

DAC Delivery Programme
PROGRAMME BOARD

Meeting 26 May 2021
14h00 – 16h30

Participants:

Giorgio TRAVAINI (host)	Kay KOLSHORN
Manuel ALARCON ESPINOSA (host)	Leonardo DONGIOVANNI (EC)
Andreas LIPKA	Mark TOPAL
Bertrand MINARY	Martin ERTL
Bo OLSSON	Martin ZSIFKOVITS
Burkard KUREK	Matthias KNÜPPLING
Carlo BORGHINI (S2R)	Oscar MARTOS
Christian RADEWAGEN	Paul HEGGE
Christoph KLOSE	Peter REINSHAGEN
Constanze BANNHOLZER	Stefan HAGENLOCHER
Frederic HENON	Sven WELLBROCK
Jan BERGSTRAND	Thomas JÄGER
Jens ENGELMANN	Thomas PETRASCHEK
Johan AHMAN	Ulrich MAUSER
Johann FEINDERT	

14h00

1. Introduction [S2R]

a. Welcome, adoption of the Agenda

Carlo Borghini (S2R) welcomed all the participants and opened the meeting. He proposed a minute of silence to remember a colleague from Bombardier Transportation who passed away in an accident. He stressed that behind all the success there is work done by men and women.

The agenda was adopted without any changes. No AoB was introduced.

14h10

2. Review of actions since the last PB

JENS ENGELMANN and MARK TOPAL presented the review of actions undertaken since the March meeting. The main activities revolved around the written procedure on the stage A criteria as launched by the S2R. The criteria have been discussed bilaterally, and the parties raised their comments. As confirmed, this issue has been resolved.

JENS ENGELMANN mentioned that there is a parallel work to include trade unions in the DAC programme. He mentioned that due to the fact that associations encountered certain issues related to time and resources, the contact with associations is expected to be renewed in mid-May.

MARK TOPAL added that the important part of the work between the March and May meetings was focused on the point 11 in Agenda (open call). He expressed satisfaction with the current feedback and positive feelings toward the outcome of the work.

CARLO BORGHINI stressed that neither S2R nor EC/ERA will attend the discussion on point 11 (open call) in order to ensure that there is no conflict of interest or any breach from the legal rules. He stressed that no matter what the results of the call would be, it is important to emphasize that the process of the DAC delivery is ongoing. He also mentioned that in accordance with the rules of Horizon2020, all costs that would be sustained the day after the submission of the call can be considered as eligible if the consortium decide to opt at their own risk with an early start date.

Mark Topal mentioned that the S2R JU is also financing the LCC independent study. Carlo Borghini explained that this is also thanked to the members of the CCA and members of S2R who agreed to adapt the scope of CCA with specific focus on the DAC.

3. New Members, interested parties

JENS ENGELMANN and MARK TOPAL stressed that there was an exchange with a possible new PB member, SBB Cargo. There was also an exchange with MEDWAY from Portugal about the possible accession. MARK TOPAL stressed that the feedback from discussion is positive, and the Portuguese company may become one of the early birds for testing, and even deployment. It has been stressed that MEDWAY is expected to send a request to join WP1 and maybe WP2.

GIORGIO TRAVAINI presented the current structure of members. He introduced 6 new organizations that expressed the interest in programme: ASSOFERR, BLS, OLEO, Luzern University, SAVVY Telematic Systems, and Tatravagonka Poprad. He mentioned that some of the organizations are already active (participating in WPs), and others are in process to be integrated. In total, there are currently 55 entities working in EDDP and the number is growing.

MARK TOPAL stressed that everyone is welcome in the group. He expressed the concern that the growing number of the participants may lead to discussion on the future decision-making procedures. CARLO BORGHINI shared the concern. He also added that the current structure is based on the two-layer approach – with programme board and supervisory board – and that provides check-and-balance.

OSKAR MARTOS posed a question on the extension of digital automated coupling to the other countries of the European Union given the recent exchange with the Portuguese MEDWAY. He pointed to the necessity of not losing interoperability.

