

**SUPERVISORY BOARD**  
**Meeting 3 December 2024**

**Brussels, Hybrid**

**14h00 – 16h30**

Minutes

**PARTICIPANTS**

BACCONNIER Estelle	DG MOVE
BANNHOLZER Constanze	ÖBB
CAUBET Jean-Francois	RoIRail
CAUVET Antoine	EU-RAIL JU
DE LA HAYE Marcel	CER
DE MARCO TELESE Giancarlo	UIC
ENGELMANN Jens	RAILABLE
FEIGHAN Conor	ERFA
FITCH Keir	DG MOVE
GRAEBER Johannes	SP

IBANEZ DE YRIGOYEN Javier	EU-RAIL JU
NOEL Tibo	NUON CONSULTING
PETERHANS Gilles	UIP
PIRON Olivier	ERA
SCHETTINI GHERARDINI Bardo	EIM
SCHULTZE Ralf-Charley	UIRR
TABOURET Hugo	UNIFE
TIONE Roberto	WABTEC
TRAVAINI Giorgio	EU-RAIL JU
ZAEHRINGER Sandy	DG MOVE

## **1. Introduction**

Keir Fitch (KF) opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. He explained that the European Commission (EC) has just transitioned to the new Commission composition and informed the participants that it had formally taken in office on 2/12/2024. KF noted that rail freight and a clean industrial deal were mentioned in Commissioner Tzitzikostas mission letter.

Minutes (MoM) approval: Marcel de la Haye (MH) informed that he would like the minutes of the previous to be amended in a specific section. Javier IBANEZ (JI) thanked MH and replied that the minutes will be rectified. The final version of the MoM was sent after the meeting and uploaded in the EU-Rail Ju's website.

Giorgio TRAVAINI (GT) welcomed the participants as well and presented the agenda, which was accepted without further topics proposed for discussion.

## **2. Review of actions since the last programme board**

*For further details, please see the slides.*

Jens ENGELMANN (JE) welcomed the participants and presented all DAC related work areas and activities.

## **3. B1: EDDP/FP5/SPT4 Risk Management Workshop – State of play**

*For further details, please see the slides.*

JE explained the risk management process that has been engaged by all the contributors of the project. Questions like "How do you judge the risk in terms of likelihood and severity?" were asked to identify and evaluate their probability and severity and then determined the actions to be implemented to mitigate those. JE specified that the risks were not unknown and presented the results of the analysis. He explained that the risks were classified in a matrix, composed of two axes (probability and severity) i.e. top risks for FP5-TRANS4M-R Technology Development, top risks for pioneer DAC trains, top risks for DAC full deployment. JE highlighted some risks, such as the emergency brakes solution and the need to have everything that is necessary for the locomotives.

JE continued the presentation with the preview of decisions for the upcoming board meetings. KF underlined the numerous decisions to be taken in the next meetings. He proposed to have an appropriate time to circulate the necessary documents, around three or four weeks before meetings, to allow the members to assess those before taking the decision.

GT pointed out that there are several topics happening around DAC and stressed the need for decisions by making sure that the entities involved understand the importance of DAC.

## **4. B1: General DAC Master Plan – Possible impact**

JE explained that the risks management exercise performed has an impact on the General Master Plan (GMP), an example being the impact on the pioneer DAC trains which need to be coordinated with manufacturers so the trains can run with DAC ready solution.

KF declared that there are lessons learned from this revision provided of the GMP.

Olivier PIRON (OP) mentioned that the TSI will be ready by the end of 2027 and requested whether the plans from the project are aligned with it.

JE replied that so far the planning is aligned to achieve the TSI ready 2027.

KF asked for more precise feedback on the date by when the pioneers trains would deliver results that can be used to finalise the TSIs.

Sandy ZAEHRINGER (SZ) detailed that TSI revision is foreseen for 2029 and hence for the inclusion of the DAC specification the results of the pioneer trains have to be ready inclusion in the ERA recommendation in 2028. As a first step it is foreseen to provide the mature specifications as well as the assessment methods in an ERA technical document to be used for the authorisation of the pioneer trains, the results of this campaign to be taken into account for the final specifications to be included in the TSI. Prerequisite is that the respective specifications are mature enough for operation in commercial service. We will closely work together with ERA and ERJU to see if there are requirements to be already considered for the 2027 TSI revision.

Gilles PETERHANS (GP) declared that it is important for the sector not to experience again an ETCS-like experience, to have a coordinated approach at European level and that maybe not the full deployment of activities but at least some of it could follow that coordinated approach.

KF agreed, but noted this would depend in part on future decisions on the EU budget.

MH mentioned the work for the FRMCS deployment group and proposed to have a similar framework for the DAC. He elaborated that we should use our previous experience to better coordinate.

JE replied that it cannot be decided now as it needs to be budgeted.

KF suggested the work on deployment should be done by the EDDP and the SP.

GT said that it will ultimately depend on the instruments and budget provided by the EC. He added that there is also a legal aspect to consider and concluded on the importance of the political willingness to push for it.

**→ KF asked if everybody endorsed the new workplan and that was accepted.**

#### **5. C1-C2: migration roadmap | Fleet analyses, Retrofit Capacity: state of play.**

GT informed the PB members that he signed the DACFIT project in October 2024. This project will last for 2 years. The DACFIT official kick-off meeting will take place on the 16/12/2024.

