



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT

Directorate B - European mobility network

B.2 - Single European rail area

TAP TSI

Telematics Applications for Passenger Services
Technical Specifications for Interoperability

10TH TAP STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

28TH SEPTEMBER 2012

53, AVENUE DES ARTS, BRUSSELS

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees:

Patrizio Grillo Co-chair;	DG MOVE
Libor Lochman Co-chair;	CER
Rütger Fenkes	TAP Phase 1 Project Manager
John Lutz	TAF Deployment team
Robert Parkinson	ECTAA
Michael Purcell	EIM
Rian van der Borgt	EPF
Mickael Varga	ERA
Svend Leirvaag	ETTSA - by phone
Simon Fletcher	UIC
Marc Guigon	UIC
Jan Möllman	EPTO
William Bird	DG MOVE

1. Adoption of agenda

The proposed agenda was adopted.

2. Minutes of previous Steering Committee (3rd July)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Final ERA recommendations Phase One deliverables & decision on legal status of Implementation Guides

ERA (MV) made a presentation on the status of the ERA recommendation on the Phase One deliverables:

ERA completed its monitoring of the deliverables on 12th July and sent its report to the Commission on 13th July 2012. Subsequently three outstanding issues have been addressed:

- the benefit analysis was completed by the Project Team on 10th September,
- outstanding issues on PRM were identified between ERA, the Project Team and DG MOVE,
- a discussion has subsequently been held on exchange of tariff data (see later item).

Several PRINCE2 documents were still to be completed. The Project Manager (RF) pointed out that all PRINCE2 documents requested by ERA have been delivered. ERA is asked to specify what is still missing.

An updated version of ERA's report on the TAP Phase 1 deliverables was sent to the Commission on 27th September. This indicated that:

- the deliverables were fit for purpose,
- there were specific comments on the retail architecture proposals
- two options were recommended:
 - The first would be that the Implementation Guides as presented would be made into IT Specifications and become to incorporated in the TSI in the form of ERA Technical Documents and would therefore be legally binding. As a result the deliverables would have to go through the official CCM procedure, and, as a mandatory requirement following any changes, would need a formal adoption by the Commission after a vote in RISC.
 - In the second option the deliverables are still "technical documents" but not in the sense of article 5(8) of directive 2008/57/EC. They would NOT be referred to in the TSI so they would not be legally binding, but the TSI, in its chapter 7, would clearly explain that such documents are published by ERA and also the TSI would have to explain how these documents are being maintained, with or without CCM procedure, with or without involvement of RISC and SteCo.
- The deliverables on retail architecture, governance and the Masterplan should be incorporated in Annex V.

Concerning next steps:

- the official final recommendation would be submitted by ERA to the Commission by the end of October,
- a presentation would be made to RISC on 17th October
- a vote on the revised TSI was anticipated at the RISC meeting in January 2013.

A discussion was then held on the two alternative options (as explained above) both for the Implementation Guides and the Governance/Retail Architecture/Masterplan documents being either incorporated within the TAP TSI or be kept separate from the TSI and referred to source documents.

Implementation Guides

In the second option the Implementation Guides would include the Technical Documents (MV). The documents would need to be kept publically available (through the ERA

website). PG pointed out that the documents themselves would not be legally binding and were thus able to be modified without having to go through the legislative process (adoption by the Commission after a vote by RISC). The second option (of non-legally binding documents) provided a good solution to the issue of regularly updating the documents without have to readopt the legislation at regular intervals and as such was a better means of regulation.

ERA (MV) pointed out that there was a similar example for composite brake blocks for wagons.

ETTSA (SL) said that there would need to be clarification for cases of the application of more 'modern' solutions deviating from the TSI since it would be apparent that a standardised (TSI) version did not necessarily reflect the state of the art which could be much more advanced.

Decision

It was agreed that the second option (non-legally binding documents referred to in Chapter 7) proposed by ERA should be adopted.

Governance/Retail Architecture/Masterplan

In relation to this part of the discussion, it was pointed out that the Consolidated Masterplan was expected to be completed and submitted to the Commission by end of April 2013 (this could tie in with having reference to these documents in the new version of TAP TSI, even if they had not been completed).

RF raised the issue whether the aspects of governance/retail architecture and the Masterplan were covered in Chapter 7 or in Annex V. MV confirmed that they were listed in Annex V referred to from Chapter 7.

