

NB

The answers are based on the current SBA proposal and subject to final confirmation by a formal decision of the future GB as necessary

Q no.	Questions	Answers
Batch 1	1.) Program Models	
	General questions to the program models:	
	I. Why do you want to change the current model we work in the programs together? What are the current pain points you want to solve?	<p>The S2R Programme has been suffering from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heavy administration - running of yearly calls, requiring different input from Members, the assessment by the JU, different iterative processes lasting around 18 months and concluded by the same members to submit proposals in answering the same topics. In addition, assessment of proposals by external experts, grant agreement preparations for around 2 - 3 months to address administrative requirements and inconsistencies in the proposals, etc. At the end all this work to simply translate the Multi-Annual Action Plan in annual calls. This approach is at a minimum substantially inefficient and costly. - Content – in order to combine JU budget availability and the annual calls, TDs have been sliced in the different waves or projects in answer to the calls, asking for collaboration agreements from the same members working in the different series of projects, each time recreating work packages and with difficulties in addressing the exploitation work at the conclusion of each stand-alone project. - Programme management - intertwined projects overlapped in different occasions and regularly we have overlapping assessment that do not maximize the resources available - Delivery – most of the projects in the initial waves of the calls were designed to deliver intermediate results and not tangible solutions, questioning the capacity of the JU to deliver in the

Q no.	Questions	Answers
		<p><i>different evaluation processes launched by the Commission in line with the S2R Regulation.</i></p> <p><i>These are some examples of the issues to be addressed from the current S2R legal framework that have been mitigated in the implementation with different corrections introduced together with the key role of the Members, starting from the Founding Members.</i></p> <p><i>The Single Basic Act introduces the possibility to engage at the Programme start sufficient resources for a strong focus on impact that would not only materialize at the end of a successive run of intertwined projects, but all along its life. Hence the Programme shall be designed to meet such expectations with the definition of key milestones per individual project and clear deliverables ready for implementation packages by their end.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the joint effort of the future Founding Members will require collaboration based on the Membership and not driven by Grant Agreements.</i></p> <p><i>Europe's Rail JU is not a series of collaborative projects launched on disconnected topics but an integrated programme to be managed as such; this is embedded in the nature of the partnership.</i></p>
	<p><i>II. Is there an analysis available, which shows the advantages / disadvantages of the program model? What is the added value of the different models?</i></p>	<p><i>The analysis is presented in the slides and the advantages and disadvantages where presented too.</i></p>
	Feed-back:	
	<u>a.) Type of call</u>	
	<p><i>Could you please give us more details about the “Innovation procurement” and how you want to handle this program model?</i></p>	<p><i>As it was presented the “Innovation Procurement” would require to launch a call for tenders – possibly more flexible than a call for proposals – where the JU would acquire the reports, draft standards and specifications resulting from the work of the projects working</i></p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
		<p>together, while the ownership of IPRs and all other elements will remain always under the same conditions of grants.</p> <p>It will require first to establish a framework contract reflecting the conditions included in the grant agreements that will constitute the basis for the call as well as the collaboration.</p> <p>It would allow for more flexibility in the management of the programme evolution, change management, etc. also from the reporting of contributions as it would be possible to define a fix rate against the work performed, to be reported in accordance with the accounting practice of each company.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as indicated it is not usually applied in the context of research and innovation where grants are the privileged approach that also the SBA proposal currently mirrors.</p>
	<u>b.) Type of Proposal: Individual proposal submission</u>	
