



System Pillar Steering Group

Meeting 30 November 2023

14h30 – 17h30

Minutes of the Meeting

1. Welcome from the Chair and adoption of the Agenda

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC (DG MOVE) welcomed the participants to the 7th meeting of the System Pillar Steering Group (SP-STG). He reminded the members that the agenda and documents were circulated prior to the meeting.

2. Approval of meeting 6 Minute

The minutes of the 6th meeting of the SP-STG were approved.

3. Update

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC updated the members of the SP-STG on the Commission's activity. He informed the members that the discussions on the TSI mandate have been launched and that there is ongoing preparation for a standardisation request. He then reassured the members that this step represents the onset of the discussions, which shall be followed by consulting various stakeholders of the railway sector at large, as well as the member states. On this note, he invited the members of the SP-STG to provide comments until the end of January 2024, which the Commission will duly share with the member states and representative bodies in order to ensure that inputs originating from the JU are all incorporated.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC then provided further details concerning the consultations for the TSI mandate. He mentioned that a variety of topics have been gathered and shared with the members the outstanding change requests. While the topics that will suffer changes were already in the pipeline, he announced that the addition of completely new topics is foreseen and open for debate. He then clarified that not all proposals of new topics will remain within the TSI, explaining that certain topics may be moved following an analysis of their potential effectiveness for the harmonization of the railway sector.

Nicolas FURIO asked for a confirmation that the EC will launch the consultations for the TSI mandate within the next couple of weeks and for a clarification on the precise deadline for input. He also enquired about how the TSI mandate consultations can be aligned with the STIP consultations and whether the Commission plans to use the former as a basis for the latter. Finally, he asked about how and where the new topics have been determined.

Bardo SCHETTINI reinforced the first point of Nicolas FURIO by also asking for a clarification in terms of timing. He also raised the issue of alignment with the STIP consultations, considering the rough January deadline for input regarding the TSI mandate. Moreover, he asked about how the members of the SP-STG will acquire an overview of what is included in the STIP consultations in order to support them in their contributions concerning the TSI mandate, considering that the deadline for input for the STIP consultation is fixed in March 2024.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC clarified that the TSI mandate consultations are not formal and thus not made public on the EC website. He shared that an invitation will be sent to all parties concerned, with the intention of receiving valuable feedback. He estimated that these invitations will be sent the week after the meeting at hand, the latest. Furthermore, he stressed that the objective is to consider the risk presentation and react to it, without performing additional analysis and/or contributing with additional documents. Next, he clarified that the new consultation topics have been proposed by the EC.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC proceeded to tackle the issue of alignment with the STIP consultations, mentioning that the EC is in a challenging position. He explained that the STIP process has been designed in order to allow for a proper discussion in a format that fits with the process of the System Pillar. In February, a RISC Committee will take place within the scope of the STIP process, for which initial feedback will be needed in advance. To ensure the alignment mentioned by the members, the EC will require their input at this stage.

Bardo SCHETTINI asked for additional AOB point on FRMCS, to be tackled at the end of the meeting.

ITEMS FOR DECISION OF THE SYSTEM PILLAR STEERING GROUP

4. Harmonization Granularity

Friedemann BITSCH explained the purpose of the documents on granularity, which involves improving development, deployment, and operation. As part of these documents, existing rules were complemented, and a template was introduced to provide an overview on the recommended use of the documents, thus serving as a practical guide. He finalised his contribution by presenting to the members the open comments and open issues. On this note, he requested members to approve the document, understanding it as a valuable resource that can also be used for STIP and Architecture Roadmaps in the near future.

Ian CONLON clarified that the meaning of granularity and modularity has been under discussion for a long time and that the document represents the optimum step towards providing a framework for assessing this fundamental question.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC mentioned that modularity is already being introduced in the TSIs in a gradual manner. He stated that the document at hand allows for a deeper discussion, one that is better defined in scope and procedures.

Johannes GRAEBER mentioned that these issues are intensely discussed within the scope of FP5. He enquired about whether the adoption of the document will be binding on the FPs and asked for clarification on the document's legal status for the JU.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC stated that, while the FPs can implement the framework if it is deemed useful, the framework cannot be formally imposed.

