



TAP TSI

Telematics Applications for Passenger Services
Technical Specifications for Interoperability

TAP SC6
SR
19.03.2012

Version 02
origin EN
status NA

TAP Steering Committee meeting No 6 – Final minutes

6 March 2012, 9:00-12:00, 53, avenue des arts, 1000 Brussels

1. Welcome

2. Adoption of the agenda

It is agreed to go immediately to point 10 then come back to point 4.

3. Adoption of the minutes of TAP SteCo 5

adopted

10. Presentation of retail architecture scenarios

The Project Team representative presents the PPT about Retail Architecture Scenarios which was the Project Team input to the SteCo. This PPT is focusing on how the scenarios were for retail architecture were chosen. Several scenarios have been identified. 2 scenarios presented today. Steco is asked to choose one scenario because there are only 2 months remaining before the deadline. He reminds of tap requirements re architecture in 4.2.21.1 and 7.2.3. There must be minimal impact on existing and safeguard it investment already made.

Description of scenario 1 – file transfer

- ▶ All data types are considered as resources and technically exchanged by moving files
 - Data type : timetable, fares/prices, reference data, e-Fulfilment keys...
 - Producers (RUs) host their data on their own servers
 - Consumers (other RUs, third parties, public authorities...) get the files from the producers' servers

- ▶ A central registry keeps track of all the resources
 - The registry can answer to the following type of questions :
 - “Where and how can I get DB’s timetable data?”
 - “When was the data updated?”
 - The registry has a list of consumers that are interested in given resources
 - Each time producers update their resources, they notify the registry
 - The registry can in turn notify the interested consumers
 - Example : SNCF tells the registry they are interested in DB’s timetable. Each time DB update their timetable, the registry notifies SNCF.

Description of scenario 2 – Central databases for timetable and tariffs/fares data

- ▶ Central timetable database
 - Performs data quality checks (syntax and content)
 - Integrates RUs' timetables into a European timetable
 - Delivers extractions tailored to consumers' business agreements

- ▶ Central fares and prices database
 - Contains fare structure and "initial" prices (NRT, IRT, special fares)
 - Receives price updates for fares available on each trains (IRT)
 - Forwards the price updates to subscribed consumers according to business agreements

- ▶ It is an extension of scenario 1
 - The registry is still required for reference data and e-Fulfilment resources
 - Smaller RUs with lower investment capacities will not be able to fund projects to connect to a central database for fares or timetable

ETTSA remarks that it exists differences functional requirements between timetable and fares. Why having bundled them in scenario?

the Project Team representative: now more and more RU implement market prices (quick reaction). (quota managed fares) Changing the fares is a challenge. Not done at the moment.

Scenario 2 is more ambitious. Scenario 2 is an extension of scenario 1..

The PM highlighted the limited size of central components for scenario 1:

ERA asks more information on data quality checks.

The Project Team representative confirms that for the publication of fare and timetable data a central quality checker tool will be released for all actors by the central governance body.

He confirms that the data released to TVs will have the same timeliness and accuracy as released to other RUs.

DG MOVE underlines that all actors (e.g. TVs, non UIC railways) shall have access to the same content with the same timeliness and accuracy. The data must be released under the same conditions for all actors in a fair and transparent manner.

ERA underlines, that scenario 1 must be developed in a way, which enables scenario 2. Even if a centralized database according to scenario 2 will be set-up, the same database content must be accessible by all actors under fair and transparent conditions.

ETTSA: experience of GDS shows that data quality is always better with a central architecture.

EIM: Does not share that view. Contemporary IT technology no longer needs huge centralised databases that must be fed by companies so that the information in them can be extracted.

Current technology means that information can be shared on a peer-to-peer basis between companies and if that information is what a company is using for its day-to-day operations, it will be more accurate than data that is sent to some central point to meet a legal obligation. There is still a view that centralised data is more accurate because it will have been subject to some processing that will have ensured its referential integrity and manages its consistency. To a certain degree, that is true. But emerging technology means that this is no longer necessary. Techniques are being introduced that means that data in different datastores can share the same context and mappings. Therefore, if it is accessed by a peer company, it will be immediately usable by them and its referential integrity can be shared and assured.

The techniques underpinning this are those such as the use of ontology and semantic reasoning.

These technologies are not all there yet but are on the way and so we need to be preparing for them and thinking in terms of centralised datastores as virtual.

