



## **System Pillar Steering Group Meeting 13**

**Meeting 4 June 2025**

**09h30 – 12h30**

Minutes of the Meeting

### **1. Welcome from the Chair and Adoption of the Agenda** – Approval of the 12th Meeting's Minutes

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) welcomed the participants to the 12<sup>th</sup> System Pillar (SP) Steering Group (STG) meeting.

Klaus MINDEL (UNIFE) introduced Hartwig SCHUSTER as the incoming new UNIFE's General Manager, noting that he will take over his role. He informed the members that he will go into retirement soon and took the opportunity to say goodbye to all. He wished everyone success and good results in the following years and thanked the members.

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) thanked Mr Mindel for his work and contribution over the years and wished him good luck in retirement and he welcomed Mr Schuster.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) thanked also Mr Mindel for his contribution and wished him all the best for his retirement.

The agenda was then agreed by the members after he asked to the participants if they have any other business point to add to it.

### **2. Approval of Meeting 12 Minute**

The minutes of the 12th meeting of the SP Steering Group (STG) were adopted without further comments.

### **3. Update**

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) provided updates regarding the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). He mentioned that, according to his information, the EC intends to take a first formal decision on the next MFF on **16 July**, though this is still informal. He noted that the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) may be part of the next MFF, which would be a positive outcome, but there is no further information at this stage.

He informed the group that the high-speed rail master plan communication is being finalised and is scheduled for adoption this summer. He also mentioned that the impact assessment for the revision of the Train Drivers Directive is being finalised, with a legislative proposal expected early next year.

Regarding implementing and delegated acts, he stated that the final versions of the TSI Telematics documents have been circulated to Member States, with a view to discussion and vote during the next RISC meeting, scheduled for the first week of July.

Giorgio TRAVAINI (Europe's Rail) informed the Steering Group that Europe's Rail now counts 31 members, including 30 private ones, noting the achievement in both geographical coverage and competencies. He mentioned that the five associated members selected by the Governing Board have signed the letter of commitment and are now fully involved.

He thanked group members for contributing to the position papers supporting the future partnership and said the next Governing Board is expected to approve a refined version of the high-level paper. He shared concerns raised at the International Transport Forum regarding the lack of investment focus on rail for CO2 reduction, calling for stronger advocacy at both EU and national level.

He noted ongoing efforts to promote Europe's Rail Research and Innovation outcomes, and he informed the group that he is currently attending the Committee meeting for the next Transport Research Arena and the European Startup Prize.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) noted there were no comments on the updates and moved to the next agenda point concerning possible decisions of the System Pillar Steering Group. He introduced the item on the Trackside Asset Control System Specification BL4 Release4.

## **ITEMS FOR DECISION OF THE SYSTEM PILLAR STEERING GROUP**

### **4. TRACKSIDE ASSET CONTROL SYSTEM**

Malik BENAUMER (TACS) presented the proposal for the publication of the System Pillar Baseline 4 Release 4 in the Trackside Asset Control and Supervision domain. He recalled that previous releases were published in June 2023 and 2024, and the current release is scheduled for June 2025. The release includes developments and editorial improvements from the previous version. He mentioned that 25 documents are included, of which 12 are updated and 13 remain unchanged (*for further details, please refer to the slides*). He highlighted that the updates involve corrections, clarification of previous specifications, and updated references, notably aligning cybersecurity content with the System Pillar cyber domain.

He noted continued close collaboration with the transversal CCS domain, including joint task forces which are working groups on diagnostics and maintenance. He outlined the two-step review process: first through the TACS/TCCS domains and joint mirror groups (joint railway and industry meetings), then via an overview document submitted to the Core Group and finally to the Steering Group for decision.

He eventually concluded mentioning that the deliverables apply to both the System Pillar target architecture and the EULYNX architecture and that the documents will be published by both Europe's Rail and EULYNX.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) expressed support for the proposed decision and thanked the team for their work. He noted that it represents a natural continuation of the previous releases and confirmed a favorable position.

Miroslav HALTUF (SRG) asked whether the published documents would be included in the technical annexes to the TSIs or if they would remain as separate documents without any link to the TSIs.

Malik BENAUMER (TACS) clarified that the publication is not linked to the TSIs.

Klaus MINDEL (UNIFE) thanked the team for their work and confirmed UNIFE's readiness to release BL4R4. He also highlighted the need for consistent terminology and document naming in the next phase of work.

