



Deployment Group - First Informal Meeting

25th April 2024

14:00 – 16:00

Valenciennes (France)

Participants

1.	Maria Luisa Domínguez González	ADIF	Physical
2.	Mark Remie	AERRL / Nexrail	Physical
3.	Pierre Fleury	Alstom	Remote
4.	Iosu Ibarbia	CAF	Physical
5.	Alberto Mazzola	CER	Remote
6.	Karsten Kemeter	DB	Remote
7.	Monika Heiming	EIM	Physical
8.	Davide Pifferi	FSI	Remote
9.	Antonella Trombetta	Hitachi Rail	Remote
10.	Gianluca Tomei	Knorr-Bremse	Remote
11.	Ove Skovdahl	Norwegian Railway Directorate	Physical
12.	Christian Sagmeister	OEBB	Physical
13.	Ralf Kaminsky	Siemens	Physical
14.	Gilles Quesnel	SNCF	Physical
15.	Paulo Duarte	SRG (Portugal)	Remote
16.	Gemma Maria Salazar Luque	Thales	Remote
17.	Susanne Skovgaard	Trafikverket	Remote
18.	Nicolas Furio	UNIFE	Physical
19.	Jochen Holzfeind	Voestalpine Railway Systems	Remote
20.	Enno Wiebe	-	Physical
21.	Jean-Philippe Gachot	CER	Physical
22.	Wouter Malfait	ERA	Physical
23.	Giorgio Travaini	EU-RAIL	Physical
24.	Karel Van Gils	EU-RAIL	Physical
25.	Ian Conlon	EU-RAIL	Physical
26.	Silvia Comas	EU-RAIL	Remote
27.	Anna Torres	EU-RAIL	Remote
28.	Keir Fitch	DG MOVE	Physical
29.	Wawrzyniec Perschke	DG MOVE	Physical
30.			

31. Matthias Ruete	DG MOVE	Physical
32. Christof Schoser	DG MOVE	Physical
33. Alfonso Lorenzo Barba	Ineco	Physical

Agenda

1. Opening and introduction
2. Introduction round
3. Goal and deliverables: Deployment Group
4. Procedures
 - a. Concept rules of procedure
 - b. Appoint chair and co-chair
 - c. ERA as observer
5. Discussion on topics for next meetings
 - a. FRMCS
 - b. Further international harmonised operations and processes
 - c. Other
6. AOB
 - a. Invitation of UIC

Minutes of the Meeting

1. Opening and introduction

Giorgio Travaini (EU-RAIL) welcomes the attendees to the first informal meeting of the EU-RAIL Deployment Grupo (DpG). He introduces the setting up process of the DpG (see the meeting presentation).

Ralf Kaminsky (Siemens) asks about the possibility and the procedure to bring new members to the DpG. Giorgio Travaini answers new members can enter to the group following the process described in the presentation and followed by the current members. He also clarifies that there is no limited number of DpG members.

2. Introduction round

Each participant of the meeting introduces himself/herself.

3. Goal and deliverables

Giorgio Travaini introduces the DpG goal and deliverables (see the meeting presentation).

Nicolas Furio (UNIFE) indicates that there are already groups for managing relevant topics, e.g., EDDP for DAC and ERTMS stakeholders platform for ERTMS issues. He asks how is going to avoid duplicates between those groups and the Deployment group (DpG). Keir Fitch clarifies that the EDDP is an example for the DpG, but already well organised, and regarding the ERTMS stakeholders platform, there will be

coordination to avoid duplications, if needed. In any case, the DpG will be focused on financial and timing for deployment topics. Giorgio Travaini uses the slide on the presentation: “State of play & discussion. Where do we need a European coordination?” to answer the Nicolas’ question.

Matthias Ruete (DG MOVE) reflects on the how address the recommendations of the DpG and the value of those recommendations. Additionally, he indicates that we should go through the DpG legal definition in the JU in order to not go outside. Finally, Matthias Ruete proposes go through the STIP to identify what topics are interesting to be managed by the DpG.

Gilles Quesnel (SNCF) asks to clarify the scope of the DpG. He recommends that when the DpG makes a commitment or recommendation, we should catch the potential impact on the sector. Giorgio Travaini indicates that the DpG also represents the representatives bodies of the sector, that can provide their comments.

Karsten Kemeter (DB) asks questions on three topics. Firstly, he asks about the impact of the DpG and the result of its work. Secondly, he asks on how the DpG identifies the topics to be analysed and the meaning of “coordination” in this context. Finally, he asks more detailed on the financing, e.g., how the experts will be paid.

Keir Fitch answers that the DpG will identify the topics that, if not coordinated, their deployment will be a problem. Additionally, we will create some structure to get commitments on these topics to provide recommendations. Matthias Ruete indicates that the DpG only can make recommendations. Giorgio Travaini indicates that we should not underestimate a recommendation from the DpG because it will be considered a recommendation from the sector.

Giorgio Travaini indicates that when an issue is identified, we need experts to go more in detail. The DpG will recommend the creation of a dedicated subgroup to analyse in detail the topic. The experts will come from the companies involved in the DpG, and they will not be remunerated based on a voluntary participation the group. The JU could support to the subgroups on specific topics on research activities/studies.

4. Discussion on topics for next meetings

Giorgio Travaini proposes FRMCS as the first topic to focus in a subgroup (see the meeting presentation). He asks to the attenders if there is an agreement on launch a technical group of experts to work on FRMCS. This subgroup should create outputs to be discussed on the DpG.

