



# TAP TSI

Telematics Applications for Passenger Services  
Technical Specifications for Interoperability

TAP SC3	Version 03	
SR	origin	EN
20.12.2011	status	A

## TAP Phase one –Minutes

### Third meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE

4 October 2011

#### 1. Welcome

The sector co-chairman welcomes the participants. The Commission co-chairman is on mission.

The steering committee welcomes Mr Svend Leirvaag, who will replace Mr Hans Jorgensen (who has retired) as ticket vendor representative.

#### 2. Adoption of the agenda

Revised agenda adopted (addition of 11bis reservation of PRM assistance by the Commission)

#### 3. Adoption of the minutes of TAP SteCo 2

Adopted.

#### 4. Information on the grant

The agreement is still not signed. Main issue: structure of the partnership, reimbursement of travel expenses, legal form of ticket vendors' participation.

Retroactive date (12 May 2011) for eligible costs has been accepted by DG MOVE.

**Action: Ticket vendors to adopt one of acceptable legal forms for the partnership in the project until 15 October. UIC and its partners (ticket vendors representatives) are asked to contact the Commission to solve remaining issues and to provide the necessary documents to the Commission asap.**

#### 5. Progress Report (see details in August and September progress report)

*5a - 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**<sup>1</sup>. 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.

*5b - Issues and risks*

<b>Issues and Risks</b> (see August report, Chapter 8)	<b>Status</b> (as of 30 September 2011)
Grant only awarded almost two months after publication of the Regulation; <b>grant contract negotiations still ongoing</b> – 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"> <li>• Grant contract still not signed</li> <li>• Retroactive date (12 May 2011) for eligible costs accepted by DG MOVE</li> <li>• UIC and its partners are asked to provide the necessary documents to the Commission asap</li> </ul>
Insufficient <b>quality of RU contact details</b> in ERADIS database poses the risk that a significant number of stakeholders does not receive Project Team communi-cations at all, or in a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PM<sup>2</sup> invited to present to the next RISC<sup>3</sup> in November; MS<sup>4</sup> will be asked to provide contacts of implicated RUs and to keep national stakeholders informed</li> <li>• ERA has been informed of the issue</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Exception: Ticket Vendor survey due to close on 4 October

<sup>2</sup> Project Manager

<sup>3</sup> Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee of the EU Member States

<sup>4</sup> Member States of the EU

timely manner	
Insufficient <b>involvement</b> 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"> <li>• UITP, EPTO have been encouraged to provide written input and feedback if attending meetings is not feasible</li> <li>• PM will give a presentation to EPTO on 1 November and to the German public transport operators (VDV) on 6 October</li> <li>• PM offers to present to UITP, PTAs and other stakeholder groups</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholders' confidentiality</b> concerns to provide information in the legacy surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team reminded stakeholders of § 7.2.2.1 6. (stakeholders shall provide information as and when requested by the Project Team)</li> <li>• Project Team contracts will contain a confidentiality clause</li> </ul>
Unclear who is officially mandated to provide information on <b>TAF TSI</b> and who is the <b>official voice</b> when discussing common elements and governance for maintaining codings, references etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue closed; different layers of liaison between TAP and TAF established</li> <li>• Joint TAP/ TAF SteCo meeting envisaged on issues not solved</li> </ul>
Several <b>TAF TSI</b> messages, implementation guides etc. are still incomplete. It is not yet all clear which <b>baseline</b> the RU/IM work stream needs to work to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close interaction between different layers of the TAP and TAF project organisations established</li> <li>• Sense of urgency mutually understood</li> </ul>
Risk of slow mobilisation of steering-level representatives to identify and assess future <b>governance options</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One-on-one meetings of Project Team members with some steering-level representatives initiated</li> </ul>

<b>Issues and Risks</b>	<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>
(see September report, Chapter 8)	
Retail kick-off meetings highlighted some significant <b>misconceptions</b> of participants <b>about TAP TSI</b> and the Phase One scope and objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Intensify communication about the need to strike a balance between “doing nothing” and “proclaiming the ultimate revolution in rail retailing”</li> <li>• Work stream leaders to provide solid working papers with to help frame discussions</li> <li>• <b>See also the glossary in the TAP TSI</b></li> </ul>

