



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

11TH TAP STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

21ST NOVEMBER 2012

53, AVENUE DES ARTS, BRUSSELS

MINUTES

Attendees:

Patrizio Grillo Co-chair;	DG MOVE
Libor Lochman Co-chair;	CER
Rütger Fenkes	TAP Phase 1 Project Manager
John Lutz	TAF Deployment Manager
Davide Pifferi	CER Joint Sector Group
Javier Ibanez	CER
Robert Parkinson	ECTAA
Michael Purcell	EIM
Rian van der Borgt	EPF
Jan Möllman	EPTO
Mickael Varga	ERA
Svend Leirvaag	ETTSA
Harald Reisinger	RNE
Alexander Stuessi	UITP
William Bird	DG MOVE

1. Adoption of agenda

The proposed agenda was adopted.

2. Minutes of previous Steering Committee (28th September 2012)

The minutes of the previous Steering Committee held on 28th September were approved.

3. Final ERA recommendation Phase One deliverables

ERA (MK) reported on the status in relation to the Phase One deliverables:

ERA made a presentation to RISC on 17th October and sent its final recommendation to DG MOVE on 31st October.

A meeting was held on 8th November between ERA and the Retail Architecture WS Leader, attended by the Project Manager, at which it was agreed that ERA would receive the adapted retail architecture deliverable and the migration plan by mid-December 2012.

The Phase One deliverables were now considered to be fit for purpose, although some documents should still be completed in PRINCE2.

The Project Manager indicated that the work required on the retail architecture document was purely one to improving readability and that it was agreed with ERA that no material changes with an impact to the ERA recommendation are to be expected. He also stated that the outstanding documents for PRINCE2 had been provided in time on 12 July 2012.

MV reported that he had been in consultation with ERA's legal service who considered that the Technical Documents associated with TAP TSI must be referenced in the TSI. The documents should therefore be incorporated into the Annexes of the TSI. As such, using non-referenced ERA Technical Documents or Means of Compliance was not currently possible.

EPTO (JM) considered that ERA was in contempt of the Steering Committee citing that the position was not in accordance with the decision made at the previous meeting. MV indicated that he had spoken to the ERA lawyers subsequent to the last Steering Committee meeting and they had made the strong conclusion that the ERA position was the only possible decision.

Both EPTO and CER (LL) stressed that this was not the first time that the issue had been discussed and that the decision had been made by the Steering Committee that non-binding documents should be used.

EIM (MP) indicated that the advice of the ERA lawyers should be shared with the Steering Committee. The opinion needed to be one that spelled out the actual argumentation behind their decision rather than a statement that 'it cannot be done'.

DG MOVE (PG) noted that the recommendation was not in compliance with the decision of the Steering Committee. He indicated several instances where non-legally binding documents were referenced in TSIs (list of brake blocks in WAG TSI, list of codes in TSI OPE). MV commented that he did not know whether ERA Technical Documents could quickly be changed for means of compliance. PG stated that means of compliance are covered in the 4th Railway Package, however it would take 2 years before the measures could be adopted.

RF indicated that the documents had been submitted to ERA as Implementation Guides which had been transposed by ERA into IT specifications. There had been some confusion on the terminology. He suggested that the Implementation Guides could be revisited as suggested in previous SteCo meetings to identify elements of the Implementation Guides that qualify as being part of the Technical Documents. The project team would be willing to take such elements from the Implementation Guides going into existing Technical Documents.

EIM reiterated that the status of each document should be established to show how legislation applies to each, so that an opinion can be determined by DG MOVE lawyers.

CER (LL) asked why, given that the decision had actually been taken on several previous occasions, the advice of the ERA lawyers had only been sought at this stage.

Action

DG MOVE and ERA would meet with the legal representative of ERA to discuss why reference to non-legally binding documents is not possible. If no solution could be found

to use non-legally binding documents, the Steering Committee would be reconvened to discuss the issue.

In clarification of the question of what had been presented to RISC, ERA reported that both the incorporation of Technical Documents in the Annexes and the potential to apply means of compliance had been indicated. DG MOVE further clarified by stating that RISC had been informed that the Steering Committee had decided that non-legally binding documents should be referred to. This point was also stressed by the Danish representative at RISC.

