Deployment Group - Second Informal Meeting

11th July 2024
14:00 – 16:00
Brussels (Belgium)

Participants

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

31. Keir Fitch	DG MOVE	Physical
32. Wawrzyniec Perschke	DG MOVE	Physical
33. Matthias Ruete	DG MOVE	No
34. Christof Schoser	DG MOVE	Remote
35. Alfonso Lorenzo Barba	Ineco	Physical

Agenda

1. Opening and introduction

2. New members

3. Informal appointment of the chair

4. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

5. FRMCS subgroup

    a. Concept paper

    b. MNO frequencies

6. Communication Plan

7. Rules of Procedure (RoP)

    a. Process to appoint subgroups

8. AOB

    a. Next meeting

Minutes of the Meeting

1. Opening and introduction

Giorgio Travaini (EU-RAIL) and Keir Fitch (DG MOVE) welcome the attendees both physically and remote to the second informal meeting of the EU-RAIL Deployment Group (DpG).

They indicate that the EC process to formalise the DpG is on-going.

2. New members

Giorgio Travaini indicates some candidates have been approved as DpG members, following the stabilised procedure. Mr. Jean-Michale Evanghelou (UIC) and Mr. Paulo Lauzzana (ALE) introduce himself.

3. Informal appointment of the chair

Following the approach mentioned in the first informal DpG meeting, Giorgio Travaini proposes Monika Heiming (EIM) to chair the DpG, when DpG comes formal. Keir Fitch and Giorgio Travaini will co-chair the DpG.

The DpG members have no objections to this proposal. [*Informal decision*]

4. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

No additional 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 first informal DpG meeting*]

Giorgio Travaini reviews the list of actions (see the meeting presentation). Regarding the action 2, Giorgio Travaini indicates that EU-RAIL and DG MOVE are preparing a paper on the differences between ERTMS stakeholders platform and DpG. [*Action: send the paper on the differences between ERTMS stakeholders platform and DpG*]

5. FRMCS subgroup

Giorgio Travaini introduces the FRMCS subgroup topic (see the meeting presentation).

a. Concept paper

Giorgio Travaini presented the concept paper based on the provided powerpoint presentation and the concept paper.

Alberto Mazzola (CER) expresses his doubts about being the only place to discuss FRMCS, especially if the financial aspects are out of the scope of the DpG. He indicates the financial point is essential for the deployment plans because, if there is no funding discussion on the DpG, the FRMCS deployment issue is not fully analysed.

Keir Fitch clarifies that the aim of this statement is to avoid having different forums managing the same topic and taking incoherent decisions. The DpG will be focussed on achieving the necessary coordination to have a coherent and efficient FRMCS deployment at EU level by considering the cross-border strategies, the migration phase, analysing the UIC specification, the evolution of the system, legislation discussions, management the deployment, etc.

Keir Fitch indicates that coordination to minimise the cost of the migration to FRMCS should be deal by the DpG, also coordination on parallel technologies, having in mind OPEX and CAPEX. We need to address the financing topic but also make the investment in a rational and optimised way, not only at EU level but also at MS level.

Giorgio Travaini clarifies the DpG only provides recommendations to the decisions makers, e.g., the sector and the EC.

Carole Coune (AERRL) proposes to add specific short objectives for the FRMCS subgroup, e.g., the FRMCS subgroup to define the conditions to deploy FRMCS as soon as possible, considering the locomotives lifecycle of 30 years.

Susanne Skovgaard (TrafikVerket) asks about the coordination within EU-RAIL and the necessity of an updated MoU of the sector to support the recommendations. Giorgio Travaini answers the DpG is the

third pillar and will be coordinated with System Pillar and Innovation pillar that provide the results. He clarifies it is no necessary to create a new MoU because there is collaboration and UIC is now a member of the DpG and a MoU with UIC already exist [post-meeting note: the JU also had a MoU with ETSI under S2R].

Karsten Kemeter (DB) proposes to add in the point 2 on migration scenarios the assessment of the number of vehicles on the different counties and other topics such as DAC. The migration scenarios should consider not only FRMCS and they should consider other technical migrations.

Maria Luisa Domínguez (Adif) indicates as important task conducting the risk assessment of deployment delays.

Gilles Quesnel asks to clarify the scope of the FRMCS subgroup and the relation with the System Pillar (SP) tasks on migration. Additionally, he indicates that migration and deployment are different concepts: migration is the way to archive the goal and the deployment is the step-by-step process. Ian Conlon (EU-RAIL) clarifies the SP is only focused, related to migration, on the system architecture migration without focusing on specific technologies, e.g., FRMCS migration is not faced by SP. The FRMCS subgroup should identify what have sense to be faced and what not.