UITP: Data quality is a responsibility of RU.

Pro's and con's of both scenarios are presented.

Regarding smaller RU, the the Project Team representative indicated that pushing data is a disadvantage because it is a huge task to do. Many smaller RU do not have dynamic price. They have NRT. There are however new small players using global price. Small RU only need FTP server. If they have an agreement with another one, e.g. DB, they have to do nothing.

ETPO favors scenario 1.

DG MOVE is not against scenario 1 but more needs to be done to facilitate live last minutes information (current message not possible). He notes that works on B5 (pricing message) is ongoing and deliverable expected by Q2 2013.

ERA reminds that an economic assessment still has to confirm the architecture scenario 1 and that a central quality checker tool must be publicly available and stated in the retail architecture/governance deliverables.

the Project Team representative replies that the order of magnitude is known. PT is working on that.

ETTSA is convinced that, based on the experience from other, deregulated transport industries, that the use of yield managed fares will increase as a proportion of the total volume as competition increases, simply because the RUs can't afford not to. The inclusion of this new message in the TSI is therefore an important step.

The SteCo tentatively (pending receiving the economic evaluation and a description of the data quality management) approved the proposal for architecture scenario 1, with the additional requirement that the new dynamic fares/availability message (for yield managed fares) is covered, probably as a replacement for the current B5. A short-term roadmap should be provided for this. Steco agrees on this "scenario 1+". The availability of rail products through ticket vendors will be similar to the availability through RU systems. No heavy, central

management structure has to be established, but up to market players to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of an architecture that have clear shortcomings in operational terms and by providing market driven solutions.

11. governance

At the last SteCo, the project team was asked to:

- declare the principles from which governance proposals were formed
- display the options that were considered and the reasons for choosing the recommended option
- describe the interaction with the sector organisations.

The principles and the options are described in the new draft presented by the the Project Team representative.

Meetings have been held with:

- CER, EIM, UITP, EPTO
- ECTAA and ETTSA
- several individual RUs.

There has been a general support for the proposals and no persistent opposition presented at the meetings.

Some parties have questioned the need for the entity to be a legal organisation although in general they have recognised the need once the requirements on the entity have been made clear.

Some parties have asked why yet another rail sector body is needed although they have subsequently understood it is needed in recognition of the changed business and legal environment that follows the TAP-TSI Regulation.

The ticket vendors raised a legitimate question in respect of how they could be involved of the governance of non-regulatory aspects, given the good working relationship established in the TAP project. This is being addressed outside the project but any material progress will be reported to SteCo for information.

Contact has been made with the UIC as a candidate supplier to the TAP-TSI governance entity of the technical services described in the draft. The UIC is assessing how this could be done, including extending to TAP stakeholders and third parties the right to participate in the technical work defined in the governance draft. This will be decided at the Commercial and Distribution Forum in April.

EPF asked about the position of the passengers in the governance structure. The project team representative explained he sees the governance as something done by the industry, the public interest being represented by DG MOVE. ERA proposed to have at least an observer seat in the supervisory board for the passengers, to which nobody objected.

The next steps for the governance task are to:

- complete the detailed service definitions as per section 3.1
- make service cost and service charging estimates – life cycle costs
- provide cost and other information needed by funding bodies such as UIC, EIM, TVs, etc
- add detail to the proposals for input to change management
- provide further precision on the detailed governance rules as per chapter 6.

The next issue of the document is due end March and it is planned to have these next steps incorporated.

Comments on the current draft are welcome, especially is submitted by 19 March.

12. Presentation of economic evaluation (methodology)

The PM presents the document Presentation of economic evaluation (methodology). He stressed that in this economic evaluation, only costs will be taken into account but not the benefits. Here the most efficient cost solution will be chosen for the architecture scenarios. Project management stressed that they will concentrate on the two project scenarios.

He stressed that RUs have not delivered too much input to PM on econ eval.

He mentioned that there will be a next meeting with ERA on 08.03.2012.

Conclusion: In the next SteCo (24.04.2012) meeting the PM will show the updated and more detailed econ eval document. This document will contain figures delivered by the stakeholders to PM.

13. Outline of Phase Two transition activities

The PM presents the PPT about Outline of Phase Two transition activities (as Project Manager input). The Project Team recommends several activities to take place between mid-May and republication of the Regulation.