Aude CHAILLEY (CER) expressed support and approval of the documents presented.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) noted that only expressions of support were heard and he concluded that the **decision was adopted**. He then suggested to move on the agenda item regarding Standardisation and TSI Input Plan.

## **5. EU-RAIL STANDARDISATION AND TSI INPUT PLAN**

Soenke KRAFT (Europe's Rail) presented the revision of the Standardisation and TSI Input Plan. He recalled that the updated process was launched in December, including input collection, internal assessment, and sector review. He highlighted that many comments were received which have been replied. A second version of the STIP, along with a resolution table and protocol of changes, was published two weeks ago.

He noted that the content remains largely aligned with the first version as it is its continuity, with updates mostly related to timing and harmonisation channels. He clarified that the delivery dates have been adjusted based on progress, and new topics were added by Flagship Projects (*for further details, please refer to the slides*).

Soenke KRAFT (Europe's Rail) highlighted that the full ATO GoA 3,4 specification is now planned after 2032, while demonstrator work continues. He mentioned that the ASTP basic version is currently under discussion questioning the need for a EVC odometry separation with specified interface.

Regarding Input to the EC standardisation request Mr Kraft reported that coordination with CEN-CENELEC is ongoing, with recent feedback regarding clearer topic definitions. An updated version was shared and will be discussed with the EC and CEN-CENELEC. He also noted continued alignment work with ERA on the TSI revision process. Although no major changes have been made to the planning, delays and new topics will require further discussion.

He pointed out several areas needing attention, including multi-display onboard, DAC TSI package and new topics such as electromagnetic braking system, virtual certification, light weight design vehicles and updated vehicle categories which are resulting from the Flagship Projects (*for further details, please refer to the slides*).

He concluded mentioning that discussions with ERA will continue in the coming days to finalise alignment on the TSI revision and endorsement process.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) underlined the importance of the STIP work, noting that Europe's Rail input should directly support the development of the TSIs. He mentioned that the STIP serves as a mechanism to ensure timely delivery and traceability of progress. Referring to the finalisation and endorsement, he mentioned that several changes in the STIP could impact ERA's ability to deliver the TSIs within the timeframe set by the EC.

Then, he noted that the work on verifying these impacts is not yet finalised. He had requested both the Agency and the Europe's Rail to conduct a more in-depth analysis to ensure that changes in the STIP do not compromise priority topics or lead automatically to delays in the TSIs. He emphasised that such decisions should follow a coordinated process.

He concluded that the current version of STIP 2.0 was not ready for adoption. He proposed that ERA and Europe's Rail continue this work during June and return with the analysis and any necessary

changes. Adoption could then follow via written procedure, depending on the outcome and views of the STIP group.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) noted that the STIP is a living document that will continue to change. He referred to possible updates, including the FRMCS section, and future discussions on priorities linked to budget reductions and deliverables.

He stressed the need for a timely and consensus-based update process and the importance of maintaining visibility for all stakeholders. He welcomed the proposal to postpone adoption and had no specific comments on the content.

Miroslav HALTUF (SRG) thanked the System Pillar team for the excellent work on the STIP process. He underlined that the SRG considers the process highly important and has decided to monitor it, especially the coordination with RISC members at the member states level. He requested from System Pillar to provide a one-page summary document in written form.

Aude CHAILLEY (CER) thanked the System Pillar team for the work and noted that the process was faster and leaner compared to the first version, which she said is expected as the process stabilises. She mentioned that CER had submitted questions and requests for clarification and thanked the team for considering them. She raised further questions on how System Pillar documents coming from the Innovation Pillar will be handled in the future, and whether a process exists or will be established for their analysis.

Nicholas SHRIMPTON (UNIFE) thanked the System Pillar team for the work on STIP V2.0, acknowledging both the consideration given to UNIFE's comments and the transparent documentation. He confirmed readiness for endorsement via written procedure when launched.

Carole COUNE (AERRL) raised a comment regarding the STIP, initially submitted under part C1 but relevant to the entire document. She underlined the importance for infrastructure managers to know as early as possible which items are intended to become mandatory. She stated that innovation and market uptake should not be made mandatory and noted an intention to do so in some cases. She requested clarification on the motivation behind making certain recommendations mandatory.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) agreed on the importance of having a lean process but noted that this is the first revision of the STIP, and there is a learning process. He highlighted the need for earlier and deeper involvement of ERA in future revisions to ensure transparency on possible delays. He also that the impact on delivery of the TSI of new elements needs to be considered.