Karsten Kemeter indicates a complete migration by 2032 is impossible due to product availability and propose to deal this topic and think on it. Giorgio Travaini indicates this is the reason of DpG group, i.e., looking for scenarios to be achievable. Keir Fitch mentions that manufactures are face out GSM-R by 2032, no more later than 2035. Therefore, challenges should be faced (e.g., on-board migration) and assumptions should be taken.

Carole Coune proposes to mention in the FRMCS document as members of the group "other rolling stocks" in addition to "RU". Giorgio Travaini agrees and the document will clarify that all the DpG members could be FRMCS subgroup members.

Alberto Mazzola indicates FRMCS deployment should be analysed as part of the ERTMS deployment, financial part and learn on DAC approach. Ian replies that the DpG is an opportunity for the sector to face the necessary coordination on EU level to migrate from GSM-R to FRMCS. Keir Fitch adds the financial point should be faced in the next steps of FRMCS, but at the end of the day most of the money cannot comes from the European Union, e.g., the members of AERRAIL invest and support the deployment by themselves.

Enno Wiebe (UNIFE) support the FRMCS approach in the DpG is similar to the EDDP on DAC because it is a structure approach, and it produces useful inputs. Giorgio Travaini clarifies this is the approach of the points we are presenting. They are based on the experience and the lessons learnt from the EDDP. The idea is creating something similar to the EDDP with all of DpG members on-board to discuss in a coordinated way the FRMCS issues.

Karel Van Gils introduces the activities proposed for the FRMCS subgroup, indicating that they are based on the EDDP, adapted to FRMCS (see the meeting presentation).

Mark Remie (AERRL / Nexrail) indicates he misses a general approach to have in mind the whole picture, not only FRMCS. There will be a big change and this evolution should be coordinated. Keir Fitch answers DpG is a horizontal group to face all the new technology, not focused only on a unique technology. FRMCS is the first point, but DpG should see the different technologies and the different deployment plans for those technologies. We will work on FRMCS taking into consideration cost cutting and other technologies.

Jean-Michel Evanghelou (UIC) considers there is a lot of work to do in the proposed points and it is an ambitious plan. He considers this work is necessary and should face step by step. Additionally, Jean-Michel Evanghelou emphasizes the need of coordination between ETCS, FRMCS and ATO deployment strategies, and he proposes to consider all of them together, i.e., ERTMS at EU level, to avoid collective mistakes with the ETCS deployment strategy in the past. On the technical angle, Jean-Michel Evanghelou considers there are lot of points to coordinate the migration and deployment of FRMCS at EU level as part of ERTMS.

Wawrzyniec Perschke (DG MOVE) indicates we should be more precise on what the remit of the FRMCS subgroup is and agree a detailed the work program, e.g., deadlines, order of the activities, etc.

Karsten Kemeter proposes not to include all the topics in the first analysis but doing a first assessment to decide on the program of the subgroup. He emphasises there are lot of competences that could be managed by one or several subgroups. Giorgio Travaini clarifies the intention of the '9 points list' is describing the scope of the FRMCS subgroup and, if everybody agrees, a remit for the FRMCS subgroup will be prepared. Additionally, Giorgio clarifies only a subgroup on FRMCS is expected, not several subgroups depending on the topic to be managed.

Davide Pifferi (FSI) emphasizes a preparation phase is necessary to identify the necessities, objectives and the work program of the FRMCS subgroup. It is as big project, and these points should be clarified at the beginning.

Jean-Michel Evanghelou has several comments. Firstly, he considers the good way is asking the experts of the FRMCS subgroup about the remit and if they can support and done the proposed work. These experts should propose the FRMCS subgroup work plan based on the '9 points' agreed on the High Level DpG. Secondly, he indicates there are dependencies among the 9 points proposed, and we cannot answer these topics in a few days. We should be prepared to answer these questions for the following 2-3 years. Finally, Jean-Michel emphasises that experts on FRMCS are already involve on national programs, ERA EECT, future MORANE2, etc. There are not lot of people expert on FRMCS. We need a smart approach because these people are overload. We should define a work program acceptable by the experts that will work on it. It is difficult to find supporting people with the competencies to perform this analysis.

Keir Fitch comments on two points. Firstly, he asks if we have enough expertise to realise this analysis in the short time, otherwise, we have a problem. Secondly, by considering the limited number of FRMCS experts, we should use the FRMCS paper in an efficient way, avoiding different groups analysing the same topic (i.e., no duplicating processes). It is something to be considered by the FRMCS subgroup members.

Alberto Mazzola indicates the topic is important and he agrees to address it taking into account the lessons learnt from the past. He asks if it is expected that de DpG analyses the National Implementation Plans

(NIPs) on ERTMS or is something given. Alberto Mazzola considers missing topics on FRMCS deployment in the NIPs should be identified. Keir Fitch clarifies we should check if the national proposals are coherent among them and if the MS are currently planning working on FRMCS.

