



## 1st JOINT SESSION SRG / SSG

14 May 2024

15:00-17:00h  
Hybrid meeting

Draft Minutes

<p><b>1. Welcome and introduction by SRG and SSG Chairs</b></p> <p><i>Declarations of conflict of interest based on the Agenda items + Approval of draft Agenda</i></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all participants to the first joint session of the Europe's Rail SRG and SSG which he considers a great opportunity to join forces.</p>	<p>15:00-15:05</p>
<p><b>2. Introduction of (roundtable) of all Members of both groups</b></p> <p>The members of each group introduced themselves.</p>	<p>15:05-15:20</p>
<p><b>Latest developments in SRG and SSG by Chairs + Exchange of views with Mr Kristian Schmidt, Director for Mobility and Transport, DG MOVE, European Commission</b></p> <p>The Chair introduced Mr Schmidt, who made a general statement followed by an exchange with the participants.</p> <p>He started by saying that there are important challenges in the rail sector and that we should all recognise that European leadership - and implicitly rail as backbone of mobility in Europe - is being challenged. There is a risk of delocalisation like it happened with other industries. Rail is a networking sector, so we need strong collaboration. DAC is a clear example that no single company can do it on its own. Green mobility is ongoing and important investments are needed. This is why the 2 groups play an important role: the SSG to help assess what innovations are needed and come with European solutions; and SRG to ensure the new systems can be delivered, because the market will not deliver them alone (e.g., TMS). Thus, we cannot innovate in a corner, we need to work together on these solutions and roll them out together. The question of funding and results from this funding is also important because EU-Rail is a successor of S2R and in view of the discussions on FP10, questions will soon be asked on how the money is being used. EU-Rail is not a think tank, our aim is to select and deploy technologies. We cannot have a JU going into various directions, we must arrive to a consensus on key issues, and focus on key priorities.</p> <p>He therefore encouraged both groups to be pro-active, highlighting the principle of openness, not work as a silo, find synergies with other sectors, be open to Eastern Europe, not be a closed club but open to everybody who has something to bring. In this regard, he welcomed that EU-Rail is collaborating with other JUs, launching joint-calls.</p>	<p>15:20-16:00</p>

<p>The Chair of the SRG agreed with Mr Schmidt's initial comments. He exhorted also on the importance to have the ED recruitment procedure concluded soon to be sure the JU can face the upcoming challenges fully staffed.</p> <p>Mr Schmidt asked the Chair of the SSG if she considered SSG's voice was heard enough. The SSG Chair answered that, in the past, the feeling was that SSG's contribution was not so essential. This time, i.e., under EU-RAIL, the SSG was involved sooner, which is satisfactorily. The SSG members are aware they are appointed as individual experts and feel complementary to the SRG.</p> <p>Mr Schmidt encouraged the members of both groups to alert the EC if they consider some priorities were missing. Mr Sanz, Vice Chair of the SSG, said that as the programme is complex, much consensus is needed and sometimes it is difficult to analyse the TRLs and what investment is needed. For the rest, he considers that the programme is very well defined, the capacity of the industry is clear, there is just a need to make coincide capacity with societal demands.</p> <p>In the view of the Chair of the SRG problems should be renamed challenges, because solve the problem is different than reaching the challenge is different.</p> <p>The AT representative maintained that EU-Rail in particular should not be a close club, that's a question of permeability, and a big progress has been made since S2R in that respect. Technology can never be an objective by itself; it is just a tool, to be framed by sectorial policies. The question is how these problems could be tackled with the view to FP10; we cannot continue like before, because this will not foster demand or changes in the mobility behaviour. Still, there is a need to capitalise on past achievements. Further, unfortunately no R&amp;I takes place outside the JU that does not cover logistics, combined transport or the societal component. In Cluster 5 consideration is given now to societal readiness.</p> <p>With regard to the silo question, Mr. Schmidt said that cooperation and competition goes hand in hand. Rail is not a silo but as a centre of gravity, for example: logistics inter-modality (ports and rail); digitalisation (the future of rail is digital - it is not in its natural DNA to be digital and the joint call with SNS JU open up this); climate change (we are part of the solution but again we need to talk to other sectors); electrification (access to affordable energy, hydrogen, etc. - in the end it is about how to connect to the grid); etc.. On all these we must ensure EU-Rail is not only pure research, so we need to move forward on deployment.</p> <p>Mr Schmidt thanked both groups for their valuable feedback and wished a good continuation of the work.</p>	
<p><b>Continuation of discussion on latest developments in SRG and SSG (by Chairs + Members)</b></p> <p>The Chair further explained that the questions are: how do you feel rail will be in 10 years? Will you have automatization, satellite, scientific research, etc.? We need to have sources to realise that mission. So we need to be optimistic but also realistic and find compromises.</p> <p>The NL representative said that certainly we needed to be pragmatic and see how the rail sector and society are organised. More questions need to be addressed: What is the position of infrastructure? Are passengers ready for technology? Sometimes a lot is possible from the</p>	<p>16:10-16:30</p>

<p>technological point of view, but society is not ready. There are other factors that also count. How to handle those other factors?</p> <p>Mr Sanz added that rail is a public transport, which means suitable for every person; also that trains are different than in the 90s, but we are still not successful in transmitting this message to society. Mobility in society has changed a lot, our programme is visionary from the point of view of coherency with public transport. He wondered if society is ready for innovations like, for instance, an autonomous train.</p> <p>The Chair of the SRG wondered whether the vision was coherent between now and the future. If we think only economically, we are not getting it. We need to preserve heritage even if it is not economically efficient. Is hyperloop the right solution for Europe? Maybe not. Mr Sanz replied that maybe it is not the solution but may still be useful for the sector.</p> <p>The DE representative said that we need to think about migration in order to allow different types of deployment within MS for whatever reasons. For this we cannot think only technical but also societal, and improving, evaluating the regulatory framework to bring those innovations into the market.</p> <p>All the above are reasons for a close collaboration between the SRG and SSG, not to lose time to move forward.</p> <p>The SSG Chair referred to rail as the backbone of the European mobility network, where one of the main challenges is how to make rail attractive for young people, jobs.</p> <p>The NL representative asked for the next phase in the discussion. Where do you want to go?</p> <p>The SRG Chair gave the example of the proposed study on rail transport policy, saying that and if they could have the support of the SSG, he would introduce it at the System Pillar group. The Chair asked DE to send the study to the SSG. And that if SSG has any proposal to make, the SRG is fully open.</p> <p>➤ <i>The Secretariat to ensure the proposed study is made available to the SSG, after a verification with the EC.</i></p> <p>The AT representative said that it is important to have a level playing field technology and society Technology will not bring the solution if we forget the users, the citizens, society, if we don't pay attention to the societal dimension.</p> <p>The Chair of the SRG agreed.</p>	
<p><b>3. Discussion and approval of the principles of cooperation and coordination activities + indicative time schedules</b></p> <p>The Chair of the SRG presented his proposal of a list of principles of cooperation of both groups. He proposed a minimum of one physical meeting per year but could be more depending on the number of topics to cover.</p> <p>The Chair of the SRG asked to the SSG whether they could agree on the proposed future cooperation. The SSG Chair referred to look on concrete documents such as the study on rail policy which can give some answers and could be a starting point.</p> <p><i>The SRG Chair asked whether it would be possible to meet again at Innotrans.</i></p>	<p>16:30-16:55</p>

<p><i>He also said that he would try to put something on the future collaboration paper and send it to the SSG.</i></p>	
<p><b>4. AoB and next meetings</b> Next meeting in Spring next year.</p>	<p>16:55- 17:00</p>