	<p>The “Use Cases” will have a much higher complexity as the previous S2R projects. We don’t believe that we are as a group able to create a work break down structure and the necessary work package descriptions for each “use case” in a reasonable time. The projects XXXX is involved show us that due to the complexity the technical discussions to clarify the scope can use a lot of time. What we suggest is a rough phase model for each use case and a clear definition of the targets and sub targets (SMART= Specific, Measurable, Activating, Reasonable, Time-Bound, Explanation at the end of the e-mail) of the use cases. When we have this definition we can measure each project if its contributes to the targets.</p>	<p>The Use Cases were not proposed as such as the basis of the definition of the projects to be realized but as key areas within the Master Plan. In any case they will be significantly further developed over the next couple of months. The Description of Work will require to define the specific technological activities to be performed to reach the impact foreseen in the Use Cases (if they will be kept as proposed or their evolutions). These two are related but they are handled in different stages. In particular, the matrix provided should facilitate to find back in the Use Cases the proposed technological innovations described in the Transforming Projects proposed in the SRIA.</p>
	<u>c.) Type of topic</u>	
	<p>Model 1, 2.1 and 2.2 for this topic is resonable and fine for XXXX. Model 3 with a tender/order mechanism will be not supported by us. This need a previously work break down structure for all programs. Same arguments applied here as for point b.)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The choice of the model will require that the Commission system will provide the necessary support without additional administration or complexity.</p> <p>It will have to take into account also the structure of programme and the number/content of the projects.</p>
	<u>d.) Type of contract</u>	

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	XXXX will support the current contract approach. The advantage is that we have for this approach proven documents (Model Grant Agreement, Model Consortium Agreement,...) and a lot of experience from the projects. To define a new legal framework will cost us capacity and time.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Nevertheless, to be noted that the driver of the participation to Europe's Rail is not the MGA or the Consortium Agreement, but in the order</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Single Basic Act 2. The S2R Financial Rules and regulations 3. The Membership Agreements 4. A possible Membership collaboration agreement on the way of working together and to avoid administrative burden of the duplication of collaboration agreements 5. The Grant Agreements 6. The Consortium Agreement (which could be replaced by 4 for all projects into which members are working together and once again reducing administration)
	<u>e.) Type of Coordination& Monitoring</u>	
	100% Project Coordinators for the programs:	
	This is from our perspective a good answer to the capacity shortage of project management in the past and is supported by us. We have to discuss, how we can secure that the person from the beneficiaries than really work for 100% for the program?	<p>Noted</p> <p>The idea would be to establish a direct reporting with the Head of R&I in the JU and monitor the situation, introducing additional measures if needed</p>
	Member have just admin/finance relation to JU:	
	Cooperation is one key-element of S2R and of ERJU. The current from XXXX supported lump sum approach create inside of a project additional force on each member to fulfil the obligation, because it has an impact on each other beneficiary.	Noted
	<u>f.) Type of Communication & dissemination</u>	
	XXXX support the approach to have a centralize support and promotion for all communication and dissemination topics. As you mentioned in the meeting this is very often the 9 th of 10 th job of a project manager and have room for improvements.	Noted

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	Before we make here a decision for a new legal framework / program models or other changes in comparison to the current proven process, we suggest to analysis the chances and risk of such a change and to create an overview about the advantages and disadvantages of the new approach. XXXX prefer the current S2R model we use, with small improvements to reduce the administrative work.	As indicated, the current S2R model does not fit as such for the purposes of Europe's Rail as defined in the SBA. Model 1 is the most similar to S2R addressing the shortcomings identified here above.
	2.) Controlling Topics	
	a) <u>Lump Sum approach</u>	
	XXXX support also for the the new initiative to use the "lump sum" concept.	Noted
	b) <u>24 Mio.€ net contribution from the rail sector</u>	
	<i>Is a service agreement in preparation, about the scope (including central communication + project coordination) the members can expected for their net contribution?</i>	The Single Basic Act proposal indicates the costs covered by the cash contributions for the running costs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Europe's Rail staff and associated costs - Building, ICT, meeting organizations, etc. - Communications and disseminations - Statutory costs related to the nature of the JU as Union body - The detailed budget is available in the LFS annexed to the SBA
	c) <u>Industry Contribution: IKAA calculation</u>	
	The definition of the two types of IKAA were not clear.	