He stated that he had discussed this with the new Executive Director, who supports this approach, and has asked ERA and EU-Rail to meet in June to develop a shared understanding of the linkages between the STIP and the TSIs. He noted that for future revisions, the goal is to bring forward a STIP version that has already integrated this analysis.

He welcomed the general agreement on proceeding with adoption via written procedure once the current work is completed.

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) confirmed that the STIP is a living document and suggested it should be updated no more than once a year, in coordination with the EC and the TSI revision cycle. He agreed to provide a one-page summary of major changes to all members, including the SRG.

He noted that the transfer of documents from the Innovation Pillar to the System Pillar should be handled case by case, depending on the quality process.

He clarified that decisions on whether items become mandatory are made by the EC and Member States through the RISC process, not by the JU.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) clarified that inclusion in the TSI is potentially mandatory. He explained that some parts of the CCS TSI are mandatory, while others, such as ATO or certain GSMR functionalities, remain optional while being in the TSI. He noted that identifying in advance which functionalities will become mandatory is challenging and should be guided by interoperability.

He supported limiting mandatory functions to those necessary for interoperability and proposed that the JU and ERA could make pre-assessments. He stressed that final decisions lie with the Agency with input from infrastructure managers, JU and rolling stockholders.

Carole COUNE (AERRL) raised a follow-up question, using DAC as an example. She asked whether a similar level of cost-benefit analysis is carried out for other technologies when a recommendation is made to make them mandatory.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) replied by recalling that, according to the delegated decision of the EC, any TSI recommendation must be supplemented by a cost-benefit analysis.

He also pointed out that conducting cost-benefit analysis depends on data availability. He acknowledged ongoing difficulties in accessing reliable data and noted that this is a wider challenge within the rail sector. He stated that while efforts are made to base decisions on facts, data limitations can restrict what is possible.

Miroslav HALTUF (SRG) added that a cost-benefit analysis is not always necessary at every stage, but an impact assessment should be prepared. He stated that if the impact assessment reveals a need from the sector, then a cost-benefit analysis becomes necessary.

Nicholas SHRIMPTON (UNIFE) asked about the next steps at DG MOVE level regarding the update of the TSI request. He inquired whether there is any indication of the process following the expected update at the July RISC meeting, and how long it might take to formalise any changes. He also asked if there is already an indication of further steps from July to September.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) replied that there is no update at this stage. He stated that the Commission has asked ERA to prepare a report on the TSI delivery process and possible delays, and decisions will be taken based on that.

He concluded the discussion on this item, confirmed that the STIP report **has not been adopted** and will be submitted for adoption via written procedure after the additional analysis between ERA and EU-Rail is completed.

## **6. FRMCS –SYSTEM PILLAR REPORT**

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) introduced agenda item 6 on the FRMCS System Pillar report. He noted that, while the item was initially marked for decision, this has proven premature. He mentioned that the aim has been to prepare a report reflecting sector consensus on key elements of FRMCS introduction, including system specifications, timelines, and governance.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) provided an update on the FRMCS System Pillar report. He recalled the process timeline, noting that the first draft was circulated in March, followed by a second draft in early May, and that recent comments from members were appreciated. He observed that while there is growing convergence, full consensus has not yet been reached.

He highlighted remaining points for agreement, including the feasibility of achieving the minimum viable product as agreed at the EECT. He mentioned concerns raised by UNIFE about specification points and potential resource constraints, especially related to Morane 2 project activities.

He raised questions on governance, and he referred to the risks of limited resources and possible deviations to the plan. He also asked whether the proposed setup is adequate to address these. On the drafting process, he noted progress in proposals to involve supply industry more closely and highlighted the need to confirm agreement between UIC and UNIFE on the approach *(for further details, please refer to the slides)*.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) presented the proposed next steps and invited written feedback from stakeholders on the specific questions sent in advance, requesting replies within five working days (**12th of June**). He stated that, depending on the responses, a final draft could be circulated for written adoption before the end of July.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) presented the scope and the timing issues focusing on the open points for V2 specifications that need to be resolved. He also requested from UNIFE to provide more details on V3 functions and how they could impact the timeline. He also asked all stakeholders to reflect on whether sufficient resources have been allocated to meet the timeline and whether the current governance mechanism is adequate to respond to potential lack *(for further details, please refer to the slides)*.

