

PROGRAMME BOARD

Meeting 26 June 2024

14h00 – 16h30

Minutes

PARTICIPANTS

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| ÅHMAN Johan | Dellner | MARTOS Oscar | ERA |
| BACCONNIER Es- telle | EC (DG MOVE) | NOËL Tibo | NUON Consult- ing |
| BANNHOLZER Con- stanze | ÖBB | OLSSON Bo | Trafikverket |
| BERGSTRAND Jan | Trafikverket | RADEWAGEN Chris- tian | Voith |
| ENGELMANN Jens | Railiable | RAOULT David | Wabtec |
| FEINDERT Johann | GATX | REINSHAGEN Peter | ERMEWA |
| GOHEL Nicolas | Blue Arches | SÜNDER Michael | Deutsche Bahn |
| GRÄBER Johannes | Knorr-Bremse | TIEDEMANN Joa- chim | Siemens Mobil- ity |
| GÜNTER Armin | Deutsche Bahn | TRAVAINI Giorgio | EU-Rail JU |
| HILSE Hans-Chris- tian | Knorr-Bremse | TOPAL-GOEKCELI Mark | ÖBB |
| IBANEZ DE YRI- GOYEN Javier (JU) | EU-Rail JU | VAN BALEN Mitchell | ERA |
| KLOHR Markus | Alstom | VAN GILS Karel | EU-Rail JU |
| LIPKA Andreas | Deutsche Bahn | WILLIAMS Molley | Deutsche Bahn |
| LIPPERT Valeska | EU-Rail JU | ZAEHRINGER Sandy | EC (DG MOVE) |
| LOCHMAN Libor | Wabtec | ZOCCO Maria Anto- nietta | MERCITALIA INTERMODAL |

1. Introduction, welcome, adoption of the agenda

Giorgio TRAVAINI (GT) welcomed those present and led through the agenda.

2. Review of actions since the last Programme Board

GT mentioned the action resulting from the last Programme Board (PB) meeting and referred to its upcoming further discussion.

EDDP ad migration roadmap

3. G: State of play 100 pioneer DAC trains incl. debrief EC meeting

Jens ENGELMANN (JE) introduced the discussion on the 100 pioneer DAC trains by giving an overview of the developments to date.

Karel VAN GILS (KvG) reminded of the kick-off meeting held in April 2024 with 48 parties interested in participating and the subsequent bilateral discussions with the applicants, which will be evaluated in a feedback session in July 2024. KvG named participation, technology availability, authorisation, and financing possibilities as relevant output measures. He then presented the interested companies and some key figures on the resources provided by the participants. *For more detailed information, please refer to the presentation.*

Christian RADEWAGEN (CR) asked whether the diagram of participating companies was complete. Mark TOPAL-GOEKCELI (MT) confirmed that with Dellner, another DAC provider would be interested in participating in the pioneer train development.

KvG emphasised the geographically broad interest in participation, which would enable a high diversity of operating scenarios in terms of environmental conditions and transport situations across Europe.

MT stressed that the financial conceptualisation was still an open question. He emphasised the urgent need for a funding/financing plan so the interest of the partners in the project is maintained. KvG explained that with the information available, further planning could be undertaken on the funding/financing possibilities at European and national level. GT added that the question of funding/financing could be worked on in co-operation with the EC and that the efforts would be intensified following bilateral talks. In parallel to the European programmes and EU-Rail funding, national support initiatives should be examined and collected to exploit synergies and ensure coherence in Europe. MT reaffirmed the relevance of a timely solution to funding by providing a timeline and participation overview. Estelle BACCONNIER (EB) confirmed that work was underway to allow the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) programme to support the pioneer trains. The next CEF call was planned in September 2024. Funding would be attributed provided the proposal scores high on the selection criteria and would be limited, meaning that both co-funding for CEF and alternative financing options would be necessary. MT raised his concern that a failure of the efforts to obtain funding from the EU and thus of demonstrating political commitment should lead to a termination of the initiative. GT highlighted that work is being done

to include it in the next financial framework, but clear priorities must also be set for the development of the rail sector. He emphasised the importance of national participation in the pioneer trains.