Matthias Ruete indicates that ERA recommendations on FRMCS should be considered. Keir Fitch clarifies that ERA opinion on technical topics will be considered but the costs for the migration and other points should be analysed (e.g., by the DpG) to define the best strategy.

Karel van Gils (EU-RAIL) adds that in different technical bodies and groups already much work is done on technology, architecture, requirements and testing. A dedicated vision on deployment is in many cases missing, dealing with financial migration consequences, quantities of retrofitting, availability of resources and workshop capacity, etc. This will be part of the scope of the deployment group. He also refers to the

many big programmes coming to the sector (ERTMS, FRMCS, ATO, DAC, etc), which has to be coordinated for efficient and effective deployment and implementation.

Mark Remie claims that currently nobody is taking into account the loco owners, but they have to face the implementation of FRMCS on current over 20 years old locos.

Nicolas Furio indicates that companies have different strategies. The suppliers need to have a clear picture on the current status in Europe and the deployment plans. He notes that we should deal with the obsolescence of GSM-R.

Gilles Quesnel indicates that SNCF has no available data on financial plans in the long term, and they have only the capacity to see the plans for the following 4 years. He claims that with these data the suppliers cannot plan to increase the industrial capacity. He considers interesting that the DpG face the financial topics. Matthias Ruete clarifies that it is expected that this information will be available in the National Implementation Plans (NIPs) foreseen by June 2024.

Giorgio Travaini indicates that several inputs are expected. The DpG should put them all together to define the strategy to face this issue.

Following a round of question, the DpG members of the informal meeting agree that a subgroup on the FRMCS topic should be created [*informal decision*].

Giorgio Travaini asks if the attendees want to propose other topics to be considered by the DpG. Mark Remie (AERRL / Nexrail) proposes the traction form for hybrid trains, e.g., how to deal with charging, change from traction form, etc. Giorgio Travaini indicates that the specification activities are in the JU scope. Keir Fitch indicates that it is a subject that could be consider in the DpG for those topics where coordination is necessary. Giorgio Travaini confirms the traction form for hybrid trains is noted to be considered in future DpG meetings, and exhort the members to reflect about this possible topic.

Christian Sagmeister (OEBB) asks about the communication plan of the DpG. Giorgio Travaini agrees with the proposal and it will be addressed at the next meeting. [*Action: Draft a communication plan on the DpG activities*].

Karsten Kemeter proposes to also discuss in the DpG the 'ETCS version 2.x on board systems are not compatible with FRMCS' topic. He indicates that have a full picture of the situation will be useful. Gilles Quesnel considers that the DpG needs the ERA output on the issue. In addition, he considers that we should avoid double discussions in different groups (e.g. CTO Council). For this reason, clarifying the scope of the DpG is important.

Matthias Ruete indicates we should understand the articulation of the DpG and the ERTMS stakeholders platform. He clarifies the ERTMS stakeholders platform is a high level group (i.e., political level) and the DpG is a more detailed discussion group. A clarification meeting will be set up. [*Action: Meeting between EU-RAIL and DG MOVE to clear interaction and differences between ERTMS stakeholders platform and DpG to avoid duplications*].

Keir Fitch indicates that the DpG needs the input from the technical subgroups to agree its recommendations, but we should agree with this approach. Giorgio Travaini indicates that a remit of the subgroups will be prepared to be discussed in the next meeting. [*Action: Draft the remit of the FRMCS subgroup including the selection criteria, scope of the work and the tasks thereof, in order to avoid duplications with other groups*].

Keir Fitch asks how to get the coordination of the deployment in Europe and if we should use the DpG to face the coordination issues on relation with ERTMS topics, not only FRMCS. Gilles Quesnel answers that DpG approach has to be broad and no focus only in one topic (e.g., FRMCS) to consider the different parts of the implementation scheme. Ralf Kaminsky supports this approach of no focusing only in one topic to have the complete picture.

5. Procedures

Giorgio Travaini purposes the attendees to send by mail their comments on the draft Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the DpG distributed in advance to the meeting. [*Action: Review the draft Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the DpG distributed in advance to the meeting*]

Giorgio Travaini introduces the proposals for the chair, co-chair and observes (see the meeting presentation).

Nicolas Furio proposes that the chair of the DpG be carried out by users. Monika Heiming (EIM) indicates that EIM or one of its members is happy to chair the DpG. Chair and co-chair will be confirmed in the first official meeting of the DpG.

6. AOB

Giorgio Travaini indicates that new potential member having expressed the interest: UIC, ALE and NR. It is agreed to invite UIC as member of the DpG for the next meeting, following the defined process. [*Action: Invite UIC as member of the DpG for the next meeting, following the defined process.*]

Giorgio Travaini propose 11th June for the next meeting. However, some members are not available. It is agreed to make a Doodle for choosing the next meetings date. [*Action: Make a doodle for choosing date for the following DpG meetings*].

Action List

No.	Action	Owner	Status
1	Draft a communication plan on the DpG activities	EU-RAIL	Open
2	Meeting between EU-RAIL and DG MOVE to clear interaction and differences between ERTMS stakeholders platform and DpG to avoid duplications	EU-RAIL & DG MOVE	Open
3	Draft the remit of the FRMCS subgroup including the selection criteria, scope of the work and the tasks thereof, in order to avoid duplications with other groups	EU-RAIL & DG MOVE	Open
4	Review the draft Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the DpG distributed in advance to the meeting	All	Open
5	Invite UIC as member of the DpG for the next meeting, following the defined process.	EU-RAIL	Open
6	Make a doodle for choosing date for the following DpG meetings	EU-RAIL /INECO	Open