

TAP SC2	Version 02
SR	origin EN
04.10.2011	status A

## TAP Phase one –Minutes

### Second meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE

8 July 2011

#### **1. Welcome**

The two co-chairmen welcome the participants.

#### **2. Adoption of the agenda**

Point 7 withdrawn. No document available.

#### **Together:**

#### **3. Introduction of the project team**

#### **4. Introduction of new observer(s)**

All the attendees introduced themselves.

In particular:

- Project team Manager: Rütger Fenkes
- Project team members: Ugo Dell'Arciprete, Dominique Margottin, Sebastian Naundorf, Rob Parkinson, Chris Querée
- Project Assistant: Isabelle Fonverne
- new observers: Simon Fletcher, UIC and Jan Möllmann, EPTO

#### **5. Adoption of minutes of the first meeting**

Adopted.

#### **6. Adoption of the steering committee rules of procedure**

Adopted.

The secretariat is asked to prepare a clean version of the document. Separate the composition of the steering committee. Spelling mistake in surname to be corrected.

#### **8. Project description and project work programme including a timetable**

Legal base: the Commission stresses that the legal base of TAP TSI (454/2011) is the interoperability Directive.

Project objectives:

- The TAP Phase One shall indicate in a clear and unambiguous manner how the provisions of the TAP TSI shall be implemented in order to ensure that the expected system is up and running in due time.
- The TAP Phase One has to be elaborated within max. 12 month after the publication of TAP TSI (13 May 2011 to 13 May 2012).

Functional scope: the project covers most of the basic parameters (BP) (except 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6.1, 4.2.7.1, 4.2.8.1) and also addresses gaps towards a full-service model. The Commission insisted that BP 4.2.13 remains in the project: "Handling of information provision in vehicle area". The SteCo agreed, however, that the Project Team will not develop contents for this Basic Parameter, but will make sure that questions about the company-specific implementation plans will be included in any relevant sending to the implicated RUs so as to remind them of their obligation to comply.

Discussion on the geographical scope will be held at steering committee meeting 3. Top-level summary of what the Project is, and what it is not:

What is TAP phase one?

- A transformation of the legal obligations in 454/2011 into a concrete design
- The definition of the full-service model requirements providing a modern basis for ticket vendor and rail sector interoperability
- A coordinated step in the development of European rail distribution and passenger rail operations
- A complex project with
  - ambitious quality goals
  - multiple stakeholders
  - limited time, resources and budget
- A new experience of collaboration within a regulatory framework

TAP Phase One is not

- The build and run phases of “the system”
- An opportunity to change or extend Regulatory obligations
- A think-tank for integrating ideas by parties not involved in TAP Phase One
- A vehicle to change ERA TDs – but the project will ~~investigate~~ **identify (when they arise)** where, and what kind of, changes are useful for the ERA CCM process to follow-up on
- Compliance-checking the individual RU implementation of those BPs that need to be implemented by 13 Nov. 2011:4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6.1, 4.2.7.1, 4.2.8.1

The Project Team has based its work planning on the primary assumptions.

Among them

- Project strictly limited to fulfil the requirements of the Regulation plus the full-service model requirements (agreed between railway and ticket vendor associations)
- Steering Committee gives guidance to the Project Team if requested and takes decision (in accordance with the rules of procedures) on the progress reports in a timely manner to ensure execution of the project in time and budget

The role and responsibilities are defined in the Commission Regulation 454/2010. The following table gives some details.

Role	Responsibilities
<b>SteCo &amp; ERA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>See rules of procedure (agenda item 6), and 454/2011 Chapter 7 re ERA contribution</i></li> <li>▪ Members of the SteCo keep their associations' members informed</li> </ul>

<b>Project Manager (PM)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Leads, drives and manages the project based on SteCo instructions and guidance</li> <li>▪ Ensures quality results are delivered to SteCo expectations within time and budget</li> <li>▪ Acts as the link between SteCo and Project Team and the ERA</li> <li>▪ Ensures transparency and adequate stakeholder representation</li> <li>▪ Develops and manages the execution of the stakeholder communication plan</li> <li>▪ Monitors consistency of approaches across work streams</li> <li>▪ Produces monthly progress reports and intermediate report</li> <li>▪ Consolidates project output into a consistent master plan and set of final deliverables</li> <li>▪ Escalates issues to the Steering Committee, if necessary</li> <li>▪ Manages the Project Assistant</li> </ul>
<b>Work Stream Leaders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lead, drive and manage respective Work Streams on a day-to-day basis</li> <li>▪ Provide detailed planning and define resource needs (expertise, skills, work load)</li> <li>▪ Ensure Work Stream delivers quality results, milestones are met and stakeholder buy-in</li> <li>▪ Provide structured input for monthly progress reports and intermediate report</li> <li>▪ Manage interfaces with other Work Streams and relevant initiatives (e.g. TAF TSI)</li> <li>▪ Escalate issues to the Project Manager, if necessary</li> </ul>
<b>Expert Group Members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Help deliver quality Work Stream deliverables by contributing expertise and time</li> <li>▪ Form the informal Phase One network of experts</li> <li>▪ Serve as multipliers for the project within their respective organisations</li> </ul>

