

#### SUPERVISORY BOARD

#### 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting 23 March 2023 14h30 - 16h30

### DRAFT agenda

Conference call

## List of participants

BACCONNIER Estelle	IBANEZ Javier (JU)	SCHETTINI Bardo
(EC)		
BANNHOLZER Constanze	LIPKA Andreas	TIONE Roberto
	(observer)	(observer)
DE ROSE Antonio	MARXEN Ralf	TOPAL Mark (PM)
(observer)		
ENGELMANN Jens (PM)	MONDVAY Boglarka	TRAVAINI Giorgio (JU)
FEIGHAN Conor	PETERHANS Gilles	VAN BALEN Mitchel
FITCH Keir (EC)	PIRON Olivier (ERA)	WIEBE Enno
FURIO Nicolas	RADEWAGEN Christian	
GRAEBER Johannes	SEESSLE Patrick	
(observer)	(observer)	

## 1. Introduction, welcome and adoption of the Agenda

On behalf of the Commission, Keir FITCH welcomed the participants and Giorgio TRAVAINI in his new role as the JU's ED a.i. and as co-Chair of the EDDP Supervisory Board. Keir FITCH informed the Supervisory Board that a new EDDP support project is expected to be running soon pending the outcome of the evaluation process of the EU-Rail 2<sup>nd</sup> call and informed about the recent developments in the Commission in trying to rump up the efforts not only on the technical side but also on the funding and financing on the DAC delivery programme. He briefly referred to the DAC discussions held in the last CTO Council and the proposed approach for a letter of support to the DAC implementation signed by CEOs of individual RUs/Wagon Keepers

In relation to the TSI package, the EC is moving forward to finalise it by the end of March, but it includes no reference on the DAC. Since no specifications were ready. The incorporation of DAC to the relevant TSIs (LOC&PAS, WAG, CCS) can only happen once the solution is fully ready, with the technical specifications. Estelle BACCONNIER was introduced as the policy officer that will follow the detailed work on DAC within DG MOVE.

# 2. Review of actions since the last Supervisory Board

Jens ENGELMANN introduced the actions reported since the last EDDP Supervisory Board. On the first action, Giorgio TRAVAINI explained that the JU distributed to the SP members and JU members the draft of the "EU-Rail and Harmonisation" process within the System Pillar which includes the terminology definitions asked in the last EDDP SB; comments are expected until the end of the month. Johannes GRAEBER confirmed that based on that input a common terminology will be achieved. Olivier PIRON, requested that ERA be involved for this work and it was clarified that ERA is fully involved, Pio GUIDO is part of the System Pillar Core Group.

On the second action, Jens ENGELMANN and Javier IBANEZ confirmed that the proposal on the transition to sounding boards and the adaptation to the EDDP structure is underway and will be updated in the EU-Rail website. Jens ENGELMANN raised the concern on having the associations involved and referred to the website to have an official place where this involvement can be realised through the sounding boards and be integrated in future meetings.

## 3. Information on Destination 8/topic 7

Giorgio TRAVAINI confirmed that the evaluation of proposals was finalised, and that the decision of the EU-Rail JU Governing Board has been taken. The applicants will be receiving the letters shortly and in parallel the GB decision will be published in the EU-Rail website. The selected proposals for funding by the GB will enter into the Grant Agreement Preparation phase in order to conclude the signature of the GA, which could take up to three months. Nevertheless, projects could already start their activities (at their risk) with a fixed start date since the date of the submission of their proposal.

Enno WIEBE requests whether additional input can be provided on the topics defined in the scope.

Giorgio TRAVAINI clarifies that the generic content presented was on purpose, as the proposed project activities remains confidential until the letters with the decision are sent out. In the next SB additional details could be provided.