On behalf of UNIFE, Nicolas FURIO fully endorsed the document. He then raised the point that the next step would be to ensure the full usage of the guide within the System Pillar, which should be monitored.

Bardo SCHETTINI mentioned that, in the view of his organisation, a certain number of open points still need to be worked out. He also signalled that there are areas in which the guide does not provide any solutions. He proceeded to expressing support for further work on the guide, drawing practical examples from other sectors, such as aviation. For these reasons, he stated that his organisation would prefer to 'endorse' the document rather than to fully approve it.

Klaus MINDEL stated that the guide is of high importance and will contribute to more efficient discussions. He then asked why the guide is not foreseen to be implemented in the Innovation Pillar as well, for the same purpose of efficiency.

Ian CONLON explained that the set of documents constituting the guide first need to be approved within the System Pillar. He further stated that the System Pillar cannot propose a binding approach on the FPs. However, the guide shall be circulated and used if seen as constructive.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC added that, should the objective shift towards making the guide obligatory, this change would require the approval of the Governing Board. He also asked the members for consensus on approving the document.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC asked the members of the SP-STG if they agreed to endorse the guide in its current form, with the conscious knowledge that it will undergo updates.

➔ The guide concerning Harmonisation Granularity was endorsed by the members of the SP-STG through consensus.

5. System Pillar Engineering Management Plan V2

Marc SANGO began by reminding the members that the SEMP V2 represents an improvement of the SEMP V1, which was presented in the third meeting of the SP-STG of 28 November 2022. He continued by pointing out the needs addressed in the improved version (*for more details, please refer to the presentation*).

Marc SANGO then described the main open point, namely helping the System Pillar domain implement the plan. He finalised his contribution by launching the request for a decision of the SP-STG, encouraging members to approve the plan on the basis of the significant improvements that it brings, in comparison to the previous version.

Haltuf MIROSLAV raised the concern that glossaries and definitions, as well as change control management, do not always show consistency. He strongly recommended to follow any prior links to the definitions, so that each definition will be understood within each TSI or standard in the same manner. Marc SANGO responded that work is continuously undertaken in different prototypes to define the concept.

Enno WIEBE shared his concern that the document oftentimes presents a lack of clarity and is difficult to read. While fully supporting the approach that the document is based on, he added that its current form would not be successful as a guidebook.

Nicolas FURIO voiced his agreement with the document but also shared the view of Enno WIEBE concerning the document's readability.

➔ Ian CONLON mentioned that the decision documents corresponding to the present meeting of the SP-STG will be resent due to some small errors.

Bardo SCHETTINI voiced his support of the document and a full awareness of the difficulty of the exercise. He also expressed appreciation for the already ongoing work on the V3 of the plan, while sharing the

concerns highlighted by the other members. As a final note, he suggested additional simplification for the V3.

Ian CONLON expanded on the purpose of the document by stating that, even though the plan tackles how the System Pillar should work, the processes therein should be endorsed more broadly. He explained that the intention is to have common engineering methodologies for people in concerned organisations, thus equating to a formalised framework. He reassured the members that doubts related to applicability and readability are taken seriously.

➔ **The guide System Pillar Engineering Plan (V2) was approved by the members of the SP-STG through consensus.**

6. Annual Work Plan

Ian CONLON initiated this point by reminding the members that the SBA requires the System Pillar to provide advice on the JU's Annual Work Plan, on points tackling the System Pillar's work. He added that these points were extracted from the overall document and circulated in advance of the meeting at hand.

Bardo SCHETTINI shared his observation that there is a large number of deliverables foreseen for the later part of 2024. He expressed concern regarding the impact of creating a large wave of deliverables that will need to be examined by the Mirror Groups, particularly considering the issue of low expert availability. He proposed to implement an intermediate milestone programme management plan through which the documents that are in the making are shared repeatedly along the way, according to set milestones. In summary, the suggestion was to evenly divide experts' workload throughout the year.

Ian CONLON responded that the aim is to implement a more standardised and formalised programme management approach. He mentioned that a formal PMO role has been established and that bi-monthly discussions are taking place to make sure that there is a common set of info used to understand progress.