	<i>Could you please provide us with a more detailed definition of this two IKAA types and with the mathematic calculation for them?</i>	The table for the calculation has been provided and the distinction between the two types of IKAA has been deleted, as instead of bringing clarity created confusion. The IKAA is required to reach the ratio between the amounts of contribution expected to be received from the Founding Members and the overall funding expected to be awarded to them, topping up the IKOP which results from the difference between the Eligible Costs and the funding. The excel spreadsheet distributed after the meeting provides all the necessary model calculations.
Batch 2	CFM e-mail sent to JU ED on 7 March 2021	

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our candidature is endorsed by a "National team" containing a wide range of railway stakeholders. The stakeholders include among others infrastructure owner, rolling stock owner (renting rolling stock to operators) and the national agent offering sales/ticket solutions for the railways as well as travel planner for public transport throughout. The stakeholders will contribute with knowhow, pilot facilities, use cases and innovation in close cooperation with the international R&I community. In the practical execution of projects, we have learned that the general portal of Horizon Europe will be utilized. <u>Will those stakeholders have the possibility to be partner/participate directly in the projects / use cases? And will they directly report on their contribution to the project/use case?</u> This is desirable from our side. 	<p>With regard to the Membership and seat in the Governing Board, there will be only one seat, NRD candidature would be finally confirmed in the adoption of the Single Basic Act by the Member States of the European Union.</p> <p>In terms of participation, in the current S2R, linked third parties to a Member are direct beneficiaries of the grants. Subject to the final version of the Model Grant Agreement (still under development in the Commission Services) it can be expected that this approach is maintained. Also considering the fact that all calls will be Open Calls.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the three stakeholders are fully state owned organizations, are they considered linked parties to the main CFM? In case of further investigation needed, how do we go about examining this matter? 	<p>The Model Grant Agreement applicable to the future partnership will provide the answer, although it is expected that the link as you indicate would suffice.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In case of further clarifications needed, we would very much welcome a briefing meeting. The goal of this briefing would be to familiarize us with the expectations, rules and culture of Europe's Rail JU and Shift2Rail, which would in turn ensure a more efficient cooperation with yourselves in the future. 	<p>Please contact the assistance of the S2R JU Executive Director to organize such meeting but also to exchange with present S2R members with whom you have contacts.</p>
Batch 3	<p>1- Way of working (slide 5)</p> <p>The preparation of the ERJU including the drafting process of the Master Plan will require the mobilization of resources from the Candidates Founding Members (CFMs).</p>	<p>The organization of the meetings require a flexible and agile approach.</p> <p>As far as possible the documentation will be provide before the meetings to allow necessary preparations; if not possible the</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	<p>To establish a fruitful discussion/negotiation between the European Commission and the CFMs, we consider that it is of paramount importance to implement an efficient working process based on the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CFMs working meetings shall be planned in advance. We appreciate the list of meeting dates proposed on slide 50. Nevertheless, it should be assumed that additional meetings will be needed. Therefore, it would be helpful to plan additional working meetings that could be later cancelled if there is no specific topic for discussion or not enough progress. • Working meetings materials (including Agenda, draft presentation, working documents) should be sent to the CFMs minimum 10 days prior to the CFMs working meetings. This will allow CFMs to review the documents and send their comments/inputs before the CFMs working meetings. <p>Such a working process will allow the implementation of a reliable working process. It will help to identify key/critical topics for discussion during the CFMs working meetings. It will also allow the implementation of an efficient iterative process as mentioned on slide 5.</p> <p>Moreover, we would appreciate to get an explanation of how the commission are expecting to manage the development of the documents and content of the programme with the many stakeholders (splitting topics, who leads etc). To achieve completion by June/July a more detailed plan would be good to enable the CFMs to prepare internally (current plan stops on 9/3).</p>	<p>meetings will be the opportunity to present the documentation, to have a first reaction and request for comments/suggestions at the following meeting or in writing. The CFM will be required to provide their reaction in no more than 5 working days.