## 4. DAC Sector Statement

Keir FITCH made a brief introduction to what was agreed by the CTOs of RUs/IMs back in the last CTO Council. The agreed sector statement would enable to start building broad support across MS for DAC. The statement from the railway companies with a direct signature of CEOs and endorsement of technical solution and business case, and endorsement by CTOs, would show the substantial support for the DAC project. He also reported on the hearing in the European Parliament, TRAN Committee, on DAC in February with many MEPs being supportive.

Mark TOPAL agreed on the necessity to show direct company support with this letter and encouraged the necessity of the sector players statement for the DAC deployment to happen with a realistic plan build up on a proved and widely tested standardised technology. He encouraged companies to get involved and associations to facilitate the statement to address the message.

Gilles PETERHANS, confirmed that UIP will be part of the sector statement and asks for the role of the CTO Council to which clarifications are provided in the sense of the role of the CTO Council. It was clarified that it is an informal council with rail RUs/IMs CTOs representatives exchanging views on a broad number of subjects.

Enno WIEBE asked whether it is realistic to have this statement signed by individual companies (by June 2023) as well as the role expected from CER for collecting these signatures.

Keir FITCH confirmed the fact that having the statement signed company by company would show the commitment that the companies are prepared to fundamentally change their operations with the retrofitting of DAC. The support for the process would be much more powerful in that sense towards MS.

Conor FEIGHAN commented on another statement from Central European associations (February 2023) not fully supporting DAC as well as requesting clarity on financing aspects at this point.

Mark TOPAL pointed out that the statement made by the Central European associations was not having all members involved. He indicated being confident that a major part of the market share would join the position. The message the effort from the association to get the paper accepted by its members would be welcomed. The purpose is to prepare the statement and then consider which companies would join and pass the message.

Giorgio TRAVAINI reflects on the ambitious targets set by the group and offers the support from the JU to focus on the coordination actions for the common statement of the sector to be realised.

### → Mark TOPAL and Jens ENGELMANN to lead the work and follow-up on the consensus for the support on the DAC sector common statement.

## 5. Critical issue 3: (loco) fleet data criteria & urgency s – state of play

Jens ENGELMANN introduced the critical issue highlighted, which is presented by Andreas LIPKA. He stated that some of the assumptions from the very early stage of the project were not precise enough. A huge part of European locomotive fleet is not prepared to take the DAC. Even if the approach taken by FP5 goes in the right direction, the solutions covered might not cover the whole European fleet. From the EDDP PB there was a broad support to cover the whole wagon fleet. Together with the associations and the approach to their members, the data presented is still not enough and more discussion on the technical approach is needed. A complete overview of the fleet would be needed (excluding the shunters not registered) to have a common European approach.

Enno WIEBE indicated that CER is happy to contribute to the exercise and see the need for more information on the locomotives. CER members believe that the figures on the locomotive fleet are of major importance for input on the CBA and on the investment plan.

# → CER would be sharing additional detailed figures and get back to the EDDP SB.

Jens ENGELMANN pointed out that a draft letter will be received to support the task force to collect additional data.

Giorgio TRAVAINI asked on the visibility from which parties the data is missing, so specific stakeholders could be addressed.

Andreas LIPKA stated that the total number of vehicles in Europe is unknown. Master data information was gathered through associations. As an example, the data from mid-size enterprises not organised through associations is missing. Discrepancies in figures (around 1/6) are key to be identified in order to define the whole migration plan. Scrapping scheme should be also mentioned with the existing capacities to replace the equipment.

## 6. Next steps (Q1-Q2/2023), incl. needs

Jens ENGELMANN presented the PM activities on DACcelerate and the ramp-up of activities foreseen after the decision on Destination 8/topic 7 of the EU-Rail JU call. (*Please refer to the presentation*). As an open point, it was presented that the EDDP migration roadmap actions still have no resources/funding in place and that solutions largely depends on the setup of the DAC pre-deployment structure.

Keir FITCH raised the importance that at the more technical level the MS should be brought along with the EDDP. There will be a dedicated discussion on DAC at the EU-Rail SRG, but given SRG is predominantly research Ministry focused, additional work is needed to ensure transport ministries and ministers are fully associated with ongoing actions. A meeting of Member States representatives in the EDDP would therefore be valuable, in addition to the SRG.