The Project Manager asked whether it was possible to obtain a copy of the ERA recommendation. He noted that in the minutes of the previous meeting that ERA was called upon to circulate to the Steering Committee a proposal for the new text of the TAP TSI taking into consideration the decisions on the accompanying documentation taken during that meeting.

MV indicated that this had not been done given the advice from ERA's legal department.

EIM commented that if there was a legal opinion that defined the competence of the Steering Committee it should be circulated.

In relation to timing, DG MOVE clarified that if TAP TSI could be drafted by mid-December there could be a vote at the RISC meeting in January and publication could be expected by summer 2013. RF noted that had there been a realisation that this timescale was necessary, the project team would not have agreed the date for changes to the retail architecture document to be made for 12th December but for an earlier date.

4. Masterplan Status

The Project Manager reported that a Questions & Answers session had been organised. 17 railway undertakings and industry organisations had attended. There had been a number of questions concerning the role of the NEBs. UIC member RUs appeared to be well informed about the requirements to submit an implementation plan, but it appeared that a number of regional railways were unaware, and that Member States were not notifying RUs/IMs in their country, of the requirement. There was a major concern relating to the role of the National Contact Points and of the lack of information coming from RUs/IMs who were not members of the representative bodies. The Commission was asked to remind the Member States of the need for implementation reports.

The Masterplan Reports were to be submitted by the end of 2012; a first view of the consolidation of the implementation plans should be available by the end of January 2013, with the consolidated plan to be delivered by the end of April 2013.

5. Tariff Data Exchange Between RUs

DG MOVE (WB) reported that a meeting had been held between DG MOVE & DG COMP to clarify views on the points raised by CER. A note would be drafted which summarised these views would be sent to CER and a meeting would be held if considered necessary.

6. Steering Committee Rules of Procedure

DG MOVE (WB) described the changes made to the Rules of Procedure to reflect the situation for Phases Two and Three.

Amendments were suggested by ECTAA (RP) for Article 2 (objectives to include the definition of Phase Three) and the Project Manager (the use of "retail" for retail architecture was dropped; reporting was still to continue on a monthly basis but in the form of a shortened 'one page' report rather than the more extensive version produced during Phase One).

The Rules for Procedure were adopted subject to the amendments proposed in the meeting.

7. Link between COM call for tender on "intermodal journey planner and ticketing" & TAP TSI

This item was introduced by John Berry of DG MOVE who is responsible for the study on an intermodal journey planner and ticketing system. He described the background and nature of the study. The study had been commissioned by the European Parliament and had been open to tender from July to September 2012.

He indicated that he had previously been unable to make a presentation to SteCo since the tendering period had still been open. He was not currently in a position to reveal which bid had been successful since this was still subject to approval. However there had been 22 expressions of interest and 6 proposals submitted. The study would have two phases – the first phase would comprise of a study of the Commission's role in this area, and test out subsidiarity, proportionality and European added value assessing market impact and the adoption of a 'business as usual' approach. Phase One would last for 9 months. Phase Two would be a trial and validation of proofs of concept with a duration of 15 months. The funding would be split € 300k for Phase One and €1.2 million for the Phase Two. An added complication was that the commencement of Phase Two would be conditional on the results of Phase One. The kick off meeting would be held in January 2013.

EPF (RvdB) asked if stakeholders would be involved and whether there would be any input from passengers. JB indicated that he would be in contact with EPF.

ECTAA (RP) asked how the distribution of right to travel would be addressed.

JB considered that this would probably be through the use of smartcards.

EPTO pointed out that the Terms of Reference of the study had made particular reference to TAP TSI. He questioned what would be done to link to developing solutions. JB replied that any system developed would need to be compliant with existing systems.

CER (LL) pointed out that the item had been raised to specifically address the potential link between the study and the activities of the TAP Steering Committee. JB agreed that he would present regular reports to the Steering Committee of the progress of the study.

8. Any Other Business

None.

9. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting was set for Thursday January 17th 2013 at 09.30 hours in Brussels (with a joint TAF/TAP SteCo at 11.15 hrs) and the subsequent meeting on Tuesday 26th March 2013 (provisionally at 10.30 hrs with a joint TAF/TAP SteCo at 12.15 hrs), location to be announced.