- 1) Parallel to ERA recommendation on deliverables.
 - a) Communicate Phase One deliverables and share know-how, e.g.
 - Execute national seminars
 - Present to rep bodies, associations
 - Inform specialised press
 - b) Respond to questions from ERA
 - c) Feed Change Requests into CCM process
 - d) Prepare business-driven follow-up activities.
- 2) Launch Regulation-driven Ph Two activities
 - a) Coordinate masterplanning
 - Stakeholder kick-off
 - Stakeholder coaching as appropriate
 - Consolidation early 2013
 - b) Prepare TAP governance
 - c) Prepare procurement of central services
 - d) Feed Change Requests into CCM
- 3) Launch business-driven follow-up to Ph One
 - a) RU/ IM follow-up activities
 - b) Full-service model projects (details tbd)

He underlined that work requires funding where it seems to be problematic that sector organizations did not prepare budget for this purpose and TEN-T funding needs 50% payment by the stakeholders.

4. Feedback from the meeting UITP-EPTO-COM-ERA-TAP co-chair-TAP PM held on 9 February 2012 (9:15)

See minutes attached.

5. Feedback from the meetings ERA-project team on options for Technical Documents B1-B2-B3

The PM presents the outcome of the meetings with ERA (Jan and Feb 2012) as follows:

(1) PM and ERA recommend to identify and evaluate a solution in conjunction with the closing of the open points on domestic tariffs (enhancement of NeTEx)

(2) ERA asks PM to deliver to ERA asap justification and real use case examples with quantifiable impacts on the rail stakeholders for issues stated in the PM reports.

[PM comment: The PM does not agree the nature of this request qualifies as an option forward and holds the position that justification and real use case examples, illustrating concrete issues, have been explained in-depth in the two meetings.]

(3) Duly justified enhancements of the TDs B.1-B.3 and B.5 to account for the changed tariff landscape (esp. train linked tickets)

(4) PM recommends developing an online interface concept as an alternative way for complying with the TAP requirements (see recommendation to TAP SteCo meeting of 10 Jan).

ERA points out that above conclusion N° 2 is important for ERA in order to show that ERA cannot incorporate issues as moving targets into the rail legislation.

The PM confirms that the retail specifications implementation guide lines will deliver how stakeholders have to implement existing B.1-B.3. In these guides the PM team will highlight possible tariff issues as “warning” but not as “blockers”.

EPTO warns that the ongoing amendments in Netex should not be incompatible with the requirements of public transport.

ERA confirms that this is not the case and NeTEx will serve as plug-in of heavy rail requirements.

6. Decisions on issues raised in the Progress Report

See February report point 8

7. ERA Monitoring Report

Since the last TAP Phase One steering committee (Jan 2012) following is to be reported by ERA:

TAP Phase One project extranet site:

ERA acknowledges the great effort and transparency from the PM team by making available the TAP extranet site hosted at UIC. ERA believes this is the right way to ensure efficient communication during TAP Phase One. Further steps should be undertaken, however, to ensure that

- All minutes/agendas are published for all WG meetings. Minutes should reflect the decisions taken in the meeting and further follow up actions.
- All additional supporting meeting docs (also important emails potentially impacting the decisions of the meeting) are published.

TAP Phase One deliverables:

ERA appreciates the high level of participation of RUs, IMs and TVs in the various WGs of the TAP Phase One work streams. This shows to ERA the high commitment of the stakeholders to contribute to the success of the project.

ERA has to point out, however, that there is a risk that some deliverables will be delayed compared to the planning which was communicated by the TAP Phase One Project Team on 08 July 2012, namely

- Retail architecture users guides for implementation (Jan 2012)
- Description of the retail architecture (Jan 2012)
- Consequently the work streams FSM, Governance and Master Plan risk to be delayed

PS: if above retail architecture is in favour of the ftp scenario then the usage of the registers should be described in sequence diagrams and in detailed use case descriptions.

Quality of TAP retail data:

Quality requirements of retail data were addressed in various TAP Phase One WGs, which is the correct approach to make TAP Phase One happen and to deliver high quality distribution data to all involved stakeholders. ERA does not see, however, for the time being how the chosen retail architecture will ensure that retail data (timetables, fares etc) will pass through efficient data checks for

- integrity,
- quality and
- multiple RU integration.

Moreover, if the ftp scenario is chosen by the retail architects at least a central software component must be made available by the governance body in order to ensure that published data have successfully passed above check so all involved stakeholders can expect an average data quality (see also minutes of the TAP Phase One PM/ERA Meeting on Economic Evaluation of TAP Phase One 31.01.2012).