➔ **The Annual Work Plan was endorsed by the members of the SP-STG through consensus.**

Ny Tiana TOURNIER (ERA) added that the Agency would share its overall comments under the Governing Board. She mentioned that there are few comments on the System Pillar.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION OF THE SYSTEM PILLAR STEERING GROUP

7. "1 Year of the System Pillar"

- *Open discussion on progress to date and the future perspective*

Ian CONLON presented the lessons learned after the first year of the functioning of the System Pillar, encouraging the discussion-based nature of this agenda topic.



30-11-2023_EIM
feedback ERJU SP Ye

Bardo SCHETTINI mentioned that EIM had submitted written comments:

Particular topics include the perception of Polarion as a barrier, primarily because experts not within specific tasks do not use it on a constant basis. He asked whether this issue could be tackled in any way as part of the Work Programme 2024. There need to be an improvement in the use of mirror groups. Lastly,

he suggested the establishment of a newsletter aiming to internally promote the work of the System Pillar, coupled by occasions for more strategic discussions involving high-level management. He underlined that communication to high-level Management will also be instrumental to create awareness when discussions on investments for the deployment of the deliverables will take place. Nicolas FURIO also focused on the strategy for communicating the impact of the System Pillar on the railway sector. He believes that better strategic communication could be implemented to reach the entire railway sector, so that the System Pillar is viewed as a key body within the sector. Nicolas FURIO supported Polarion and the general tool environment as now working effectively. Next, he stressed the importance of the migration aspect, which in his view should be considered as a key priority within the System Pillar, enabling the smooth deployment of the technologies. In the end, he expressed disappointment in the STIP consultation process, explaining that it is still unclear how the STIP, a key document, will be prepared and when it will be disseminated.

Enno WIEBE stated that he has a positive perspective on the work of the System Pillar, including both intermediate outcomes and governance. He added that it can be difficult for the railway operating community, JUs, and infrastructure managers to actively promote the System Pillar, due to other, more urgent priorities. However, he assured the members that CER promoted and highlighted the work being done within the System Pillar. Enno WIEBE further shared the perspective that the application of Polarion is challenging and that it is not used to the fullest extent. Finally, he recommended to work on expert availability, ensuring a full commitment to the activity of the System Pillar and a lively attendance in the different Mirror Groups.

Regarding the availability of experts, Ian CONLON confirmed that low availability leads to slow delivery. He stated that for a number of tasks and domains, there need to be content generators with a high level of commitment, in order to speed delivery. Shifting to the point about sector buy-in, he mentioned that the System Pillar is dependent on its members and their organisations and that the sector's validation of the work being produced will represent a focal point in 2024. Furthermore, he recognised that the area of communication could be improved, explaining that the main barrier is that of capacity. He reassured the members that there will be efforts to reallocate some resources and prioritise how the work of the System Pillar is communicated. Additionally, responding to the point on the Polarion environment, in 2024 the topic of how information for persons outside the core tasks and domains will be managed. Ian CONLON concluded that the JU will take all the provided feedback into account, which could be centralised in a paper to be issued.

Perschke WAWRZYNIÉC provided some general feedback from the Commission's side. He recognized that the System Pillar is still in a process of development but that a growing and more visible recognition of the System Pillar among stakeholders should be expected in the coming years. He confirmed that, should a discussion take place on the Mirror Groups, the Commission will actively participate. Concerning the field of communication, he assured the members that the EC will also seek to contribute to the proper external communication of the System Pillar and its outputs.

8. CER Compendium on Railway System Architecture

- Information from CER

Enno WIEBE mentioned that CER aims to turn the DB and SNCF Potsdam Declaration into a position paper in collaboration with EIM, entitled "The CER/EIM Paper Railway System Architecture". He assured the members that the paper will be duly shared upon publishing, adding that it represents a clear commitment to the System Pillar's goals and deliverables. He stressed the importance of discussing the modular approach in the paper with railway system providers, particularly a step-by-step approach to the migration plateaus.

Ian CONLON stated that the first step would be to establish what sits in each of the migration plateaus, as well as target architectures.