The project will be supported by experts: so far, around 30 experts from UIC and 12 from ticket vendors. UITP/ EPTO ready to contribute (may send experts to the working groups as well). UNIFE might send experts as well.

Each project team member presents his work stream: RU/IM work stream, retail system specifications work stream, retail system architecture work stream, full-service model work stream, governance work stream, master plan work stream, overall project management and stakeholder engagement

Regarding the RU/IM work stream, the expected deliverables are revised message catalogue B.30 & change requests, description of reference files, data quality (and mgt.), system design, service level obligations & draft revised specs needed for TAP change to TAF Common Interface (attention should be paid to keep the change resquests to the minimum), project plan for central functions. Commission reminds, however, to limit the changes in B.30 to the strictest necessary in order not to block the ongoing development and deployment of TAF TSI.

Regarding the retail system specs work stream, the expected deliverables are (1) a description of the main systems in use or under development and a summary of issues and opportunities arising from the analysis and (2) a description of the existing user guides studied by the Expert Groups and new unified standard user guides.

Regarding the retail system architecture work stream, the expected deliverables are Common 'Info Exchange Architecture' description, functional and technical requirements for the reference files and databases and a list of duly justified and described changes/ evolutions that need to be addressed. Attention should be paid to synergies/integration with TAF.

Regarding retail system specs and architecture, the Commission requested that attention is paid to reservation for assistance to PRM, bikes and cars; it should be described what TAP will (and won't) mean for PRM assistance booking.. Moreover, the issue of discussing settlement/revenue sharing is raised, although settlement is not part of TAP TSI.

Regarding the work stream full-service model the key activities aim to create the initial model of requirements for end-to-end full-service model (from pre-sales to post-sales) by reviewing the findings and making a gap analysis.

The ETTSA representative stressed that besides the design of the future TAP system, there is a need to reflect on settlement/revenue sharing. The SteCo shared the view that this is not part of TAP but we need to keep an eye on it.

Regarding the governance work stream, the deliverables will be the structure and responsibilities for the operation of the system, including entity administration requirements and funding issues. The goal is that proposals are supported by the ones who will have to pay for it.

Regarding the Master Plan work stream, deliverables are costed implementation plans and life cycle cost analysis.

Regarding the overall project management and stakeholder engagement, one first key action is the launch of the web site of the project after the summer break and the collaborative extranet (Commission asks the PM, however, to ensure that web site's content is aligned with Commission's view on TAP Phase One). There is also a communication plan: in this communication plan it should be considered, where useful, to introduce additional columns for acknowledgements indicating that the affected stake holders have well received the communications and understood them. UITP stresses the importance of informing public authorities/Member States.

On risk management, a clear understanding of risks is needed and project management tool-set will be applied to manage mitigation, but Steering Committee backing is necessary. In particular, it is important to clarify the scope (a dedicated point for the next steering committee), to be strict on agreed rules of procedures, to communicate roles and responsibilities, to have stability of resources.

The PM has explained in his presentation that the PM and the project team will use the PRINCE2 project methodology, procedures and templates for the purposes of

TAP Phase One to ensure its transparent execution. The Project Manager reminded that any project management methodology offers a maximum toolset to manage a project throughout its lifecycle, but that not necessarily all tools and templates have to be applied in their entirety, and that any PM methodology allows pragmatic and customised application.

9. Content and level of detail of the monthly progress report

Goal:

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

Content:

- Management dashboard
  - Overall status (traffic light)
  - Results/ achievements
  - Next steps
  - Issues/ decision requests
- Back-up and supporting documents
  - Timeline overview and milestone tracking
  - Issues log including update on previous issues mentioned
  - Timeline and budget impact of current problems, description of recommended resolution
  - Link to new contents on website

The monthly progress report will be sent on the 5<sup>th</sup> working day of each month, starting with the August report to be submitted by 7 September 2011.

The European Railway Agency will get access from the PM to all TAP Phase One project documents in order to ensure that ERA gets more detailed project information and can perform the monitoring according to chapter 7.2 of TAP TSI.