The PM does not agree with the risk for delay for master plan, governance and FSM.

8. TAP change control management

ERA presents the ERA TAP change control management document which contained a summary of the TAP (and TAF) related CRs and then the details of the individual CRs.

9. Exchange of tariff data: clarification from competition law point of view

DG MOVE has received the formal paper from CER and is consulting DG COMP. DG MOVE will be in a position to provide a reply by next meeting.

14. Next meeting: 24 April 10-16:30 CER

15. A.O.B

16. Closing

ANNEX



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT
Directorate B - European mobility network
B.2 - Single European rail area

Brussels, 16 February 2012
MOVE/B-2/IV

Subject: Meeting UITP-EPTO-COM-ERA of 9 February 2012 on UITP-EPTO position paper on TAP TSI

Attendees: UITP: Sarah Kendall, Mal McGreevy, Dominique Descolas, Jan Moellmann (EPTO), Berthold Radermacher, Ulrich Weber, Brigitte Ollier, Stenerik Ringqvist; TAP TSI SC: Libor Lochman, TAP TSI Project manager: Rütger Fenkes; DG MOVE: Isabelle Vandoorne, Sian Prout, Anna Gigantino, John Berry, Nora Bednarski, Juliet Raffailac, Nicolette Camilleri; ERA: Mickael Varga, Kai Brandstack.

Background: On 8th December, the TAP phase one project team issued the intermediate report. UITP and EPTO commented on it. A number of the comments do not specifically relate to the report, but are of a more general nature. The TAP steering committee co-chairmen, Libor Lochman and Patrizio Grillo proposed to hold a bilateral meeting with UITP and EPTO to address their comments. Moreover, UITP and EPTO forwarded their comments to the Cabinet and to Sian Prout, HoU MOVE B2. The proposed meeting was held on 9 February 2012, in DM24 03/58, from 15:00 to 16:00.

Sian Prout welcomed the attendees and invited them to briefly present themselves. She indicated that issues not covered in the time available for discussion today would be addressed by DG MOVE in written form.

DG MOVE explained that ERA and DG MOVE do not share the analysis made in the position paper re the ERA study on the limit of scope. This report is about how the border should be indicated, not about where the border should be. Any part of the report should not be taken out of this context. In the report ERA neither allows nor forbids exempting anything from the scope of the TSIs. In the report, ERA does not say if something should or should not be in the TSIs.

The general principal of the Interoperability Directive is that it is a Member State responsibility to exclude or not some part of the rail system from the scope of the Interoperability Directive. It therefore falls to a MS to define the limit of what is excluded.

Article 1

3. Member States may exclude from the measures they adopt in implementation of this Directive:

(a) metros, trams and other light rail systems;

(b) networks that are functionally separate from the rest of the railway system and intended only for the operation of local, urban or suburban passenger services, as well as railway undertakings operating solely on these networks;

(c) privately owned railway infrastructure and vehicles exclusively used on such infrastructure that exist solely for use by the owner for its own freight operations;

(d) infrastructure and vehicles reserved for a strictly local, historical or touristic use.

A discussion was held on the meaning of "functionally separate ". This may need further clarification.

TAP TSI applies to the TEN network. TAP is a functional sub-system. General line taken so far by the DG MOVE: it applies to all journeys/services provided on the TEN.

In the context of revision of the OPE TSI (which is also a functional subsystem) related to the mandate of extension of scope, ERA confirmed that it is recommended that the whole rail system (TEN+off-TEN) is within the scope of OPE TSI except all parts that can be excluded.

It is the DG MOVE viewpoint that regional networks does not correspond to the categories candidate for exclusion. If they are off-TEN, they are excluded from the scope of current TAP TSI. If they are on TEN, they are included in the scope of TAP TSI.

Libor Lochman replied that a difference should be made between structural subsystems like RST, ENE, INF and the functional ones (typically TAP/TAF) where rather than the physical border between the networks the type of services shall be the decisive parameter.

Sarah Kendall raised concerns re local cross-border services being regarded as "international service" and as thus fully in scope of TAP TSI.

Link with exemptions of the PRR

The scopes of Regulation 1371/2007 (PRR) and TAP TSI are not aligned today and this adds a layer of complexity. DG MOVE explained that today the TAP scope is basically the TEN and PRR covers all railways journeys and services throughout the EU.