<p>Following in-depth analysis, both RU and ticket vendor architecture experts point out <b>restrictions</b> and shortcomings of the <b>Technical Documents</b> as-is<sup>5</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• <b>Project team and ERA to liaise to clarify the issue and to advise the steering committee on them.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Multitude of initiatives</b> outside of the project that are more or less related to TAP TSI, but <b>not under the responsibility and control of the Project Team</b><sup>6</sup></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team already very actively liaising with many initiatives and identifying synergies</li> <li>• Steering Committee members asked to notify the team of any initiatives that may be conducive to, or have an impact on, Phase One</li> <li>• Bear in mind that Phase One does not mean other ongoing initiatives need to be stopped</li> </ul>
<p>Analyses in the RU/ IM work stream show that from a passenger RU point of view, several <b>TAF messages</b> should be modified – TAF may not be in a position to accept these without negative impact on their own planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint impact and feasibility assessment by TAF and the RU/ IM work stream</li> <li>• In case issues remain, resolution joint TAP/ TAF Steering Committee</li> </ul>
<p><b>Location reference files:</b> RU/IM work stream highlighted areas where retail work stream analysis and review is required in order to <b>ensure consistency</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close collaboration between RU/ IM and Retail work stream leaders within the Phase One team; PM supervision</li> </ul>
<p>Risk that <b>additional</b> project <b>tasks</b> from TAP CCM process lead to strain on budgeted project resources and loss of project focus</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PM to inform SteCo and ERA CCM management in case extra work cannot be covered as-is in the project</li> <li>• Subsequently, joint assessment of options forward</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> Notably B.1 – B.3, B.5

<sup>6</sup> For instance various smart ticketing projects, bi- or multilateral retail system connectivity projects, PRM assistance booking

<p>Proposals from the <b>Governance</b> work stream and their budget implications will need <b>to be agreed by the sector representative bodies prior to the completion of Phase One</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SteCo members asked add appropriate agenda items to their organisations' meetings in Q1 2012</li> </ul>

The Steering committee agrees on the proposed mitigation.

The Steering Committee confirms that the monthly progress report satisfies members' information needs. The following reports should focus on content and conclusions of meetings. ERA proposed to separate issues and risks in the next progress report.

However the Steering Committee requests the reports to outline issues of strategic importance, allowing the Steering Committee to take the decisions efficiently.

In order to allow Steering Committee members to discuss details of the project, a workshop will be organised prior to the next Steering Committee meeting.

#### **6. Review of stakeholder engagement strategy: How to ensure broad buy-in?**

The TAP Steering committee agrees that there is a need to raise awareness among PTA (public transport authorities).

#### **7. Confirmation of website and extranet content**

The steering committee confirms the content of the website <http://tap-tsi.uic.org>. Moreover, approved minutes of meetings and project reports should be published on the web site. The extranet should be kept up-to-date. There are too few minutes of meeting available on it.

**Action: Each SteCo members should make sure that there is a link on their web site to the TAP-STI ph1 project web site.**

#### **8. First findings from RU/ IM and retail surveys and Expert Group work**

See progress report and ppt. For decisions on issues, see above in section 5.

#### **9. Options to harmonise TAP/ TAF timelines for the development of common elements**

The project team assumes that as TAP will likely build on TAF common interface and reference files, the timeline will be identical for common elements. However, governance of common elements needs to be defined approx. by February 2012 so it can be taken into account for implementation plans and master planning.

The Steering committee agrees that both TAF and TAP SteCos should co-decide on governance of common elements within the timeframe mentioned.

## 10. Monitoring Report

ERA presents the monitoring of the TAP Phase One Project especially in light of the agreed PRINCE2 project management tool.

The PPT highlights on the slides 6 to 8 in which PRINCE2 phase the project is situated right now (“Start up a Project”), which mandatory actions and documents have been produced by the project team. On the same slides the necessary actions and documents not yet performed are listed too. Normally the next activity for the Project Manager is to request the TAP Phase One Steering Committee to formally confirm initiation of the project (after having received above missing documents). The Steering Committee will confirm afterwards the Project Manager initiation of the project has taken place. ERA reminded that the TAP Phase One Project is diverting from the PRINCE2 methodology.

**Action:** The PM will liaise with ERA to see how the latter can get the appropriate PRINCE2 documents enabling the efficient monitoring of the TAP Phase One Project.

## 11. Information on TAP change control management

The TAP CCM Board meeting took place on 27.09.2011 in Lille. The TAP CCM Board approved the draft baseline 1.1.1 which affects the ERA TAP technical documents with following Change Requests:

CR ID	Headline
TELEM00000030	Geocoordinates for railway locations
TELEM00000031	Introduction of new table L into TAP TSI TD B.1
TELEM00000033	Border points and via stations for timetable data
TELEM00000034	New or modification of codes in the ERA_TAP_Passenger_Code_List B.4.7009
TELEM00000047	New codes for ERA_TAP_Passenger_Code_List B.5.308 - Fare price code used in availability display on reservation
TELEM00000052	Missing type definitions for B.7 messages

All aforementioned CRs are available at <https://ccm.era.europa.eu/cqweb/>

The baseline 1.1.1 will be sent to DG MOVE to be presented to RISC in Nov 2011.

### 11bis reservation of PRM assistance

The Commission services highlight that there are obligations on railway undertakings, station managers, ticket vendors and tour operators in the passengers' rights regulation 1371/2007 on reservation for assistance, but it does not say how to do it.