Miroslav HALTUF (SRG) asked whether Member States would also be invited to participate in the next steps of FRMCS implementation, particularly in cases where there is interest. He noted that Member States are responsible for implementation planning and shared that, in the Czech Republic, a study has been carried out and there is interest in participating in the FRMCS testing phase, including cross-border activities with neighbouring countries.

Nicholas SHRIMPTON (UNIFE) referred to the scope discussion and the paper submitted in April, which included a detailed assessment of the EECT table marking functions for either V3 or Vx. He noted that UNIFE identified two areas: functions with no existing system requirements proposed for Vx, and functions marked for V3.

He suggested that there may be a different understanding of what constitutes the minimum viable product and proposed a line-by-line review of the table to compare views. He called for clearer feedback on the comments submitted, noting that some items might be reconsidered for Vx rather than V3. He added that for functions without current system requirements, an assessment would be needed on the effort required and the timeline for delivering them.

Carole COUNE (AERRL) shared input regarding the FRMCS report, stating that Annex 1 should not be validated as it lacks two key elements: a clear indication of which items are necessary to maintain current GSMR functionalities, and an explanation of the operational contribution or added value of each item.

She also questioned the urgency behind adding features at this stage, expressing concern that they are being rushed. She emphasised that the priority should be replacing GSM-R equipment with a solution that could support FRMCS in the future. Lastly, she noted concern that the planning appears to include no dedicated testing phase for V3 which may require more corrections.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) made three comments on the FRMCS report. First, on the scope, he stated support for the draft report as presented. He also mentioned avoiding reopening the scope discussion, noting that doing so could lead to further delays in developing the specifications. He underlined the importance of stability in the agreed scope to avoid the need for major upgrades within a few years, which would impact not only operators but also manufacturers.

Second, on governance, he noted that while further details would be shared by email, the current draft clearly outlines the roles of the System Pillar Steering Group and the High-Level Deployment Group. He mentioned that technical matters should be addressed within the appropriate groups, while any issues beyond technical decisions should be brought to the attention of the relevant stakeholders, who are responsible for escalating them to the appropriate level.

Third, on the timeline, he proposed setting a single, clear target date and in case that any delays occur, they should be discussed in the appropriate forum with transparency on the reasons for the deviation.

Marcel DE LA HAYE (CER) expressed support for EC proposals and thanked them for structuring the discussion and acknowledged the additional time given. He noted that CER had not yet submitted comments due to the lack of a unified position among its members, but efforts are ongoing to reach one. He stressed the importance of improving the governance framework, particularly the need to align technical and political/economic decision-making. He noted that CER members agree on the need for improvement and are currently discussing whether to reform the ERIG setup or consider an alternative structure. Regarding scope, he underlined that CER members are very reserved about any further reduction in scope beyond what has already been proposed by UIC.

Francois DAVENNE (UIC) thanked the group and noted that, from UIC's perspective, many of the questions circulated in advance had already been addressed but he will provide formal written replies.

On the scope, he reiterated that UIC maintains its position. Regarding UNIFE's comments, he referred to a more detailed table already submitted by UIC, particularly concerning alignment between system and functional requirements. He explained that system requirements are coming from international standards and the key issue is how they can be transferred to functional level. He invited UNIFE to respond to UIC's proposals to allow further progress.

On resources, he stated that the railway operating community and infrastructure managers do not face major issues but highlighted the importance of continued financing and support through instruments like the System Pillar Lot 3.

Regarding collaboration with UNIFE, he noted that a joint working group on functional specifications had already been agreed. He confirmed that would be pleased to welcome UNITEL into the relevant working group.

On risk management, he recalled concerns about delays linked to the EECT process but expressed confidence that proposed mitigation measures were adequate. He underlined that these structures should ensure timely delivery and transparency.

Mr Davenne also addressed earlier comments, confirming that Version 3 will be fully tested.

In conclusion, he stressed UIC's commitment to an open and collaborative approach and underlined that the strategy had been endorsed by UIC's European members.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) stressed the importance of avoiding the creation of too many additional groups or meetings, as this could overstretch limited resources. He underlined the need for efficient participation, ensuring that only those who can contribute effectively are involved. He called for a simple and clear process for sharing information and maintaining stakeholder visibility. Regarding reporting, he suggested keeping it short and to the point, to help associations communicate the key information more easily.