DG MOVE will therefore ask ERA to review the scope of TAP TSI to extend it to the whole network. UITP and EPTO seem not to agree with that and want ERA to exclude per se urban/regional services.

DG MOVE explained that Article 10 of the PRR provides that in order to provide the information and to issue tickets referred to in PRR, railway undertakings and ticket vendors shall make use of CIRSRT. Railway undertakings shall adapt their computerised systems according to TAP TSI in accordance with a deployment plan.

DG MOVE explained furthermore that some exemptions can be made from the scope of PRR, in particular on Article 10, but RUs are, even in this case, obliged to deliver information to the passengers. Member States may, on a transparent and non-discriminatory basis, grant:

- an exemption for their purely domestic railway services for a period of no longer than five years, which may be renewed twice for a maximum of five years on each occasion (making a maximum of 15 years);
- a permanent exemption for urban, suburban and regional services (only 6 MS have permanently excluded urban, suburban and regional services for article 10);
- an exemption for a period of five years, which may be renewed, in case of rail services a significant part of which is operated outside the Community.

ERA then explained a table presented in 2009 on the functions to be applied for (sub)urban and regional services. There was a discussion on the term LA – Local authorities - used in the headings of the table: UITP wanted to know what local authority means. The main outcome of this is that the current TAP TSI requires for (sub)urban and regional services the exchange of information on timetables and the provision of information. The current TAP TSI have obligation to exchange fares information for international and foreign sales only. The table presented by ERA is attached to the annex of the minutes of the meeting.

Addition after the meeting (from the glossary of TAP TSI):

Foreign sale means the sale of a train ticket by an issuer which is not (one of) the carrier(s) operating the train where the ticket will be used. The issuer is located in a country different from the country of the carrier(s)

International rail passenger service means a rail passenger service which crosses a border of at least one Member State

International journey means a passenger journey by rail crossing the border of at least one Member State

International sale means the sale of a train ticket for an international journey

There are open points for the exchange of fares for domestic services.

Conclusions:

- DG MOVE will ask ERA to extend the scope of TAP TSI to off-TEN to be aligned to the scope of PRR.
- It is DG MOVE viewpoint that the TAP master plan should take into account the national exclusions and exemptions.
- UITP and EPTO members are invited to consult their ministry to know precisely what is exempted and excluded.

Libor Lochman noted that majority of rail services do touch/cross the TEN and thus, strictly speaking the current TAP TSI are broadly applicable already today, even without the scope extension. On the other hand while PRR is generally applicable it is questionable whether TAP TSI should apply to the same extent, i.e. to functionally (not necessarily physically) separated urban and regional services.

Sarah Kendall noted that if the MS have the right to define what is in or out of scope cross-border local services might end up being in scope on one end of the line and out of scope on the other end of the line, potentially creating some uncertainties and imbalance. DG MOVE and ERA do not share the viewpoint that inappropriate data systems standards will have to be applied to local bus, tram and metro services, which could lead to poorer information/ticketing provision from the passenger perspective. Indeed, DG MOVE stressed that local urban services could also link to TAP via the NeTex interchange format. ERA makes sure that there is a correspondence between TAP and the Netex formats. Moreover, it is the goal of PRR and TAP to enhance the quality of information provided to the passengers and IS customer-oriented.

Regarding the statement that a solution developed for long-distance travel (5%) dictates the solution for the 95% of rail trips (local), DG MOVE replied that UITP should contribute more. UITP responded that they do neither have the resources (because of the small size of its members) and the EU working structures and their requirements clearly are more adapted to the working structures of bigger organisations, creating difficulties for the representatives of smaller organisations to fully attend ERA WPs and TAP Phase One WGs.

Regarding the involvement of public transport authorities, DG MOVE informed that it has met the representative of the German association BAG SPNV. The TAP Phase one project manager would meet him in Berlin on 10 February and ERA will also meet them. Moreover, it seems that the representatives of some PTA are also representative in RISC. The complexity is that PTA are not yet organised in a European network.

DG MOVE explained that the attendance of DG MOVE showed that the statement "there is no consistent approach of TAP TSI and Urban ITS program, the multimodal journey

planner, the standardisation mandate M/453-06/10/09 ICT, IFM" is taken seriously. The existing DG MOVE internal experts network will continue to cooperate.

A quick explanation was given about the future actions of DG MOVE regarding multimodal information provision, planning and integrated ticketing.