10. Content and level of detail of the intermediate report

The intermediate report is a crucial process check and will provide a stable assessment of the current landscape and feasible options

Goal:

- Provide SteCo with solid overview of where the project stands and where it is heading
- Allow SteCo to re-adjust priorities or reduce complexity as deemed appropriate
- Provide Project Team with stable framework for the remaining time

Content

- Overall:
  - Assessment of quality, timeline and budget status
    - Milestones achieved, missed, at risk
    - Budget (items expensed, committed)

- Stakeholder engagement
- Review of appropriateness of communication tools
  - Risks and recommended mitigation
- Governance Work Stream:
  - Set of governance options
  - Recommendation of preferred option
- RU/ IM Work Stream:
  - Summary on operations management issues
  - Report on first results (e.g. usage of TAF)
  - Architecture options
- Retail system Work Streams:
  - Report on legacy systems and existing user guides
  - Architecture options
- Full-service model Work Stream:
  - Draft process model
- **Master plan Work Stream:**
  - Templates for implementation costing and roadmap planning

The European Railway Agency will get access from the PM to all TAP Phase One project documents in order to ensure that ERA gets more detailed project information and can perform the monitoring according to chapter 7.2 of TAP TSI.

#### 11. Communication – seminars - web site

Phase One project communication needs to address the different information needs of multiple stakeholders in a pragmatic way.

Starting point for the planning and efficient, but targeted execution of communication activities is the prioritisation of stakeholder groups.

Communication plan will be completed once the Project Team is fully operational and project roles & responsibilities are agreed by the SteCo.

Key features of the national seminars are to allow all stakeholders to be informed on TAP TSI. This can be done after May 2012.

#### 12. Next meetings

TAP SC 1	27 May 11
TAP SC2 – kick-off meeting with the project team	8 July 11
TAP SC3 – follow-up	4 October 11 – 14:00-17:00
TAP SC 4 – interim deliverables	22 November 11 – 10:00-16:00
TAP SC 5 – follow-up	10 January 2012 -10:00-15:00
TAP SC 6 – final deliverables	Before 13 May 12

#### 13. A.O.B

The European Railway Agency reported to the SteCo that the PRINCE2 project methodology, procedures and templates must be used properly and in the right sequence for the purpose of TAP Phase One to ensure a transparent execution: each PRINCE2 phase/stage has to create a mandatory set of management products (reports, logs, registers) and to trigger mandatory events/decisions. In this context ERA highlighted that the TAP Phase One project at this stage seem to be at the PRINCE2

"Starting up a Project" phase. This means consequently that maybe a Project Brief (and not a PID) has been sent to EC/SteCo.

## Annex 1: Actions list

Action number	description	Actor	deadline	status
1	Bilateral meeting between co-chairpersons to agree on - organisational aspects - agenda of SC2	EC(co-chairperson) CER (co-chairperson)	Before 23/06/12	done
2	Send invitation and agenda	EC (secretary)	24/06/12	done
3	Send all the documents to the steering committee members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– updated draft rules of procedures</li> <li>– draft mission statement</li> <li>– project description</li> <li>– project work programme including a timetable</li> <li>– content and level of detail of the intermediate report</li> <li>– content and level of detail of the monthly progress report</li> <li>– others if any</li> </ul>	EC (secretary)	01/07/12	done
4	clarification of the distinction between TAP/interop directive, and the passengers' rights regulation. <b>+ scope</b>	EC	at a next meeting	At SC3
5	Send to the co-chairpersons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– project</li> </ul>	Project team Manager	23/06/12	done

	description – project work programme including a timetable – content and level of detail of the intermediate report – content and level of detail of the monthly progress report			
6	Justification of UIC & EPTO as observers + CV of representatives	CER, UITP	Before 23/06/12	done
7	Nomination of alternates	all	Before 23/06/12	done
8	Project Manager to send the updated PID		Before end August	
9	PID approval	Co-Chairpersons	Within 2 weeks of receiving the PID	
10	Project team to send RU questionnaire to UITP and EPTO			Done in the meantime

## Annex 2: attendees

CER (co-chair)	Libor Lochman
EC (co-chair)	Patrizio Grillo
EC (secretary)	Isabelle Vandoorne
EIM	Michael Purcell
EPF	Rian van der Borgt
ERA	Mickael Varga
ETTSA	Hans Egon Jorgensen
UITP	Sarah Kendall
UNIFE	Eric Fontanel
ECTAA (observer)	Robert Edward Parkinson
EPTO (observer)	Jan Möllmann
UIC (observer)	Simon Fletcher
Project Manager	Ruetger Fenkes
Project team member	Ugo Dell'Arciprete
Project team member	Dominique Margottin
Project team member	Chris Queree
Project team member	Sebastian Naundorf
Project team assistant	Isabelle Fonverne