</p> <p>Ad hoc meetings will be organized based on the progress of the preparatory activities as well as the SBA discussions.</p> <p>In terms of process, based on the consolidation exercise and subject to its results, it will be possible to refine the next steps: a) to discuss about an adjustment to the submitted tables, as it might be needed and/or b) to proceed to the next phase, where the CFM will be asked to indicate how to split the work to provide the input on the initial definition of the high level programme, based on delivering Flagship Projects under the Master Plan but building upon the SRIA Transforming Project aligned with budgetary availability.</p> <p>This work will continue during the months of April – May, to ensure that we may have a stable content by end of June.</p>
	<p>2- Master Plan (Slides 10 to 28)</p> <p>We will, as soon as possible, provide our comments directly to the European Commission regarding the Master Plan by filling in the two templates provided (Word and Excel files).</p>	<p>In accordance with the SBA, the Commission shall prepare the Master Plan and submit it to the GB, developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders. In order to ensure this process, we propose the CFM to appoint reps of each stakeholder group, two suppliers,</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	<p>Nevertheless, as general comments, we would like to underline the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Master Plan shall be mainly based on the Strategic Rail Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA) that has been prepared collectively by the rail sector and published in 2020 by ERRAC. The European Commission was involved in the preparation process of the SRIA. We consider the SRIA as the leading document for the preparation of the Master Plan and later the preparation of the Multi Annual Programme. • There should be a clear structure either based on Use Cases or Transforming Projects, a mix of both does not seem beneficial, increasing administrative effort and causing confusion internally but also externally. If Use Cases are applied, they must in principle cover the content of the nine Transforming Projects identified in the SRIA. This will have to be confirmed as soon as possible by the European Commission • The European DAC Delivery Programme launched under Shift2Rail Programme shall continue within ERJU while the migration of DAC Type 4 should be secured within the System Pillar (SP) and DAC Type 5 should be part of the Innovation Pillar (IP) (TP2 as well as use case “Competitive digital green rail freight”). The present organisation of the EDDP should be retained. If the Budget for EDDP and CCS activities will be the announced 50 Mio. € it should be clearly assigned to each task. • Even if the preparation of the System Pillar will be addressed in a specific group involving rail sector associations, we would like to contribute at least as observers. Referring to the Single Basic Act, the ERJU GB will be involved in the decision making process of the System Pillar if there is no consensus. Therefore, it is 	<p>two RUs/IMs and finally 1 rep for the research community to support the writing team and ensure a smooth process.</p> <p>You are invited to provide the names of the representatives by 25 March cob.</p> <p>To answer some questions about Master Plan versus SRIA, if the Master Plan would have expected to be the SRIA there would not be a need for a Master Plan.</p> <p>The Master Plan will build upon the SRIA, but, it will be more focused on areas where common action is vital at European level to deliver meaningful change in the sector, also in the light of budgetary constraints.</p> <p>With regard to the EDDP, it will be consider taking into consideration the activities to be performed in terms of R&I and/or specification/standard needs.</p> <p>The CFM are associated to the System Pillar preparations as their associations are called to participate actively to its preparatory activities. The CFM will be kept informed and consulted for the necessary interfaces between System Pillar and Innovation Pillar all along the process.</p> <p>Flagship 7 of the “Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy” clearly refers to innovation, data and artificial intelligence for smarter mobility making reference to a series of solutions for different modes. The rail research and innovation programme of the Union cannot ignore these priorities; nevertheless, no CFM is requested to be part of such activities.</p> <p>With regart to 6.1 this will be part of the future exchanges based on the details comments as individual CFM level.</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	<p>important for us that the CFMs are direct part of the System Pillar activities during both the preparatory phase and project phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not support the inclusion of Maglev and Hyperloop in the ERJU Master Plan. The expressions “Loop systems” and “vacuum tube trains” are not mentioned in the SRIA. However, we are open to observe corresponding activities in the market of alternative transportation solutions. The topic 6.1 (slide 27) has to be clarified. 	