Nicholas SHRIMPSON (UNIFE) stressed the need for greater transparency and visibility regarding the governance structure. He requested clarity on which mixed groups would be involved, what topics they would address, and the planning for the next two years. He underlined that without this information, it is difficult to assess commitments related to scope and deadlines. He called for more detailed information on group responsibilities, timelines, decision-making processes, and outputs, including meeting minutes and planned activities, to ensure effective participation and resource planning.

Carole COUNE (AERRL) expressed support for the points raised by UNIFE.

Francois DAVENNE (UIC) noted there had been a lack of information exchange between UNITEL and UNIFE. He stated that a discussion had already taken place with UNITEL regarding which working group their experts would participate in. He suggested that UNITEL follow up separately to confirm expert participation.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) provided a detailed response to the various points raised during the discussion. Regarding Member State involvement, he clarified that the existing plan reflects EIM's suggestion not to unnecessarily multiply groups. He mentioned that feedback from Member States is expected via this group and the SRG and Information will also be shared through the High-Level Deployment Group and the RISC. He suggested that the stakeholder group organised by UIC is of a technical nature and best suited for participation by railway industry associations, though Member State involvement could be reconsidered in case it is required.

On the UNIFE table of comments, he stressed that this discussion should occur at technical level between UNITEL and UIC. However, he urged UNIFE to clearly identify on the EECT scope which functions represent a substantial workload risk, specify which ones could lead to delays, and indicate the associated risks to the timeline.

In response to concerns from AERRL, Wawka asked UIC, ERA, and potentially UNIFE whether it would be possible to identify which functionalities in Annex 1 are replacing GSM-R, in order to improve its

transparency. He noted that including operational gains for functionalities going beyond GSMR would be more difficult. He added that identifying GSM-R replacement functionalities is more feasible and could be useful for the Deployment Group.

He acknowledged UIC's confirmation regarding V3 testing and invited Carole COUNE (AERRL) to submit her expert's comments in writing to ensure all concerns are addressed.

On governance, he explained that the current monitoring tool supports decision-making bodies like the System Pillar Steering Group and the High-Level Deployment Group. He agreed this structure should be made more explicit in the report to ensure shared understanding and timely action.

He welcomed the constructive clarifications from UIC and expressed satisfaction that cooperation between railways and suppliers is progressing. On the topic of group structure, he reiterated the shared desire to avoid unnecessary new bodies and supported improving visibility on groups. He noted that one of the first deliverables to be shared with the FRMCS Stakeholder Group would be a more detailed resource plan which will indicate the current situation.

Finally, he flagged the open question of aligning the availability of a detailed timeline with the adoption of the report, expressing hope that this would not become a bottleneck. He concluded on a positive note, stating he now saw a clear path forward to concluding the report soon.

Miroslav HALTUF (SRG) asked for clarification on whether the process under discussion is solely an internal System Pillar process within the JU, or if it is part of a broader process that will lead to the preparation of the full FRMCS specifications for approval.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) clarified that the report presents a comprehensive overview of the entire process up to the adoption of the TSI. While the current focus is on the technical development of specifications, the report also reflects the work of ERA's extended core team and outlines the potential process at the RISC. He noted that achieving stakeholder consensus could facilitate a smooth RISC discussion. He added that deployment matters fall under the responsibility of the Deployment Group, which operates separately.

Miroslav HALTUF (SRG) explained that his question aimed to avoid issues similar to those experienced during the ERTMS process and certain TSI revisions, where smaller stakeholders opposed the proposed specifications. He clarified that his concern was not about Member States specifically, but about ensuring that the process leads to outcomes acceptable to all parties responsible for implementing FRMCS.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) clarified that the current process is limited to this group, which was selected to build industry consensus. He stated that stakeholders are expected to be represented through their associations, and the process will not be extended to others at this stage. He emphasised the need for urgency and cautioned against reopening past discussions, particularly on the scope, which has already been addressed through the EECT.

He supported the call for stability, stressing that once agreed, the scope must remain fixed to avoid future revisions. On timelines, he explained the rationale behind presenting best and worst case scenarios, noting that rapid progress is only feasible if the specifications are of high quality.

He underlined the importance of agreeing on the specifications and the governance mechanism, in order to enable all subsequent steps to proceed as quickly as possible. He concluded by inviting all participants to respond to the email sent by Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) within five working days, highlighting the need to reach a conclusion so that the next phases of work can begin.

