



## 2<sup>ND</sup> JOINT TAF/ TAP STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

28<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2012  
53, AVENUE DES ARTS, BRUSSELS

### DRAFT MINUTES

#### Attendees:

Patrizio Grillo	DG MOVE Co-chair;
Libor Lochman	CER Co-chair;
Rütger Fenkes	TAP Phase 1 Project Manager
John Lutz	TAF Deployment team
Davide Pifferi	CER Joint Sector Group
Robert Parkinson	ECTAA
Michael Purcell	EIM
Rian van der Borgt	EPF
Mickael Varga	ERA
Laurie d'Hont	ESC
Harald Reisinger	RNE
Rainer Wilke	TAF CCG
Simon Fletcher	UIC
Marc Guigon	UIC
Ferdinand Schmitt	UIC
Johannes Mansbart	UIP
William Bird	DG MOVE

#### **1. Adoption of agenda**

The proposed agenda was adopted.

#### **2. Minutes of previous Steering Committee (3<sup>rd</sup> July)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

#### **3. Outstanding governance issues**

The TAP Project Team (RF) made a presentation on governance proposals which had been put together on the basis of discussions of the JSG. This covered:

- the background and overall requirements

- guiding principles
- proposals for governance in Phases 2 and 3
- CCM activities.

It was pointed out that the proposals reflected the fact that TAF and TAP were currently at different stages (TAF already mature, TAP in project phase).

In Phase Two joint TAP and TAF RU/IM activities would take place (they have already begun since the previous SteCo in July 2012)..

Phase Two would continue to run as a Project administered by the UIC with the Project Manager remaining in place and reporting to the TAP and Joint TAP/TAF Steering Committee. RNE would remain as the IM-coordinating body.

In Phase Three joint activities would be further refined. TAF could continue as it is whereas TAP legal requirements were different.

The TAP SteCo would continue in in Phase Two but would no longer continue for Phase Three. The method of governance would be clarified during Phase Two.

ECTAA commented that a different role was required in Phase Three therefore a different body would be needed (TAP Entity Supervisory Board).

UIC (SF) commented that although Phase Two represented a combination of activities between TAP and TAF this no longer seemed evident in Phase Three. JL indicated that at a working level activities would be carried out jointly.

PG pointed out that even if it was agreed that the Technical Documents were not legally binding there would still need to be a monitoring function for the relationship of the legal/non-legal elements. There would still need to be a neutral body to ensure that there is compliance with the measures of the TSIs.

EPF pointed out that there was still the need to ensure that passengers should also be observers to the process (there was no objection to this from SteCo). RF pointed out that passengers' interests would be represented within the Stakeholders Group.

ECTAA (RP) indicated that there should be a concrete discussion in the SteCo towards the end of Phase Two (at least 2 – 3 months before the end) to ensure that the outstanding issues of governance in Phase Three were clarified.

RNE (HR) highlighted that there was a need to define tasks, identify what needed to be changed and clarify governance.

PG asked why the TAP Entity Supervisory Board had been shown as possibly being a UIC Special Group. He asked whether this is the only option the project is following up on. EIM (MP) pointed out that the UIC Special Group, in common with other unincorporated body, runs the risk of joint and several liability falling on the individual members, and of tax liability also falling on individual members rather than the body. This would need to be addressed.

CCG (RW) endorsed this by indicating that the Special Group could be cheaper than a legal entity.

Slide 7 on CCM was shown. PG asked what its objective was; JL explained that it showed how the process would flow in relation to CCM and for links to the Agency.

MV pointed out that given a review within the Agency it could potentially be that here would be no need for CCM boards in future. It had been proposed that technical aspects

were covered by the Working Parties and that the endorsement for their work would come through RISC.

### Decisions

Slide 5 which represents the governance during TAP Phase Two (including joint TAF-TAP RU/IM activities) was endorsed and approved as the appropriate structure for the continuation of governance during Phase Two.

It was also endorsed that the IMs involved in the TAP process should take into account the input already made to the TAF process.

The final structure, definition of roles etc for Phase Three would be agreed during Phase Two.

## **4. Information on CCM**

JL reported on the status of CCM. The final batch of CRs for baseline 5.2 were processed, several being reopened to iron out critical issues.

The TAP and TAF CCM Working Parties met on 5<sup>th</sup> September. Joint TAF/TAP requests were postponed until joint groups would be able to assess them.

Baseline 5.2 has been sent to the Commission and will be submitted for approval to the RISC meeting in October 2012.

A new "developer" version 5.2.1 has been derived. This includes the latest developments (on aspects such as dictionaries, timetabling, train composition etc). It will be uploaded on the ERA website and is currently posted on the UIC website on the TAF-TSI pages.

For the future it was anticipated that one revision would be made every year and published (as per 5.2.1) but that this would be one year 'behind' the legally applicable version. Working in this manner ensures a pragmatic but transparent approach.

MV endorsed this as a good approach to keep up to date with developments.

## **5. Deployment**

JL reported that the Consolidated Master Plan will be submitted by 15<sup>th</sup> November. If SteCo has any additional requirements they should be advised by 15<sup>th</sup> November (there had been some mention of DG MOVE points but they were still to be clarified).

Two deployment seminars were held on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> September concerning reference files and requirements for railway undertakings.

There had been a meeting with small railway undertakings on 27<sup>th</sup> September. This had been well attended (12 RUs). The issue of outreach (concern had been raised by ERFA to ensure that local workshops should be run), role of NCPs and the applicability of/exemptions from TAF to very local private companies had been discussed.

PG commented that in its current form the TAF TSI is mandatory for any type of traffic, but that one could envisage the possibility of allowing a non-application of TAF in certain cases, for example in the case of local traffic under special agreement of the RU and the IM.

## **6. Any other business**

None

## **7. Date of next meeting**

It was agreed that the next meetings of TAP/TAF would be held on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2012:

- TAP SteCo at 10.30 hrs
- Joint TAP/TAF SteCo at 12.15 hrs.
- TAF SteCo at 14.00 hrs