## 7. European Investment Plan study (results)

Keir FITCH introduced the topic as a fundamental element for having the programme implemented.

Giorgio TRAVAINI presented the study which was commissioned by the JU to EY and introduced Antonio DE ROSE, who thanked for the cooperation for the execution of the Study and presented the results. (*Please refer to the presentation*)

Keir FITCH thanked for the presentation and referred to the DAC deployment management raised in the presentation to which for the moment there is immediate solution, although the EC is investigating available options.

Enno WIEBE asked on the expected benefits and how the  $\in$ 18bn are calculated, on the role of the DAC deployment manager (scenario 1 and 2), the need for it and next steps.

Keir FITCH replied that depending on the approach chosen for the establishment of the DAC deployment manager, a legal basis may be required, in particular if the

manager were to be responsible for disbursing EU funds or had mandatory powers to coordinate DAC deployment.

Antonio DE ROSE replied on the €18bn figure and what needs to be done to reach those savings. EY listed some key factors such as the establishment of a Regulation and of a deployment manager with common projects having a superior interest there would be a framework for the DAC to reflect the possible savings/gains.

Conor FEIGHAN asked on scenarios 1 and 2 and EIB financing thresholds foreseen and secondly on clarifications on whether to the point of longer and heavier trains the infrastructure constraints are meant there. Lastly, he requests on the operational saving included in the  $\in$ 800m figure and whether it only reflects savings on longer and heavier trains.

Johannes GRAEBER asked for the next steps (who and when) on the scenarios foreseen and whether the deployment group would have a role on it.

Antonio DE ROSE replies that the information on the costs and the benefits is coming from the CBA, which is still under refinement.

Mitchell VAN BALEN intervened to confirm that costs and benefits are addressed within the CBA report. In the document, all the assumptions and calculations are mentioned in detail. The document will be shared in the next EDDP SB.

Antonio DE ROSE completed on the benefits of EIB lending in order to have the possibility to have individual assets covered for smaller companies.

Keir FITCH added that a special purpose vehicle to achieve this could be set up with the private sector without the need for EU legislation. An EU legislation would be required to give the deployment manager a role in coordinating some EU funds distribution. On the choice of funding models, he stated that this is a fundamental issue that needs to be discussed with Member States. In order to move the process forward, he urged to move quickly in view of the new financial perspectives. On the link between the future DAC deployment manager and the JU's deployment group, he clarified that the deployment group is being set up and it will follow all the work of the JU. The group will work on ensuring that innovative solutions can be brought into the market and on managing their strategic deployment across rail network when needed and managed. On the other hand, the DAC deployment manager would be more targeted and business-oriented, looking for financing and funding, and developing coordinated strategies so the freight railway system can continue to function.

Giorgio TRAVAINI confirmed. In terms of timeline for the deployment group of the JU, it would be set in 2023. It is now under consultation with the members for a more precise scope definition. He emphasised that the deployment group of Europe's Rail JU should include all stakeholders.

## 8. Dissemination & events 2023

Jens ENGELMANN briefly went through the events planned. A clarification was provided on the event in May in Stockholm as the slide is not up to date (Rail Transport Days on the 30 May 2023, initially called Rail Freight Days).

Enno WIEBE raised the question on the intention to be present in additional events. Jens ENGELMANN confirmed that the presence in the event (TRAKO fair) will be ensured with DAC topics represented on the agenda.

## 9. Brief report state of play FP5 (FDFTO)

On behalf of FP5, Patrick SEESSLE briefly introduced the FP5- TRANS4M-R and activities related to operational procedures. Additional details were provided by Constance BANNHOLZER (*Please refer to the presentation*)

Olivier PIRON asked on the TSI links presented. The initial plan for the Agency would be, by mid-2025, to deliver the TSI requirements. Even if that could be postponed, the definition of the time plan and risks linked to the activities of WP4 and WP5 would need to fit and will be taken up bilaterally with the Agency in case any inconsistencies should be clarified (also in relation to the testing reflected within WP13).

