Chapter 3.1 element 6  
The table should be completed with two columns for Type of service 8 and 9, that are also defined in code list B.5.6
  
- Chapter A.2.0, last line  
The expression “in principle” is ambiguous, it should clarified what the system must do (if needed more options depending on clear criteria)
  
- Chapter A.2.5  
There should be a sequence diagram describing this case

---

## 9 Change requests for B.6

---

### 9.1 General remarks

- For all layouts there are only indications of how many positions in the grid can be occupied, but no indication of a minimum font size, therefore it could be possible to print in a field a large amount of information using an excessively small font, creating reading difficulties for the controlling staff. A minimum font size should be defined

---

### 9.2 Specific remarks

- Page 56 Field 5: the list cannot be “not exhaustive”, the specifications of B.6 must be clear
- Page 63 Rows N/O: the list cannot be “not exhaustive”, the specifications of B.6 must be clear
- Page 143+, C.1.1: the numbers on the left 177, 242, etc. refer to the list of elements that had to be encoded on the magnetic stripe of ATB tickets, as defined in Appendix D of UIC leaflet 918-2. For the scope of TD B.6 those numbers should be cancelled or renumbered starting from 1.
- Page 147 element 196: the acronyms IV,IR,BP,IQ,IM,IO,IP,IK,IT derive from the list of elements that had to be encoded on the magnetic stripe of ATB tickets, as defined in Appendix D of UIC leaflet 918-2. For the understanding of TD B.6 it is necessary to repeat in B.6 their meaning.

---

## 10 Change requests for B.7

- 3.1 9<sup>th</sup> sentence: the second language is not optional. If the language of the sales interface is not English, the designation of the contract of carriage must also be written in English
- 3.2.2: in the NB the logo to be printed in the top left corner is the one of the issuer
- 3.2.3: in “Description of the elements” not all elements are printed in the language of the distributor. The texts in row 1 and 2 must be written in the language(s) defined in 3.1 9<sup>th</sup> sentence, the station names must be written in the language of the country in which the station is located, according to the specifications of Technical Document B.6, section 2.1.2
- 9: this whole chapter can be ignored, as optional, unclear and lacking the corresponding XSD scheme. Anyway the message ID cannot be CA which is already Cancellation Acknowledgement.

## **11 Change requests for B.9**

- Page 11, 6<sup>th</sup> line: the sentence “It is up to an Infrastructure Manager to decide which of its locations are to be coded” is in contrast with the sentence on page 7 “Any location, required for the railway operations and the business process of the COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 454/2011 is to be coded as railway location”
- Page 13, 7<sup>th</sup> last line: chapter 7.2 of TAP does not define any body charged with the allocation of codes.

---

## 12 Change requests for B.10

- In different points of chapter 6 Page there is a reference to a “passenger data catalogue” but it’s never explained what it is
- In different points of chapter 6, from 6.2 to 6.16, the attributes listed for the entities do not correspond exactly to the ones shown in the diagram on page 17
- Page 32: in the diagram are mentioned messages “booking failure” and “message received” never defined
- Page 34, 8.1.2: the indicated namespace “<http://www.era.europa.eu/schemes/TAPTSI>” does not exist
- Page 35, 8.5: the versioning process of technical elements (XML, XSD) must be coordinated with the CCM process.

## 13 Change requests involving more TDs

- The tariff codes are managed differently in different documents. B.2 and list B.5.42 (also referenced as B.2.2) presents the tariff codes as 2-digit values valid universally. In reality 99 codes are not enough to define all possible tariffs created by the various entities. A technical solution had been defined at UIC to allow the use of 4-digit codes (extend the field to 6 digits and, this solution is in theory referenced in B.5, but in reality is not used. In reality the praxis is to attribute to each tariff code on 2 digits a meaning specific for an entity
- In B.2 there is reference to a code list of Distribution channels, defined in B.2.8. In B.5 there is reference to a code list of Type of requesting office or type of protocol message, defined in B.5.8. The two lists are for most part overlapping, but not entirely. It should be evaluated if it is possible to unify them
- In B.2 there is reference to a code list of Entity codes, defined in B.2.1. In B.4 there is reference to a code list of Item description codes (codes from 46 upwards), defined in B.4.7009. The two lists are for most part overlapping, but not entirely. It should be evaluated if it is possible to unify them.

## **14 Change requests for Code lists**

- The Code list “B.4.7009 - Name: Item description code” is used for codes 1 to 45 to designate the Service Mode, and for codes from 46 upwards to designate the Service Brand. This coexistence risks creating confusion. It should be evaluated if it is possible to create two distinct Code lists.