Bardo SCHETTINI added that the document is paving the way for discussions among stakeholders and that there is strategic value in the approach proposed therein. He stated that strategic deployments and financial commitments need to be carried out in a sustainable manner.

Klaus MINDEL pointed out the discussion about migration as an extremely important element and a means of getting organisations on board to commit to overall target architectures. He advised a strong string and simple migration plan towards the target architecture.

Nicolas FURIO asked, in relation to the proposal to work with UNIFE and UNIFE members, whether a discussion will take place within the framework of the System Pillar or outside of it. Enno WIEBE responded that the intention is not to create a new forum, but to conduct a trilateral discussion with the rail supply industry and rail operators.

Ian CONLON requested to ground these discussions in the framework of the System Pillar, specifically concerning the migration domain, so as to ensure alignment between the railway sector and the System Pillar work.

Ny Tiana TOURNIER reminded that the migration domain covers only CCS but not other priority topics such as DAC.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC concluded the topic by stating that the EC and the JU welcome the presented paper.

9. Standardisation and TSI Input Plan

Ian CONLON opened the topic by stating that the discussion should be oriented towards what will happen next. He described the challenge of having a lot of input for different areas, and from different parties. In response to this challenge, he suggested compiling this input into a usable document that shall function as a clear draft and a basis for subsequent discussion with the Commission, ERA, and stakeholders in the broader sector. In terms of timing, he proposed having a workable draft by the beginning or mid-February 2024 and aiming for its endorsement at the March SP-STG meeting. The document containing the input will be sent out before the holidays, with a decent period of time for members to review.

Michel RUESSSEN indicated that the consortium should also be consulted.

Ian CONLON pointed out that there are no areas outside the scope of what is generally expected from the documents, but rather strategic areas that the JU is focusing on, with specific strategic reflections on the System Pillar. He stated that no new and ad-hoc issues should be expected, and that most of the consortium members are either members of the SP-STG or of the System and Innovation Programme Board.

Nicolas FURIO requested a clarification on the deadline for receiving comments from the sector.

Ian CONLON responded that as much time as possible will be allotted in order to give the members time to reflect. He stated that there will be a suggestion of allocation for the comments and endorsement process.

10. DAC

- *General update, with an emphasis on SP activities*

Johannes GRAEBER described the ongoing alignment with operational procedures/requirements and the Operational Rulebook. With regards to system requirements for the FDFTO interface, a document describing these requirements is currently underway, in collaboration with FP5 in order to determine how they can be turned into technical specifications. He then mentioned the ongoing activity on designing a DAC central instance, which nonetheless attracts challenges in keeping wagons updated, especially in the case of bug fixes or system upgrades, if adopted. The main advantage, however, involves access to data in an organised way among actors who own or are responsible for wagons and locomotives. He then shifted to another topic of concern, the STIP, stating that the first input has been identified and that there will be continuous work on its update. To conclude, he also mentioned the regular coordination between SP Task 4, FP5 and the EDDP.

11. AOB

Ian CONLON signalled that the June meeting of the SP-STG clashes with the ERA Management Board and should therefore be rescheduled.

- FRMCS

Bardo SCHETTINI asked whether any repercussions are foreseen for the decision taken earlier this year by the System Pillar Steering Group on FRMCS following the decisions taken during the CTO Council meeting concerning FRMCS. He stressed that this is an informal group with limited voluntary participation. He also asked for clarification on MNOs.

Perschke WAWRZYNIEC mentioned that the EC stressed the fact that this particular area includes ERA radio coordination, as well as the ERTMS control group of ERA. He expressed the Commission's readiness to reinforce this point in any other fora. Regarding MNOs, he confirmed that they are included in the testing and validation process and in almost all deployment scenarios explained by infrastructure managers. On this note, he added that some testing in relation to MNO frequency has been carried out within the scope of an EU funded project, supported by the Commission and particularly by DG Connect. He finalised his contribution by sharing the need to think about the actions to be taken in relation to baseline V3 equipped vehicles, which are incompatible with FRMCS. The CTO council has discussed viable options, and the discussion will continue on 6 December 2023, after the JU General Assembly.