Addition from the Commission after the meeting:

Article 19(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations(1) requires that railway undertakings, ticket vendors and tour operators shall offer tickets and reservations at no additional cost to disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility. The reservation obligation would include the booking of wheelchair space to ensure accessibility for the passenger. Moreover, Article 24 provides that the stakeholders cooperate to provide (free-of-charge) assistance in line with article 22 (assistance at railway stations) and 23 (assistance on board). It includes all measures necessary for dealing with notifications of request for assistance(one notification/ticket even if the ticket permits multiple journeys) and with assistance in case of absence of notification.

Moreover, basic parameter 4.2.6 in the TAP TSI relates to the handling of information concerning carriage and assistance of persons with reduced mobility. However, the wording of basic parameter 4.2.6. and its sub-parameters 4.2.6.2 and 4.2.6.3 (in particular, references to the existence of a commercial agreement) may lead to misinterpretation. This is confirmed by the EPF representative.

The TAP steering committee agrees that any references to commercial agreements should be understood as follows:

Stakeholders shall communicate/cooperate to ensure that availability/reservation requests for assistance are handled. If they choose to use IT communication to communicate PRM assistance requests (availability, reservation, partial cancellation and full cancellation) their IT systems shall be able to handle messages specified in the technical document B10 in accordance with a commercial agreement for the purposes of handling information between each other in general. Moreover, a confirmation number (see second paragraph of 4.2.6.) shall be issued.

The Commission will clarify the text when revising the regulation.

The Commission service is worried because it seems that no work has been started in the project expert group dealing with reservation on this important basic parameter.

The Commission services met representatives of the UIC passage group. A major focus for the Passage Group has been to develop an assistance booking tool for international train journeys. Since November 2010, 8 RUs have been using this new tool which is used behind the scenes by call centre staff to communicate assistance-requests. UIC reports that cost-effectiveness considerations have had an impact on the decision of RUs to implement the tool. It does not appear that work on the tool is coordinated with work on Phase I of the TAP TSI (TAP should facilitate the reservation of both reserved seats and assistance for PRMs). The Commission services asks the project team to establish contact with the UIC passage group to make use of possible synergies.

**Project team and UIC passage Group to liaise.**

## **12. Directive 2008/57 and Reg 1371/2007: scope, exemptions,...**

The Commission services present their views on scope and obligations related to TAP and the regulation on passengers rights.

ERA has undertaken a study on the limit between the scope of the TSIs and urban transport and shall make a recommendation on the tool to be used. In the interim report, it is noteworthy that

- . Most of the Member States have defined the geographical scope of transposition of the Interoperability Directive by means of formulating general principles or criteria.
- . Only few Member States have complemented these criteria with a binding map (RO), binding list (NL and UK) or non-binding maps (CZ and PL).
- . In some Member States not all the cases allowed to be excluded from the transposition of the Directive by its Article 1(3) have been excluded.
- . For a functional subsystem, if a line is within the geographical scope of the TSI, the application of this TSI for the functional subsystem is mandatory.
- . Final report to RISC 22-23 November 2011

Since TAP is a functional subsystem, TAP TSI is applicable on services provided within its geographical scope, i.e. on TEN lines.

However, the passengers rights regulation (1371/2007) (which is higher in the hierarchy of European law) has a broader scope. Indeed, The Regulation applies **to all rail journeys and services throughout the EU** provided by one or more licensed railway undertakings.

Of course, there are exemptions by Member States. But not all services in the E.U. has been exempted! If we look at the situation for Article 10,

Article 10

- applies on international/cross-border journeys
- applies on domestic services in ~half of M.S.
- after max 15 years, applies on domestic services in ALL E.U. M.S.
- some M.S. have NOT exempted urban,..
- Some M.S. have exempted urban,..only for 5 years

Article 10 may be read as follows:

- railway undertakings and ticket vendors shall make use of CIRSRT to fulfil their obligations to
  - provide the information and
  - issue tickets
  - referred to in the Regulation,



- Railway undertakings
  - shall adapt their computerised [...] systems
  - according to TAP TSI
  - in accordance with a deployment plan

The information to be provided includes elements in Annex II to the Regulation. The Commission services that some elements may not be underestimated, e.g. information on Accessibility and access conditions, On-board services, Delays, Main connecting services, which are the main source of complaints.

The Commission services would like also to draw the attention on the fact that There are obligations - e.g. Art 9 (rules on availability of tickets, through tickets and reservations), Art 20(1) (information on accessibility of rail services )- that are always applicable.

There are views in the steering committee that a phased approach (from international journeys to urban journeys) is sensible and practical. However, the project manager is cautious and states that this needs a deeper analysis by the project team.

The Project Manager is asked to consider if a phased approach is suitable for any aspects of the implementation and report back to the steering committee if relevant.

The Commission services declare that one role of the national enforcement bodies of the PRR is to ensure a uniform implementation. The Commission will issue a Commission Decision to guide them in doing so.

### **13. Next meeting (Chair) (5')**

22 November, CER premises, avenue des arts, Brussels.

9:00-12:00: working discussions with the project team

13:00: TAP steering committee focussing on high level discussions and decisions.