	<p>3- Union Funding (slides 29 to 38) We would like to get the following clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the reasoning behind the split between the 462M€ allocated to the CFMs and 64M€ allocated to “Other & Exploratory”? This split is not mentioned in the SBA. Please confirm that the 462M€ EU funding are ONLY for the founding members. Please confirm that the 64M€ EU funding are from potential Associated Members and non-members. Please confirm that the CFMs will be allowed to participate in the “Other & Exploratory” R&I activities. A general explanation on slides 30 and 38 would be welcomed. We would like to thank Mr Borghini for having circulated a “simulation tool” on Friday 26 February to CFMs that will help them to simulate their contributions and associated EU funding. The general project framework is not clear. It would be good to describe how the first call in 2022 and the procedure afterwards would look like – taking into account the status quo of ER JU planning. We would expect the following scenario: Beginning 2022 the founding members would draft the first multi-annual call for projects containing potential projects based on the 	<p>The SBA establishes the allocation of the Union Funding between System Pillar (EUR 50 million) Running Costs (EUR 24 million) and the rest.</p> <p>The SBA also establishes that the JU shall cover meaningfully the exploratory research (as with S2R the intention is that all rail specific research is in the JU to ensure optimum coordination). and this was estimated to be at a minimum level of 10%. In the table shown, the minimum level was considered to cover exploratory research, other activities such as the review and monitoring of the programme, ad hoc studies to support the programme, ERA R&I needs part of the overall programme, etc. This allows the rest to be available to match the contributions to be provided by the Founding Members, subject to the overall principles of the SBA. The 10% figure also provides a reserve of flexibility for the overall programme.</p> <p>Mathematically, EUR 576 million Members’ contributions in kind expected against a possible funding of EUR 462 million results in a funding rate of 44.5%, against a funding rate at 60% for the actions (meaning in the HE systems). It is under consideration to apply such reduced funding rate to all the open calls within the scope of the core programme, for Members and non-members.</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	<p>Transforming Projects with a total amount of funding of up to 50% of 462 Mio. CFM funding. It is suggested to partner with potential “Associated Members” and non-members. Their funding would come from the 64 Mio €. The ER JU would publish the multi-annual call. FMs, AMs and other non-members would develop a common proposal following their ideas drafted in the calls. → Please comment this scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the IKAA requirement be on project or member level? And will it be possible to compensate IKOP with IKAA and vice versa? • As IKAA under HE is more similar to today’s IKOP, it is assumed that the proof/documentation/audits will be similar as today for both. Or could we assume that there will be no EC audit on IKAA? 	<p>For the System Pillar and Other/Exploratory research the funding rates will be decided as part of the Annual Work Plans to be adopted by the Governing Board.</p> <p>With regard to the scenario for the project framework, subject to the final SBA and decisions of the GB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The FM will be expected to contribute to the definition of the AWP 2022 of the JU which will be the basis of the 2022 Calls (the exact timing will depend on the SBA proceedings) - The AWP 2022 will be originating the Open Call – as all calls are open – that will follow the usual cycle similarly to the current S2R JU - The Call may introduce, in accordance with the current Recital 18 of the SBA proposal, additional conditions that require the participation of a member, targeting activities where the industrial partners can play a key role, such as large scale demos and flagship projects and contribute more. - The FM will have to decide on how to submit their proposals - The amount of budget will take into account the extent of the involvement expected to be relevant for a successful programme - It is expected that the Call will be based on multi-annuality by instalment and lump sum grants, final decision for the GB <p>The IKAA, as per article 11.1(b) is referred per member and has to be approved by the GB in accordance with article 16(2). Linking the IKAA at project level will facilitate the process to link to the AWP activities; but it does not seem to be an obligation from the SBA.</p> <p>With regard to compensantion IKOP / IKAA, the SBA make reference to contributions to be provided by the Member, in accordance with Article 11.1 SBA. IKOP definition is clear, the difference between eligible costs under HE and funding. The only way to increase IKOP is to reduce the funding rate or the members limiting their request of funding to lower levels that the maximum rate of the call; nevertheless to be kept in mind that only eligible costs under HE can be declared. To reach the contribution requested, the Member may</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