The question was also raised concerning modifications to these documents. ERA indicated that modifications would be subject to assessment by the TAP Working Party who would then send their recommendations to the Commission then ultimately by vote of RISC. PG pointed out that the Member States were not present during the Working Party but were informed through RISC. DG MOVE indicated that the forthcoming 4th Railway Package (adopted end 2012 and likely to be implemented in 2014) would establish a new version of Article 3 for more flexibility.

DG MOVE (PG) stated that there was a need to ensure that there is reference to the status of the documents and the obligations which apply. The principle would be to adopt the non-legally binding document solution (second option) and that its effectiveness should be reviewed after a couple of years.

ECTAA and EIM considered that SteCo had the responsibility to ensure that the desired outcomes were achieved, in which case SteCo should be able to modify the governance, retail architecture and the Masterplan according to their effectiveness.

Decision

The decision was taken that SteCo would continue to operate during Phase Two. Its function would be to manage the outcome in relation to governance, retail architecture and the Masterplan (which could be modified accordingly) and would be in charge of the compliance of the execution of the Implementation of TAP TSI.

A modified version of Chapter 7 would refer to the governance, retail architecture and Masterplan documents as non-legally binding documents external to the TSI.

The Agency would publish the 3 elements (Governance, Retail Architecture, Master Plan) as non-legally binding documents on their website.

Action

ERA to circulate their presentations to SteCo.

ERA to circulate a proposal of new text for the TAP TSI for discussion at the next SteCo taking into considerations the decisions taken by SteCo that both the Implementation Guides and the Governance/Retail Architecture/Masterplan documents should not be incorporated as legally binding documents but be referenced as supporting documentation.

4. Masterplan/Implementation Plans

Project Team (RF) reported that the Masterplan workshop which had been held on 25th September had attracted more than 80 participants.

One potential concern had been to ensure that Railway Undertakings who had not been involved in the workshop were aware of their obligation to provide their implementation plans to the project teams by the end of 2012. It was suggested that this should be raised at RISC to ensure that the MSs were aware of the issue.

PG asked ERA if there was a database of licences. MV indicated that it did exist but that it may not be current. PG indicated that the National Contact Points should contact all their RUs to remind them of their obligations.

RF indicated that a stable baseline would be required which would comprise of the Phase One documents and the B30 message catalogue and that any post-Phase One modification will cause problems for the RUs in their individual implementation planning.

The anticipated next steps were that:

- the Project Team would respond to requests from stakeholders,
- question and answers sessions would be planned for November
- a consolidation method for the Master Plan would be compiled.

The Project Team would keep SteCo informed of progress.

5. Tariff Data Exchange between RUs

DG MOVE (WB) reported that following the meeting of 28th June CER had produced a paper highlighting its concerns on sharing tariff data.

A constructive meeting had been held on September 7th between CER, DG MOVE and DG COMP. The discussion centred on a number of examples relating to technical documents where there could have been potential issues (B1, B2, B3). DG COMP was now able to have a better understanding of the issue.

A note will be sent from DG MOVE/COMP to clarify a number of points. On this basis, it would be determined whether it was necessary to reconvene a meeting of the parties.

6. SteCo Rules of Procedure in Phase Two

DG MOVE (PG) indicated that the rules of procedure for the TAP Steering Committee would be amended to take into account the transition into Phase 2.

Action

DG MOVE to amend existing document covering Phase 1 and circulate to members for approval at next SteCo meeting.

7. Link between COM Call for tender "To develop and validate a European passenger transport information and booking system across transport modes " & TAP TSI

DG MOVE (WB) gave some background on the outstanding study on passenger information and booking systems. The closing date for applications was 28th September (the date of the SteCo). It was pointed out that the call text did make explicit reference that the preparatory action should be based on TAP TSI.

CER (LL) pointed out that the issue to be discussed related to potential links between the study and SteCo. There was a wish to have the study group report to SteCo, although this had not been set out in the Call text. DG MOVE (PG) indicated that formally the study group could not be obliged to report to SteCo.

WB commented that since the application period was still open at the time, the officer responsible (John Berry) was not available to comment.

Project Team (RF) indicated that the study was a natural extension to the Full Service Model. A decision had been made by the Project team not to bid given that it did not exist as a legal entity. The Project Team was prepared to offer support to the winning bid to ensure consistency.

Action

It was requested that John Berry should attend the next Steering Committee meeting to explain the situation concerning potential links between the study and the Steering committee.

8. Any other business

None.

9. Date of next meeting

Next meeting of TAP SteCo was agreed for 21st November at 10.30 hrs with a joint TAF/TAP SteCo at 12.15 hrs.