JE briefly presented the different work packages and confirmed that he will be able to provide major insights in 6 months. He continued and informed the members that the state of play will focus on vehicles for pioneer trains. He said that the type of vehicles needed vehicles must be clearly stated by the mid of December. Otherwise, an escalation via EU-RAIL will be needed.

Hugo TABOURET (HT) asked how the escalation would be done, as it would mean high level meetings to be organised.

JE replied that these meetings would be set up by the Project consortium with industry partners such as Alstom or Siemens to engage on the collaboration needed.

HT replied that this is not a matter of goodwill from the industry partners as there might be some reasons behind it. He added that some meetings have been already organised between Alstom and Siemens.

KF asked whether there is any legal means to force them to provide information on locomotives, as the whole point of this project is to investigate whether it is possible to retrofit locomotives or not.

JE said that this issue should be certainly solved with the upcoming talks and meetings and continued the presentation and talked about the test installation carried out that provided interesting insights and findings. Although they are still processing the results, he shared that they observed some variations in the timings and that some good practices were also identified. He elaborated that it would have a considerable impact in the future of the project.

## **6. C1: migration roadmap | Geographical scope of migration/vehicle fleet**

*For further details, please see the slides.*

JE presented the geographical scope on the project.

**→ The geographical scope was accepted by the Members.**

## **7. FP5-TRANS4M-R: Status and Overview SB 2024**

JE handed over to Constanze BANNHOLZER (CB).

CB informed that FP5 has been working on the risk assessment re to the system architecture specifications. She elaborated that in 2025 they will focus on testing and explained that some of the testing started in 2024 (i.e., demonstrator train in Sweden). FP5 is currently working on the closing of the final points in terms of specifications. She then recalled that FP5 organised a major event in parallel to InnoTrans, where high level partners could see the status of the technology. She ensured the partners commitment to keep the timeline and to deliver on the EDDP DAC basic package. She recalled the objective is to deliver a reliable technology that could be implemented in the pioneer DAC trains.

Next topic discussed was the sounding boards that will focus on technology and operations and trade unions. There will be five sounding boards in 2025 and one specifically dedicated to workers and union representatives.

KF perceives positively the sounding boards as the EC values their feedback.

GP thanked CB. He expressed enthusiasm for the sounding boards, especially with workers and union representatives and asked about the details provided to them.

CB replied that, as WP13 is responsible for consolidating and testing activities, they will be integrated in the sounding boards.

GP claimed that we should be clear that there is a view on the components themselves.

GT emphasised the good sequence of events happening to have a clear visibility on the risks as research and innovation activities and implementing something new sometimes may not work as expected.

GP stated that it is important to have all the manufacturers on board and underlined the big change to have pioneer trains to come.

JI highlighted that during the Sounding Boards, the level of feedback received from attendants is not outstanding which does not confront the interest shown and the alignment expected within the sector on the information and specific technical details presented.

EB underlined the need to be more concrete. She elaborated that, from the EC perspective, the DAC is one of the topics where the issues are considered to be rightly handled. She stated that we should not take the lack of inputs as a sign that the entities attending are not interested.

Johannes GRAEBER (JG) highlighted the good idea to put this topic on the floor on a national level, so we can collect feedback as much as possible.

## **8. Operational Rulebook - State of Play**

*For further details, please see the slides.*

Giancarlo DE MARCO TELESE (GMT) explained that they are doing a real adaptation to make the rulebook understandable and clear for users. To do so, GMT explained that they used color-coded flowcharts, based on an input-throughput-output structure. GMT specified that they tried to keep the text as short as possible. He then detailed the split of all the process into different parts to identify all the aspects to be considered. He informed that the first iteration will be completed by February or March.

KF asked whether there was any variation among the different railway's networks.

GMT replied that what is written is not conflicting with the different national rules. However, he recognised that the Member States can implement new national regulation. He claimed that MS should consider the DAC as already harmonised and designed to be interoperable.

KF assured GMT of the strong support from the EC to ensure harmonised operational rules for DAC at the European level.

EB asked to GMT to let the EC know in case a MS would like to implement a law concerning the DAC.

GP asked whether the EDDP would need a plan for VORDAC as the interaction shown by the EDDP has always been proactive and collaborative.

JG replied that EDDP should focus on the progress of the work and let the responsibility on their side on the way they are willing to engage.

KF stated the usefulness and helpful presentation provided and thanked GMT.

### **9. Closing. PB/SB dates.**

GT gave an overview of the upcoming meeting dates and asked whether there were objections to the plan.

Some members might not be able to attend on the 20<sup>th</sup> of March as a NRB meeting takes place on the same date as well as for the meeting initially planned in June.

**→ The 20/03 was moved to the 21/03.**

**→ The 10/06 meeting was not moved as no other dates could be found.**

JE then presented the work programme of 2025 and more specifically the locomotive tendering framework contract. He explained that the target was to publish it shortly but a few elements needed to be finalised and confirmed that the document would be published along the week. He explained that the aim of the contract is to obtain all the necessary elements to develop an engineering solution for the locomotives retrofitting. He detailed that the contract has been designed to keep the door open and that each actor can join as a subcontractor.

KF asked how to deal with the failures, or the lack of replies from manufacturers.

GT replied that there are not enough funds to adapt all the loco and explained that the aim of the contract is to find the correct type of locomotives to retrofit. He specified that all the output ownership will be of the JU and will be at the disposal of any stakeholder that would like to implement it.

KF thanked the participants and closed the meeting.