		<p>complement the IKOP with IKAA under the definition of article 11.1.(b) SBA.</p> <p>IKAA reporting and certification are defined in article 11.2 SBA; it can be confirmed that article 11.2 SBA is strongly similar to article 4.4 of the current S2R regulation with regard to IKOP.</p> <p>Article 11.3 SBA it is clear on the scope of the audits by the JU or any other Union body</p>
	<p>Implementation Models (slides 43 to 46)</p> <p>Regarding the different models for “Programme Implementation proposed”, we would like the discussion to focus on models 1 and 2.1, or variant of these. Those 2 models seem to be the more appropriate for ERJU improving the existing process in Shift2Rail. Nevertheless, this is a key topic for us that will require further discussion to fine tune them and agree on a programme implementation bringing benefits to the CFMs.</p> <p>As an example, the reference to have target of non-members participation between 15-30% needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Each model foresees a project coordinator, which role is not clear today. The project coordinator (or preferably project manager) should manage the TPs and/or consortia.</p>	<p>The different models were presented for an exchange of view and to address some limits experienced in the current S2R Programme.</p> <p>With regard to the project coordinator, it is expected to manage and coordinate the project and consortia. As the JU is the main signatory of the grant agreement, the project implementation will be defined in a manner to make it similar to all the JU projects whose nature would require it.</p> <p>The open calls approach does not require defining any percentages; this was considered based on the current involvement of third parties in the S2R CFM projects.</p>
	<p>Budget – Articles 25, 26, 86 and 87</p> <p>The SBA contains no clause underlining “ring-fenced” budgets for the FMs and potential AMs.</p> <p>The SBA contains no information on the funding rate for FMs and potential AMs.</p> <p>The SBA contains no information on the funding that will be made available to the non-members.</p> <p>The FMs individual contributions will have to be discussed and negotiated with the European Commission during the next months.</p>	<p>During the next months and in view of the adoption of the SBA, the final amount of contributions expected from the members will be defined.</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	We would appreciate to get some clarifications from the European Commission on the split of the Union Contribution between the FMs.	
	Open Calls – Article 5 It is a main difference with Shift2Rail as members and non-members will be allowed to prepare proposals together but also could compete between themselves. We would appreciate to get clarifications on how this “Open Calls System” will work and will guarantee in a way “return on investment”.	See previous answers here above
	Third Countries participation – Articles 2 and 86 This reference is appreciated but it does not guarantee that the participations of Third Countries stakeholders will be subject to additional budget to ERJU. We would appreciate to get regularly updates on the negotiation between the European Commission and Third Countries and the potential impacts on ERJU. As a reminder, we would support the participation of Third Countries stakeholders within ERJU on condition that additional budget is allocated to ERJU.	Noted: this point is under active discussion between Commission policy teams and RTD central services. It is confirmed the provision of the SBA on the top up of Third Countries budget to the partnerships. The concrete mechanisms still under discussions, but there can be a certain confidence in this respect, subject to the political agreement.
	System Pillar – Articles 83, 84 and 93 Regarding the membership of the Steering Group, it seems that both rail sector associations and ERJU members would be allowed to join this group. The European Commission will select the members of this group. We would appreciate to get the confirmation that we will be able to contribute to the System Pillar Activities as ERJU FMs and not only through the rail sector associations.	Noted A group is currently established to prepare the setting up of the system pillar and the CFM will be kept informed on the constituent elements of the System Pillar.
	Deployment Group – Article 94 The description of the missions and role of this group are not described in the SBA. It is understood that this deployment group will support the implementation of rail innovations in Europe through additional opportunities (e.g. CEF, Cohesion Policy Funds..) or involvement of additional urban/mainline operators willing to implement these innovations on their networks.	The specific structure of the Deployment Coordination Group will be developed in parallel with the ongoing work on setting up ERJU. Note that we hope it will enable better businesses cases, thus enhancing access to finance including CEF and regional funds. It will NOT however be a financing mechanism as such.

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	We would appreciate to get more information on this Deployment Group from the European Commission.	
