



## Deployment Group - Third Informal Meeting

**22<sup>nd</sup> October 2024**

**15:00 – 17:30**

**Brussels (Belgium)**

### *Participants*

1.	Maria Luisa Domínguez González	ADIF	Remote
2.	Carole Coune	AERRL	Physical
3.	Mark Remie	AERRL / Nexrail	No
4.	Paulo Lauzzana	ALE	Remote
5.	Pierre Fleury	Alstom	Remote
6.	Iosu Ibarbia	CAF	Remote
7.	Alberto Mazzola	CER	Physical
8.	Jean-Philippe Gachot	CER	Physical
9.	Karsten Kemeter	DB	Physical
10.	Monika Heiming	EIM	Physical
11.	Davide Pifferi	FSI	Remote
12.	Giulia Costaglui	FSI	No
13.	Antonella Trombetta	Hitachi Rail	No
14.	Gianluca Tomei	Knorr-Bremse	Remote
15.	Ove Skovdahl	Norwegian Railway Directorate	Physical
16.	Christian Sagmeister	OEBB	Remote
17.	Ralf Kaminsky	Siemens	Remote
18.	Gilles Quesnel	SNCF	Physical
19.	Thomas Joindot	SNCF Réseau	No
20.	Paulo Duarte	SRG (Portugal)	Remote
21.	Gemma Maria Salazar Luque	Thales	Remote
22.	Susanne Skovgaard	Trafikverket	Remote
23.	Jean-Michel Evanghelou	UIC	No
24.	Enno Wiebe	UNIFE	No
25.	Nicolas Furio	UNIFE	Remote
26.	Jochen Holzfeind	Voest Alpine Railway Systems	No
27.	Franz Sodja	Voest Alpine Railway Systems	No
28.	Wouter Malfait	ERA	Remote
29.	Giorgio Travaini	EU-RAIL	Physical
30.	Karel Van Gils	EU-RAIL	Physical

31. Ian Conlon	EU-RAIL	Physical
32. Silvia Comas	EU-RAIL	No
33. Anna Torres	EU-RAIL	No
34. Keir Fitch	DG MOVE	Physical
35. Wawrzyniec Perschke	DG MOVE	Physical
36. Matthias Ruete	DG MOVE	No
37. Christof Schoser	DG MOVE	Remote
38. Alfonso Lorenzo Barba	Ineco	Physical

### *Agenda*

1. Opening and introduction
  - a. Status DpG (DG MOVE)
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting (*Decision point*)
3. FRMCS subgroup (*Decision point*)
  - a. Remits
  - b. Workplan
  - c. Management of the program (volunteers)
  - d. Interactions and dependencies among involved parties
4. Open discussion on next deployment topics to consider
5. AOB
  - a. Frequency of meetings in next year

### *Minutes of the Meeting*

#### **1. Opening and introduction**

Monika Heiming (EIM) welcomed the attendees both physically and remote to the third informal meeting of the EU-RAIL High Level Deployment Group (HL DpG).

Keir Fitch (DG MOVE) informed the EC process to formalise the HL DpG is on-going. It is expected to be finalised in November 2024.

#### **2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting**

No comments to the minutes distributed in advance of the meeting are received. The minutes are agreed.

[Action: send the approved version of the minutes of the second informal DpG meeting]

Actions from 1 to 7 in the MoM were taken and finalised. The actions from 8 to 10 were closed. Karel proposed to adopt the Communication Plan, the RoP and the process to appoint subgroups in the first formal meeting. *[Informal decision]*

Carole Coune (AERRL) asked on point 7 of the Remits of the FRMCS subgroup if the group will consider the deployment of FRMCS separately from ETCS or ATO to define the migration scenarios. This point was confirmed by the group, indicating that ERTMS is composed by ETCS, RMR (GSM-R + FRMCS) and ATO, but the deployment of each subsystem could be done separately.