Johannes GRAEBER added in relation to the TSI and the collaboration established with the Agency through the System Pillar (SP aims to involve MSs (NSAs) in the discussion of the TSI texts). He also mentioned the Agency proposal paper on how to manage retrofitting at high volume (with DAC as first blueprint) which is currently under discussion.

Gilles PETERHANS, intervened to provide some insights on the WP4 from FP5 (in response to Olivier PIRON) activities in order to validate and prepare documentation demonstrating safety (risk analysis, authorisation procedures,...) and not synchronised with the TSI requirements.

Giorgio TRAVAINI thanked Olivier PIRON for this point and concluded that

# → The JU will look with ERA on the TSI matter to ensure alignment of actions, both with FP5 and Task4 of the SP.

# **10.** DAC SPEC: coupler height/e-coupler/bridge plates

Christian RADEWAGEN provides the feedback on the DAC Specs (*Please refer to the presentation*). No questions raised.

# **11.** Brief report state of play SP (Task 4)

Before reporting on the state of play, Johannes GRAEBER asked in relation to the organisational aspects, whether regular reporting of Task 4 would be done within the EDDP PB and on ad-hoc basis for the EDDP SB. He asked whether for FP5 would be the same approach.

Giorgio TRAVAINI clarified that the EDDP SB members receive the presentation of the EDDP PB discussion, where the reporting of FP5 and Task 4 is provided. The question is raised to the EDDP SB members on whether they would like to have the reporting in every meeting or on ad-hoc basis.

Gilles PETERHANS considers that there would be no added value to technically report on each SB on the FP5 and Task 4 activities.

## → The EDDP SB endorsed the proposal only to have ad-hoc reporting on FP5 and Task 4 progress.

Johannes GRAEBER added that, if okay for EDDP SB members, he would represent the SP CG in the EDDP SB to attend as observer in case critical topics are flagged.

Giorgio TRAVAINI clarified that based on the agreement just reached by the EDDP SB, if there will be an ad-hoc reporting requested to the SP Task 4, or discussion on activities impacting the SP, Johannes Graeber will then be invited by the JU to attend the meeting as JU observer.

Roberto TIONE presented the state of play SP (task 4) (*Please refer to the presentation*).

Giorgio TRAVAINI commented on the work to be carried out within Task 4 and the TSI input plan as previously discussed to ensure coherence.

## 12. AOB and closing

Jens ENGELMANN introduced the FP5 sounding board meeting activities and the link with the draft letter to be launch with the request for operational experts to join the sounding boards that are targeting operational procedures. It is important to have operational colleagues from RUs and relaunch the request also to the EU-Rail JU members.

Javier IBANEZ confirmed that the task will be relaunched once the definition of the Sounding Boards are clearly defined (pending action from PM). The information will be also updated within the EU-Rail JU website.

Gilles PETERHANS asked whether any specific profiles are being looked for.

Jens ENGELMAN clarified that any colleague with expertise on operations and can judge operational processes such as shunting, train run, how brake tests are done and in general with planning operations background.

Enno WIEBE reflects on the deadlines provided to look for these experts and to be pragmatic on the timing considered to enable the proper seek of experts due to the importance of the topic.

This was duly noted and longer timeframe will be considered for the upcoming requests.

Estelle BACCONNIER thanked everyone on the contributions and updates received. She reflected on the challenges ahead: funding, preparation of the migration and the pre-deployment structure. She also raised the concern on the need to engage with MSs beyond the circle of the "convinced ones". The Commission is working on this and appreciated the efforts in the context of EDDP "neo" that contributed to it.

Giorgio TRAVAINI summarised on the challenges ahead, thanked for the contributions and wished for a good continuation of the DAC work.