JENS ENGELMANN confirmed that the first pre-check indicated the full compatibility of the current draft specifications, however further discussions on detailed issues will be held.

OSKAR MARTOS suggested also to make a correction with regard to the previous minutes. He mentioned the suggestion related to coverage of the Iberian track gauge and not to the Russian 1520 and clarified that the main objective is not to lose the current level of interoperability in EU. The typo will be corrected. CARLO BORGHINI also explained that following a discussion with JOSEF DOPPELBAUER it is clear that there are no exclusion anticipated, in particular for EU interoperability purposes.

Decision points:

4. Coupler type (head) selection: outcome of written procedure stage A criteria

JENS ENGELMANN explained the written procedure on the stage A criteria.

MARTIN ZSIFOVITS presented summary of comments received. As mentioned, 15 comments were received from 3 companies. The results of bilateral discussions are assessed as satisfactory. SNCF will join WP2. As mentioned, only 2 comments led to changes.

In terms of ACO.37, it has been changed from KO criteria to basic requirements (without DAC testing, no KO criteria are possible to be developed). In terms of AUCCO.5, the concern was related to weight of the DAC. As mentioned, the important is that the coupler shall weight less/equal to 370-380kg.

CHRISTIAN RADEWAGEN pointed to the need of clarification. He mentioned that at the last meeting it has been agreed that the word 'shall' in text has to be replaced by the word 'should' with regard to the weight ('shall weight less than 370-380kg'). STEFAN HAGENLOCHER supported the comment, pointing to the reformulation of wording. He confirmed that the LCC criteria has been kept in terms of the DAC weight.

All parties agreed to that the criteria and the suggested wording reformulation.

The final list will be distributed by the JU once revised as agreed by the PB.

MARK TOPAL thanked the working groups. He stressed that the communication is the key aspect of the work.

Voting procedure

MATTHIAS KNÜPPLIN presented a proposal discussed in the WP1 and WP2 in relations to the voting procedure. The proposal states that the voting rights should not be spread between all the participants, but to be concentrated around three categories of stakeholders: RUs, wagon keepers, and infrastructure managers companies. Such proposal is based on the assumption that these three groups bear major responsibilities (i.e. in operations or safety aspects).

The recommendation has been supported via chat discussion by some stakeholders (i.e. Voith, Dellner, Siemens Mobility). Other stakeholders expressed neutrality towards the proposition.

CARLO BORGHINI presented a proposal that combines recommendations made by the wagon keeper representatives, and a need to not exclude other parties. As mentioned, a common consensus as a decision-making procedure is more effective than regulatory framework or imposition of certain solutions. He proposed that the principle remains the same - a consensus is needed, so that everyone is able to express their opinions. However, in case there is a need to vote, the voting procedure will be concentrated around three parties: IMs, wagon keepers, and RUs. The other parties (outside the three categories) will have a right to raise comments/opinions for consideration before the final decision.

Members expressed their consent. CHRISTOPH KLOSE added that the comments and advice should be taken into consideration by the board. MARK TOPAL stressed that the current issue relates only to the final voting, and the procedures will be transparent.

MARTIN ERTL expressed his neutrality towards the proposition. He stressed that the main goal is to combine different worlds to come up with one coherent solution, and therefore, the manufacturers are also important in the whole process. He argued that not only operations should be taken into account, but also the technological possibilities. He pointed that the further discussion on the operational procedures is also needed. CARLO BORGHINI ensured that the idea behind the proposal is to provide a platform for all parties to raise their comments and express their views before the final decision is taken.

JENS ENGELMANN and MARK TOPAL proposed to provide a written statement that reflects the current proposition. MATTHIAS KNÜPPLIN supported the written statement stating that it should be presented to the WP1-2.

Parties agreed that the consensus is a priority, but if needed the second solution (voting) will be applied.