### **3. FRMCS subgroup**

Karel Van Gils (EU-RAIL) introduced the FRMCS subgroup topic (see the meeting presentation).

#### **a. Remits**

Karel introduced the remits adapted and agreed by the FRMCS subgroup. He asked if the remits could be approved.

Karsten Kemeter (DB) indicated he is reluctant to accept the remits without checking the capabilities of the subgroup and the prioritization of the relevant points in the 10-point list. Karel clarified the remits identify the aim of the subgroup but, obviously, the work to be done depends on the capacities of the experts coming from the members' companies. We want to be involved in a big progress next years with intermediate milestones and deliverables to be defined in the workplan based on the remits.

Ove Skovdahl (Norwegian Railway Directorate) asked if the FRMCS subgroup will consider both scenarios with and without MNOs. Karel confirmed that both scenarios are included in the remits and are in the aim of the FRMCS subgroup.

Pierre Fleury (Alstom) emphasised on point 7 of the remits that the number of scenarios should be reduced to be affordable by the working team.

The FRMCS subgroup remits were approved. *[Informal decision]*

#### **b. Workplan**

Karel introduced the workplan proposed by the FRMCS subgroup (see the meeting presentation). The members commented the workplan.

The comments and clarifications regarding slide 12 "FRMCS (deployment) related to the work areas and activities" are the following:

- "Authorization dossiers" sentence in the UIC box should be clarified. It refers to potential standardisation of the inputs on the authorisation process to make the process easier for the applicants instead of the documents provided by the applicants for a specific authorisation process. *[Action: clarify the "Authorization dossiers" sentence in the UIC box in the "FRMCS (deployment) related work areas and activities" slide of the FRMCS workplan]*
- UIC should create the FRMCS specification focused on railways application to avoid delays in the process.

- Morane is considered in slide 12 as part of the “Testing and demos” point in the EU-RAIL box. No specific reference to Morane on this slide is necessary.
- The financial and legal WG will address the authorization and the regulatory framework (i.e., point 5 of the FRMCS remits). For this point, inputs from ERA and EC will be considered, but also stakeholders should be involved in the process to be more efficient. The interaction (inputs/outputs) between the different “blocks” will be addressed in the following meetings. [Action: update the workplan by considering interaction between the different “blocks”]

It was clarified and agreed that part of the analysis under point 1 of the remits is looking into the obligations for the MNOs across the corridors and the frequencies used. Wawka Perschke (DG MOVE) explained that this depends on the requirements included by MS on the 5G license. The basic level of the connectivity is 300 Mbps and, in principle, no additional investments are requested, but the MNOs deployment should have enough quality in the corridors and also on cross border sections. Analysing options for sharing the cost between IMs and MNOs (e.g. share the cost of the masts to put the antennas) is also one of the aims of the FRMCS subgroup.

Ove Skovdahl (Norwegian Railway Directorate) commented that sharing costs with MNOs for improving mobile coverage/ capacity for passengers may be in conflict with state aid regulations and asked how that question will be addressed. Wawrzyniec Perschke informed that this question will be addressed by COM.

Giorgio Travaini (EU-RAIL) indicated that the estimation on the necessary capacities (point 2) is linked with risk assessment (point 8) and the migration scenarios (point 7). [Action: update the workplan by considering interaction among points 2, 7 and 8 in the remits]

The comments and clarifications regarding slide 15 “FRMCS Deployment plan V1” are the following:

- The technical evolution of the system depends on the tests and validation of the first commercial version (v3) that will be published in the 2027 CCS TSI, and further needs. Possible updates of the equipment for this first version could be required.
- The phasing out of GSM-R is indicated from 2032 on purpose because the CCS TSI indicates two conditions to switch off the GSM-R: 5 years should pass after the IM notified this fact and 5 years after the first version of the FRMCS specifications is included in the CCS TSI enforce.
- The IM can start the FRMCS deployment as soon as the specifications are available (i.e., 2027) but without imposing on RUs to equip their vehicles earlier than 2032.
- Update the end of the Morane 2 project, that finalises mid-2027 instead of mid-2026. [Action: update the workplan by considering Morane 2 project finalises mid 2027]
- The migration scenarios should consider the risk of delays of the plan, e.g., delay of the ETSI input (announced by end 2025 not at the beginning of 2025) or delays if the next version of the specifications provided by UIC do not cover the objective property.
- The identification of the cut-off date for GSM-R and if there is a realistic scenario to extend GSM-R beyond 2035 (e.g. considering costs, risks, if small companies are available to provide support to GSM-R when the big ones stop their support of GSM-R services) is part of the aim of the FRMCS subgroup.

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font: 11 pt, Not Italic

Formatted: Space After: 10 pt

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font: 11 pt, Not Italic

Bring forward the start of the definition of migration scenarios (point 7) was agreed although information from point 1 (current status) and point 6 (cross-borders) are an input to migration scenarios. It is preferable to start defining the migration scenarios with the available data even if not complete and to refine them later. *[Action: update the workplan bring forward the start of the definition of migration scenarios (point 7)]*

As starting point to define the migration scenarios, defining a global migration scheme with key milestones was proposed and agreed. With this approach, if delays in the defined milestones are detected, we will know that there will be delays in the defined program.

The group agreed that the FRMCS subgroup shall go further in detailing the workplan by considering the HL DpG comments. It will be presented in the next HL DpG meeting for approval. *[Action: FRMCS subgroup to detail the workplan]*

**c. Management of the program (volunteers)**

There was a strong request to introduce a dedicated Program Manager or Management Team to oversee the FRMCS Deployment activities. A “small” decision process to select them was agreed. *[Action: Send criteria and the deadline to propose candidates]*

Giorgio proposed that each member shall appoint an expert per working group of the FRMCS subgroup. *[Action: Members to appoint an expert per working group of the FRMCS subgroup]*

**d. Interactions and dependencies among involved parties**

No additional comments.

**4. Open discussion on next deployment topics to consider**

Not discussed due to a lack of time.

**5. AOB**

Karel introduced the principle of 3 meetings per year starting with the next meeting (see the meeting presentation). The proposal to extend the meeting duration to three hours was approved. *[Action: Send a “save the date” for the HL DpG meetings]*

The communication of decisions of the HL DpG to the RISC committee will be on the agenda of the next meeting. *[Action: Include in the next HL DpG meeting agenda the communication of HL DpG decisions topic]*

*Action List*

No.	Action	Owner	Deadline	Status
1	Send the approved version of the minutes of the second informal DpG meeting	EU-RAIL/INECO	End October	Open
2	Clarify the "Authorization dossiers" sentence in the UIC box in the "FRMCS (deployment) related work areas and activities" slide of the FRMCS workplan	FRMCS subgroup	February HL DpG meeting	Open
3	Update the workplan by considering interaction between the different "blocks"	FRMCS subgroup	February HL DpG meeting	Open
4	Update the workplan by considering interaction among points 2, 7 and 8 in the remits	FRMCS subgroup	February HL DpG meeting	Open
5	Update the workplan by considering Morane 2 project finalises mid 2027	FRMCS subgroup	February HL DpG meeting	Open
6	Update the workplan bring forward the start of the definition of migration scenarios (point 7)	FRMCS subgroup	February HL DpG meeting	Open
7	Go further in detailing the workplan	FRMCS subgroup	February HL DpG meeting	Open
8	Send criteria and the deadline to propose candidates for program Manager or Management Team to oversee the FRMCS Deployment activities	EU-RAIL	End October	Open
9	Appoint an expert per working group of the FRMCS subgroup	All members	End October	Open
10	Send a "save the date" for the HL DpG meetings	EU-RAIL	End October	Open
11	Include in the next HL DpG meeting agenda the communication of HL DpG decisions	EU-RAIL/INECO	February HL DpG meeting	Open