	<p>Synergies with other partnerships – Recital 12 and Article 5 It should be up to the ERJU Governing Board to agree on the areas for cooperation (through joint calls) with other Joint Undertakings.</p> <p>We would appreciate to get clarifications on when these synergies should be identified (before or after the official start of ERJU).</p>	<p>All the existing JUs are in different phases of preparing for their successor, including re-writing their programmes considering the budgetary adjustments. As S2R we liaise regularly with all existing JUs to explore opportunities for cooperation, but without having more stable and clear plans the exchanges advance slowly. Clean Hydrogen appears to be one of the JU where enhanced collaboration can be achieved, the HE Programme on aspects of ITS and passenger experience, Sesar for the aspects in relation to architecture and digitalization of complex systems, CEF2 for all the aspects in relation to deployment of S2R solutions (DAC in primis), System Pillar and future technological innovations.</p> <p>In the future, the 5G / Battery / and other partnership can be interlocutor with whom to work. The Commission is keen to ensure better synergies in the future, so some will be identified in this initial preparation phase, but others may emerge in future.</p>
	<p>Common back office – Article 12 This approach is new compared to Shift2Rail and will have to be better explained by the European Commission. It seems difficult to envisage an externalization of some activities (e.g. Communication).</p> <p>We would appreciate to get clarifications on how this common back office will work and which benefits it will bring to ERJU.</p>	<p>The Executive Directors of the JU will be responsible to analyse the synergies and bring forward a proposal for implementation.</p>
Batch 4		
	<p>The information on projects that we would like to carry out was not on a very detailed level. When and how should we update this information given the fact that slides 14-17 show calculations on the basis of this information (that was not given by us)?</p>	<p>As indicated in the task name this is a first “high level” estimation. Each CFM will have the possibility to fine tune the information in the successive steps until the signature of the accession agreement. As indicated during the meetings the slides 14-17 were made just to provide an indication of the current situation which can of course change in the upcoming month in function of the priorities defined and the synergies among the different contribution.</p>

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	When will the flagship projects be discussed with the members? Can we expect them to be the Transforming Projects?	That task is dependent on the agreement on the master plan, which did not happen yet, it is therefore a bit delayed. We expect to be able to start to discuss flagship projects or areas next month. We also expect that the capabilities they will provide to the rail sector will be reflecting largely the Transforming Projects, as it is already the case today in the master plan discussion. Their identification will also depend on the technical mapping of the expected contribution which is ongoing.
	We understood that many partners still have questions on the future implementation mode. The planning suggests that this has already been decided. Could you please explain?	This is a mistake, “simply” driven by the fact that it is a successive task after the 38. We received the input from the CFM and for the moment the reference is on model 1 and model 2.1, as was explained in the meeting. Further support to the model 1 was provided recently in the last CFM meeting with the JU, this appear to be the preferred model but it is indeed not yet “selected”.
	Could you please shortly explain this action “managing access data framework”?	Reflection needed upfront on the way assets data and statistical information is shared among the Programme for the implementation of R&I activities (e.g. also to develop AI functions or TMS advanced planning).
Batch 5		
	Letter of Commitment: several times, the LoC was mentionned but only with an indicative submission date in autumn. Will there be a template available for all funding members and by when approximately? Also, is there already a deadline defined for sending the LoC? What will be content of LoC?	The template is being worked on by Commission services, no release date is foreseen as of now. It will be shared as soon as it is available.

Q no.	Questions	Answers
	Financing Scheme: is there any information available about how the financing will be implemented in the upcoming Joint Undertaking, e.g. with a lump sum approach for all or only specific calls? Is there any detailed information available about the funding scheme (percentage of funding etc.)?	Please refer to the presentation delivered to the Candidate Founding Members after the meeting on May 6th. For the moment the JU is considering an average funding rate of 60% of the eligible costs and there is the intention of applying the lump sum method in calls that the EU-Rail JU will launch for flagship projects, just as the S2R JU has already done in its last calls regarding topics reserved for members.
	Membership Agreement: when will this document be approximately available? Is it expected to be (content-wise) similar to the version from S2R?	As already said for the first question, these documents will be available at a later stage pending internal consultation between services of the European Commission, they will be shared as soon as they become available.