→ **A concretisation of the implementation plan for the funding/financing of the DAC pioneer trains to be discussed and concluded in a timely manner.**

4. C1: migration roadmap | European vehicle fleet upgrading database

Andreas LIPKA (AL) justified the decision not to show a presentation on the European vehicle fleet upgrading database in view of the currently ongoing Grant Agreement (GA) discussions. MT noted that the role of the project leader, who is involved in the negotiations for the GA, and that of the rapporteur of the work area C of the EDDP might be differentiated. AL raised doubts about a potential conflict of interest. GT confirmed that the presentation could not be shown due to the ongoing GAP process. GT called for a specification of the activity differentiation and an examination of conflicts of interest and suggested a continuation of the discussions among the parties involved.

AL presented the status of the quantitative fleet analysis, which should be based on data already collected within the projects and on new information elicitation to close white spots in cooperation with the National Contact Points. He explained that the anonymised data should be secured in a "safe space" and referred to the still incomplete data on vehicle quantities and the lack of updates from some sources. A detailed presentation was planned as soon as the open points had been finalised. Regarding the technical implementation of the database, the consortium is currently providing vehicle documentation, which will be coordinated with the vehicle types planned for the DAC pioneer trains. He mentioned that the planned project budget would not be sufficient for the full scope, but that demonstrations could be realised through progressive data collection.

MT emphasised that a visualisation of the work plan and deliverables was necessary to allow for a general understanding and agreement. He noted that some partners would not participate without the intermediary of a neutral data collection entity, which is why a consensus should be found. GT confirmed that a joint proposal should be developed within the current GA preparation phase and presented to the PB to foster the commitment of the members.

→ **The further progresses on fleet quantification and the upgrading database are to be presented in the next PB meeting.**

5. C3: migration roadmap | tech/operational alternative migration solutions

AL continued his explanations on the technical and operational alternative migration solutions. He first specified the current understanding of migration planning, on which the four migration strategies developed are based, and explained possible adaptations associated with alternatives. Then, he summarised the results of an impact analysis of two change scenarios on the target system in relation to various

success criteria. He opens the question arising from the changes recognisable in the scenarios as to whether an alternative target system is necessary or whether the migration strategies should be adapted. *For more details on the target state and the effects of the adaption scenarios on the success indicators, please refer to the presentation.*

MT questioned the data-based nature of the target system behaviours presented. He explained that a qualified majority of EU member states was necessary for project implementation, but unlikely, which is why alternative scenarios could be used to create concessions. He pointed out that no formal decision on the migration process had yet been taken. AL confirmed that the target system and the migration strategies were developed with the help of additional consultation from the entire sector.

EB asked about the precision of the alternative scenarios developed in view of the assumptions on which they are based and the lack of data. She also questioned whether possible cost reductions were included in the analysis of the alternatives, in addition to the demonstrated benefits. AL explained that the alternatives were developed from an abstract approach, which was, however, based on realistic assumptions and experience in dealing with the intermodal part of the sector. Regarding savings potential, he confirmed the inclusion of the cost factor. He replied that the current level of detail did not allow for a concrete analysis, but that it had been recognised that the losses in benefits would exceed the cost savings.

Johannes GRÄBER (JG) asked whether the proposal also deals with migration strategies for locomotives. AL explained that the findings presented assume a hybrid coupler approach, which allows flexibility in the retrofitting of locomotives. The limitations in relation to hybrid coupling are known, which is why he named an adaptation of the authorisation process for locomotives and the flexibility of the infrastructure network as possible answers. He referred to a solution approach that has already been developed, in which a locomotive can be replaced without losses. Further specifications should be realised as soon as more precise data is available on the not suitable locomotives.

Maria Antonietta ZOCCO (MAZ) commented that the analyses should reflect the real operations and transportation patterns. AL confirmed this.

Libor LOCHMAN (LL) raised that considerations on the possible scrapping scheme should also be included in the design of the ideas for DAC retrofitting. MT confirmed this.

JE referred to the abstract nature of the discussion, which could only be specified as the project progressed. He referred to the fleet analysis and retrofit possibilities, as well as the separability of traffic as essential solution components for which there was still a great need for data. This should be taken forward and the quantification progress should be presented in different Board meetings. MT added that the next step should be to find agreements with partners who have not yet been involved in the discussion. Armin GÜNTER (AG) commented that Member States and partners

should be convinced of the DAC as a solution for the European railway sector without going too deeply into the details of its functioning.