Regarding the questions related to central platform, governance and cost, the attendees noted work is in progress in the project team and results will be discussed in the steering committee.

Isabelle Vandoorne

ANNEX: Table prepared by ERA and sent to UITP representative in autumn 2009

BP	Title	Local Authority's (LA) services automatically within scope ?	LA has to apply following ERA TDs:	ERA TDs pages total to be implemented by LA:	Particularities for LA's services scope ?
4.2.1.	Handling of Timetable data	YES	B.4, B,8, B,9	83	No particularity - LA is within scope.
4.2.2.	Handling of Tariff data	ONLY IF LA DECIDES TO APPLY IT	None	0	Only for tariffs for international and foreign sales as listed in Annex IV of TAP TSI.
4.2.3.	Handling of information on RU contacts	YES	None	0	No particularity - LA is within scope.
4.2.4.	Handling of information concerning conditions of carriage	YES	None	0	No particularity - LA is within scope.
4.2.5.	Handling of information concerning carriage of registered luggage	ONLY IF LA DECIDES TO APPLY IT	None	0	LA is within scope only if this service offered by LA
4.2.6.	Handling of information concerning carriage of PRM	YES FOR SCOPE, NO FOR MESSAGING	None	0	LA is within scope for conditions of carriage. For reservation only if this is offered by LA.
4.2.7.	Handling of information concerning the carriage of bicycles	YES FOR SCOPE, NO FOR MESSAGING	None	0	LA is within scope for conditions of carriage. For reservation only if this is offered by LA.
4.2.8.	Handling of information concerning the carriage of cars	YES FOR SCOPE, NO FOR MESSAGING	None	0	LA is within scope for conditions of carriage. For reservation only if this is offered by LA.
4.2.9.	Handling of availability/Reservation	ONLY IF LA DECIDES TO APPLY IT	(B.5)	(65)	LA is within scope if reservation is offered by LA. Normally there is no reservation in LA trains. In addition to B.5 other standards may be used, if a specific agreement between involved parties exists
4.2.10.	Handling of security elements for product distribution	ONLY IF LA DECIDES TO APPLY IT	None	0	LA is within scope if security elements are for tariffs from BP 4.2.2.
4.2.11.	Handling of fulfilment	ONLY IF LA DECIDES TO APPLY IT	None	0	LA is within scope if fulfillment is for tariffs from BP 4.2.2.

4.2.12.	Handling of information provision in Station area	YES, HOWEVER SEE COLUMN D	None	0	<p>LA is within scope for Stations, where international trains stop.</p> <p>The provisions shall apply only if there has been a renewal, major upgrade or new installation of voice announcements and/or display systems.</p> <p>The station manager decides according to agreements with the railway undertakings and/or infrastructure managers on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The type of information system (Display and/or voice announcement), — The point in time when the information is provided, — The location within the station where the information system will be installed.
4.2.13.	Handling of information provision in vehicle area	YES, HOWEVER SEE COLUMN D	None	0	<p>LA is within scope for trains that cross at minimum the border between two Member States.</p> <p>The provisions shall apply to new or renewed or upgraded rolling stock, if information systems (voice announcements and/or displays) are renewed or installed.</p> <p>The railway undertaking decides on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The type of information system (Display and/or voice announcements), — The point in time when the information will be provided, — The location within a train where the information devices will be installed.
4.2.14.	Train preparation	YES, HOWEVER, WITH ALTERNATIVE POSSIBILITY (see COLUMN D)	(B.30)	(103)	LA is within scope, however, in addition existing standards may be used, if a specific agreement between involved parties exists
4.2.15.	Train running information and forecast	YES, HOWEVER, WITH ALTERNATIVE POSSIBILITY (see COLUMN D)	(B.30)	(103)	LA is within scope, however, in addition existing standards may be used, if a specific agreement between involved parties exists
4.2.16.	Service disruption information	YES, HOWEVER, WITH ALTERNATIVE POSSIBILITY (see COLUMN D)	(B.30)	(103)	LA is within scope, however, in addition existing standards may be used, if a specific agreement between involved parties exists
4.2.17.	Handling of short term Timetable data for trains	YES, HOWEVER, WITH ALTERNATIVE POSSIBILITY (see COLUMN D)	(B.30)	(103)	LA is within scope, however, in addition existing standards may be used, if a specific agreement between involved parties exists