Information points:

5. Coupler type (head) selection

- a. Selection process stage B (LCC) / timeline + separate PB meeting June

MARTIN ZSIFKOVITS presented the work done in relation to the stage B (life-cycle costs). He stressed that the current work revolves around the analysis phase with an aim to present a life-cycle model to the PB that will be agreed. Once approved, the model should be assessed and calculated. He stressed that there is a 3-week delay in comparison to the initial plan. There are no NDAs signed by now. The alternative solution was proposed to hold an additional meeting in June dedicated to the approval of the stage B procedures. He reminded that stage B criteria are important to the entire assessment of selection.

MARK TOPAL asked about the standard NDA used within the S2R whether they may be used also in this case.

CARLO BORGHINI explained that the contractor is working under the S2R regulatory framework. He mentioned that the general conditions of the contract are public, yet in the activities, the contractor is bound by confidentiality provisions. The contractor will report to the S2R, and the board decides how to make use of the report. There is no direct relation between the contractor's opinion and the decision taken by the board. In terms of liability, CARLO BORGHINI stressed that the contractor does not take any decisions, only recommendations.

CHRISTIAN RADEWAGEN raised a comment that the definition of the LCC framework does not require any detailed data from the suppliers' side. MARTIN ZSIFOVITS stressed that in order to set up the model, the important issue is to understand the technical specifications and differences between the coupler types and their influences on the operations. CHRISTOPH KLOSE proposed to send out the general description of what is the coupler in order to facilitate the discussion.

CHRISTIAN RADEWAGEN mentioned also that there is a need to have a clear picture of who is responsible in case the confidential data provided by the suppliers will be distributed elsewhere. CARLO BORGHINI explained that the current contracts foresee liability and confidentiality in general provisions. He proposed to share the general conditions with other parties. He proposed to send an official letter to all the parties concerned indicating that the parties are requested to provide the information, as a support to the current work.

All parties agreed that the documents mentioned above will be shared by the S2R and the members.

b. Procurement boundary conditions (impact on CAPEX/LCC)

FREDERIC HENON summarized the procurement boundary conditions. Based on the existing regulations, the contractor will be asked to apply two scenarios for cost calculation within the LLC methodology: (1) 100% global sourcing; (2) 50% European sourcing. The idea is to track what are the potential impacts of both scenarios. This issue will be discussed at the next meeting. In terms of licence-free conditions, the discussion is ongoing, but no final conclusion has been achieved.

6. DAC4EU update: Dellner/CAF

ULRICH MEUSNER (DB) and JOHAN AHMAN (Dellner) provided update on the DAC4EU. At the moment, the solution proposed by CAF is no longer a part of the testing. Following some initial failures of the innovative prototype for this Type4 coupler, some reengineering work has been carried out since October 2020, combining efforts by the engineers from CAF and Dellner. Despite the efforts and due to the short time available, Dellner decided to withdraw from the testing. JOHAN AHMAN added that the costs of the final product would have been probably higher than other solutions and the reliability was in this moment low.

7. EDDP Position Paper: Full Digital Rail Freight Operations in EU / ERJU

MARK TOPAL presented the summary of the position paper that has been recently provided to the S2R and the EC. He thanked all the parties engaged and highlighted that the position paper is a joint paper built upon the consensus of all parties. The main message stemming

from the paper is that there is a need for further innovation, technology development, and research in terms of the DAC. The DAC is perceived by the parties as a whole system. Based on the position paper, it is advised that full digital rail freight should be considered as a flagship project/transforming project in the future EU-Rail JU.

CARLO BORGHINI stressed that all the inputs and concrete propositions received from members will help to shape the future content of the Master Plan of the Europe's Rail. He also added that the rail freight and digital rail freight are key aspects of the Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy. LEONARDO DONGIOVANNI confirmed that the DAC is encompassing two main priorities of the future JU, and it should play a role in Europe's Rail JU. He also mentioned that the main activities under the EU-Rail JU are related to the research. Therefore, other than research activities may be funded under other sources of investments, both at the European and national level. MARK TOPAL highlighted the importance of research. CHRISTOPH KLOSE addressed the wagon keepers and operators stating they should focus on the prioritization of use cases now.