→ **The progresses on fleet analysis and retrofittability are to be presented in the next PB meetings onwards (see previous topic), as well as the progress on the analysis on separability of traffics (in the different countries).**

6. B diverse subjects: risk management, stakeholder management

JE informed about two of many developments taking place under work area B. Firstly, he referred to the progress made in overall risk management and proposed the creation of an additional work stream to oversee risk management. Secondly, he proposed the implementation of exchange sessions for mutual updating in relation to stakeholder coordination.

GT commented that the proposals were essential, particularly in view of the increasing programme complexity. JE confirmed that the next step would be to develop a plan and then look for volunteers willing to participate.

→ **A request for the voluntary participation in the suggested risk management work stream is to be distributed after its creation.**

7. B2: Report on NCP kick off meeting

EB referred to the kick-off meeting with the National Contact Points (NCPs), the reached aim of which was to clarify expectations and launch the upcoming communication tasks.

JE recalled that the aim of the regional grouping and appointment of country ambassadors was to realise structured communication between the participating European countries. He referred to the task of the NCPs to establish links to the relevant associations and stakeholders in the countries. He presented the NCPs and linked ambassadors. *For more information, please refer to the presentation.* LL added that more information will be provided, and the first regular DAC Fora will be planned after the summer.

8. B2: Communication/dissemination 2024 – State of Play InnoTrans

JE reminded of the relevance of mutual coordination of the activities planned for InnoTrans2024.

Michael SÜNDER (MS) presented the planned procedure for coordinating the activities of the members. He informed that only 2 out of 20 partners responded to the request for an update of information in May 2024. He raised the question of the need for a DAC overview and presented the information required for this.

Hans-Christian HILSE (CH) recalled a request from EU-Rail on the activities planned in the context of their programme, including the DAC activities, so that the information could be obtained through EU-Rail. GT confirmed that it would be possible to

provide the information to the PB members once it had been verified that no additional information was required from DACcord. MAZ informed that no fixed plan could be provided yet, but that progress was expected by the end of July. MS summarised that a DAC overview was desired and that the information that could not be obtained from existing sources should be obtained through individual requests to allow synergies.

→ **EU-Rail should share available information on the planned DAC activities of the members during InnoTrans 2024**

FP5-TRANS4M-R/FDFTO

9. Sounding Board results

Constanze BANNHOLZER (CB) presented a debrief of the Sounding Board meeting held in May 2024. She informed about the participation, contents, and results of this meeting, which were openly shared, as well as about further upcoming Sounding Board meetings. She encouraged a higher participation in this meeting format. She also informed about the activities taking place in FP5 to finalise the specifications to be presented in the next PB.

JG noted that no invitation had yet been received for the preparation meeting of the Sounding Board meeting in September 2024. JE emphasised the need for more active and clearer dissemination of the meeting access.

→ **EU-Rail to place the Sounding Board Access Information more visible on its website.**

System Pillar

JG informed about the formalisation of the cooperation between the system pillar and FP5 on the rulebook discussed in the last SIPB. Regarding the FTFTO central instance for the organisation of data exchange, information on the procedure will be provided stepwise so that a publication in October 2024 is possible. Finally, he referred to a meeting taking place between the system pillar, FP2, and FP5 on the interface of the ECTS in July to provide the sector with more detailed information on its implementation.

AOB and closing

GT reflected on the necessary actions that have arisen. Accordingly, a financing plan for the pioneering train should be drawn up and possibilities of support from the sector should be examined until the publication of the CEF call in September 2024. Furthermore, the planning of data collection and analysis for migration from a fleet perspective should be presented to the PB. A proposal should be provided based on the finalisation of the GA in one of the following PBs. A call for volunteers should be launched for risk management. He also emphasised the relevance of InnoTrans for the visibility of the DAC, which requires the input of all members.

MT suggested for the following PB meeting in September 2024 a hybrid implementation with the physical part taking place in Vienna in parallel to the IRSC conference.

Javier IBANEZ DE YRIGOYEN (JI) referred to the raised proposal to be possible and GT encouraged the members to decide on the venue. It was decided that the EDDP PB meeting on 17 September 2024 will be held in Vienna with the option of joining also remotely.

GT closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their participation.