Wawrzyniec Perschke informs the Deployment Management Team (DMT), of which Alfonso Lorenzo (Ineco) is part, will analyses the NIPs. Wawrzyniec Perschke reports that 9 Member States (MS) have sent their NIPs, 8 MS have warned they are going to be delayed and 8 MS have said nothing. The first analysis is check if the NIPs follow the NIP template defined in the CCS TSI 2023 and if they meet the obligations stabilised int the TEN-T regulation 2024. Then, a cross-border analysis will be done to check the coherence or not between MS and if they have considered the public consultation when writing the NIPs. The whole NIPs analysis will be considered to write the ERTMS coordinator Work Plan. Negotiation between the ERTMS coordinator and the MS will be considered to write the ERTMS European Deployment Plan (ERTMS EDP), that is expected to be adopted by end 2025. Wawrzyniec Perschke emphasises EC cannot impose the deployment plans but there is a room for improvements.

Enno Wiebe asks if the '9 points' will be transformed in an activity program/work plan because, if experts should be provided, a clear work plan to request expert is needed. Otherwise, no expert will come to the group. EDDP is a good example. Giorgio Travaini clarifies EDDP is a bit different because in the DpG there is only one high-level group instead of two groups, that is the case of EDDP. Giorgio Travaini emphasises we need more input from their side, e.g., information on your work plan.

Giorgio Travaini proposes giving a few days to review the proposed points on FRMCS and send comments to the group, in order to agree the FRMCS concept paper. Proposal agrees. [*Action: Review the current FRMCS concept paper ('9 topics') and give feedback*].

Based on the DpG members, the FRMCS concept paper ('9 topics') will be adjusted. [*Action: Adjust the FRMCS concept paper by considering the comments in the meeting & other written feedback*].

Giorgio Travaini also proposes the members to appoint the FRMCS experts to participate in the FRMCS subgroup. Proposal agrees. [*Action: Propose experts to participate in the FRMCS subgroup*].

Giorgio Travaini proposes the adjusted FRMCS concept paper ('9 topics') is the input for the FRMCS subgroup to prepare the remit and the work plan of the FRMCS subgroup that will be presented in the next HL DpG meeting for approval, structuring the work. [*Action:* Challenge 9-point plan and draft more detailed remit on FRMCS subgroup*]. [*Action: Work plan of the FRMCS subgroup*]

Giorgio Travaini indicates the need of coordination between several workstreams in the subgroup and asks voluntaries to take the program management of the FRMCS subgroup. He clarifies there is no financial support. We will discuss this point in the October High Level DpG meeting.

b. **MNO frequencies**

Wawrzyniec Perschke introduces the FRMCS subgroup topic (see the meeting presentation). Due to lack of time, the discussion of this topic is postponed for the October DpG meeting.

6. Communication Plan

Giorgio Travaini purposes the attendees to review and send by mail their comments on the Communication Plan of the DpG distributed in advance to the meeting. [*Action: Review and send by mail comments to the draft Communication Plan of the DpG*]

7. Rules of procedure

Monika Heiming announces that EIM will provide comments to the Rules of Procedure (RoP). [*Action: Send by mail comments to the RoP*]

a. Process to appoint subgroups

Giorgio Travaini purposes the attendees to review and send by mail their comments on the process to appoint subgroup (annex to the RoP) distributed in advance to the meeting [*Action: Review and send by mail comments to the process to appoint subgroups*].

8. AOB

Giorgio Travaini indicates that the 24th September, Tuesday, at 11:30 is the VIP's visit to the EU-RAIL stand. He invites the DpG Members to be there.

Giorgio Travaini proposes having the next DpG meeting on 22 October. Ove Skovdahl (Norwegian Railway Directorate) proposes have more than two hours meeting. Enno Wiebe asks to have the meeting after 3 o'clock. All these proposals regarding the next DpG meeting are agreed.

Action List

No.	Action	Owner	Deadline	Status
1	Send the approved version of the minutes of the first informal DpG meeting	EU-RAIL /INECO	End July	Open
2	Send the paper on the differences between ERTMS stakeholders platform and DpG	EU-RAIL & DG MOVE	August	Open
3	Review the current FRMCS concept paper ('9 topics') and give feedback	All members	19 July	Open
4	Propose experts to participate in the FRMCS subgroup	All members	19 July	Open
5	Adjust the FRMCS concept paper by considering the comments in the meeting & other written feedback.	EU-RAIL/INECO	July	Open
6	Challenge 9-point plan and draft more detailed remit on FRMCS subgroup	FRMCS subgroup	October HL DpG meeting	Open
7	Work plan of the FRMCS subgroup	FRMCS subgroup	October HL DpG meeting	Open
8	Review and send by mail comments to the draft Communication Plan of the DpG	All members	End September	Open
9	Send by mail comments to the RoP	EIM	27 July	Open
10	Review and send by mail comments to the process to appoint subgroups	All members	End September	Open