8. Indicative migration scenarios and outlook

ANDREAS LIPKA presented the indicative migration scenarios based on the pre-study carried out last year. He presented three phases that are taken into account. The pre-phase is devoted to testing and gathering experience from all the IMs and RUs all over the Europe (i.e. running test wagons, using several wagons and several train systems from different countries). The pre-phase is expected to take place between 2024-2025. The ramp-up phase is expected to take place between 2026-2027. ANDREAS LIPKA stressed that currently there are test wagons conducted, and the demonstrator is expected in 2022. JENS ENGELMANN stressed that in order to have work done, the information is needed on the fleet preparedness. He addressed the wagon keepers to provide information on the technical status and the wagon situation. He stressed that an NDA may be signed if needed.

CHRISTIAN RADEWAGEN raised a comment on the volume of investment. He noted that such significant investments in a short period of time (2 years) would harm the business case. ANDREAS LIPKA explained that the indicative scenario relates to the 70% of volume transported, not the vehicles. He clarified the issue with the relevance to ramp-up phase. JENS ENGELMANN stressed that the current stage is more about feasibility rather than costs. ANDREAS LIPKA mentioned that there is a need to conduct a series of workshops for infrastructure managers and the railway undertakings to train the staff and to prepare them to particular phases.

PAUL HEGGE raised a concern on the financing capabilities of RUs. He also asked about the inclusion of block trains in the ramp-up phase. MARK TOPAL suggested that it is too early to discuss the financing, but there is awareness that funding opportunities and co-financing should be further explored. LEONARDO DONGIOVANNI stressed that the financing depends on the migration as much as the migration depends on the financing. CARLO BORGHINI shared the double-link between the migration and financing. However, he stressed that at certain point of time, the decision has to be taken independently from the financing. There is a need to come up with a business case in the migration plan that will justify the priorities. He added that migration plan may require a combination of different sources of financing.

MARK TOPAL suggested that the comments raised via chat will be discussed at another meeting. Parties agreed on that.

9. Consolidation of different existing operational procedures in EU / state of play

STEFAN HAGENLOCHER presented the status of the work of the sub-group 4 in the WP1. He thanked all the EDDP members and rail freight business for the support. He invited all the parties that are not a part of the WP1 to join the group. He summarized all the topics that are currently covered by the WP1 (details can be found in the ppt on slides 28-29). He mentioned that there are three challenging topics at the moment: (1) buffer position of DAC; (2) location and technical design of uncoupling mechanism; (3) location of air valve.

He presented two major differences in operations of RUs. First, the so-called push-off operations (i.e. Austria, Germany) where there is no coupling, but wagons are pushed away to be sorted into siding track. He mentioned that this type of operations is not used in some other countries (i.e. Switzerland or Poland), and in some it is forbidden. For push-off operations, the buffer position is needed (wagon pushed together without coupling). He mentioned that it is technically feasible to keep the push-off operations, but the coupling procedure will get more complicated with a third coupler position. There is a need to carry out tests to ensure whether it is possible to have push-off operations without the buffer position. Second, the marshal yard by using uncoupling sticks. He mentioned that despite this type of operations is used in some countries, in others it is forbidden (i.e. France).

He stressed that there are also two ways of doing uncoupling for marshalling yard operations: (1) uncoupling before the hump; (2) uncoupling on the hump. The main differences have been summarized (i.e. higher speed when uncoupling before the hump).

It has been recommended to uncouple the wagons on the hump. Such a solution does not require any buffer position. The disadvantage is that it leads to the slower speed on the hump.

For marshalling yard hump operations, two options for future processes with DAC have been discussed. The presented favoured option is the option without venting of air. If the option is not possible, the second solution is proposed (with venting of air).

MARK TOPAL and CARLO BORGHINI invited all the parties to join the work of the WP1. CARLO BORGHINI stressed that in the future there will be an event/workshop organized for the entire community on this topic. He mentioned that it is important to understand development and the risk associated with the process.

16h15

10. AOB and closing

No AOB has been introduced

11. Update on Open Call (without S2R/EC/ERA participation)

This part was not attended by the S2R/EC.