Francois DAVENNE (UIC) clarified that the document shared with UNITEL was a detailed list concerning the scope. He stated that the table regarding GSM-R functionalities exists and is already agreed with ERA.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) clarified that the reference was to the clarification table provided by UIC. He also noted that, in addition to ERIG's role in technical specifications, the establishment of an FRMCS stakeholder group had been proposed in the email circulated by UIC.

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) concluded the agenda item and invited participants to respond to the email as requested. He then opened agenda item 7, concerning the strategic direction of the next contract and the three-year perspective.

## **ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION OF THE SYSTEM PILLAR STEERING GROUP**

### **7. STRATEGIC DIRECTION OF NEXT CONTRACT**

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) introduced the strategic direction for the next contract period, focusing on the full three-year perspective. He noted that the current System Pillar programme is at its halfway point, with planning extending to 2028 and there are three framework contracts (System Pillar Core Group, System Pillar Tasks and Domain and CCS TSI maintenance). He mentioned that the scope of System Pillar work, originally focused on CCS, has broadened significantly to include areas such as DAC, harmonised diagnostics, cybersecurity, and support to FRMCS specifications.

Then, he outlined key priorities for the next three years mentioning that the consideration of the Wave 2 call for Flagship Projects and the TSI input plan V2 is nearly concluded. He added that there is now a relatively stable view of the scope of work of the Joint Undertaking and the linked harmonisation outputs and the remaining System Pillar budget needs to be planned.

He highlighted that the second three-year period has a lower budget than the first, as it was agreed that the budget would be front-loaded. This has already led to reductions in expectations for some deliverables.

He presented the summary of expected deliverables emphasising to the harmonised operational rulebook for radio based ETCS L2 with ATO up to GoA2 and the technical solution highlighting the lack of a European reference for Level 2-only operations and the expected benefits in terms of simplification and cost reduction. He also mentioned the additional technical work on Train CS domain which includes odometry, train integrity, and future changes to onboard architecture.

He also added other areas of work which include TMS/CMS, DAC, harmonised diagnostics, cybersecurity, revision of STIP and CCS TSI maintenance (*for further details, please refer to the slides*).

He noted that the core group of the Joint Undertaking supports the standardisation and TSI input plan aiming to provide a coherent and transparent view of how all actors contribute to harmonisation outputs. He recalled the relevance of aligning with the Agency, EC, and Member State processes (from the R&I programme) and also referred to the Lot 3 work, which supports the sector in ECT processes for both ETCS and FRMCS specifications.

He explained that a resource allocation per team was made based on what is achievable, resulting in a budget estimate slightly above the currently allocated System Pillar budget. The Joint Undertaking is consulting EC on the possibility of securing additional funding to support the work. He stressed that activities may need to be reduced rather than expanded.

He explained that the purpose of the presentation was to provide an updated view of the deliverable scope and gather feedback on whether the proposed resource allocation is justified or if priorities should be adjusted, especially if the full budget is not secured. He noted that, depending on the decision expected at the upcoming SIPB meeting, the next 12-month work plan will be based on the planning presented (*for further details, please refer to the slides*).

He concluded by inviting participants to share their views on the presented activities focusing whether all should be continued as planned or if not which should be prioritised.

Nicholas SHRIMPSON (UNIFE) expressed UNIFE's strong support for the System Pillar and appreciation for the work done by the core group, as well as the detailed consultations carried out with the Steering Group and domains over the past months. He stated that UNIFE sees no clear candidate for stopping among the current activities and urged members to secure the requested budget. If reductions are necessary, he suggested avoiding cuts to Task 2, Lot 3, and Task 4 due to their importance, particularly for DAC development and implementation. He noted that a reduction in Lot 1 might be considered if absolutely needed but reiterated the preference to maintain all activities.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) expressed appreciation for the analysis and acknowledged the considerable work behind it. He agreed with UNIFE in calling to secure the budget, aligning with the expected deliverables presented. He emphasised the importance of Task 2, highlighting the relevance of the Operational Rulebook and TCS, which are central to their activities.

If reductions had to be made, he noted this should be based on an analysis of the potential impact on final goals and overall operations. However, he also warned that cutting budget from Task 1 could create risks in the longer term, particularly regarding coherence, once Task 2 deliverables are finalised. Each decision, he underlined, must be made with a clear understanding of its implications. He concluded by noting that it would not be an easy process and hoped it would not be necessary.

Aude CHAILLEY (CER) thanked the System Pillar team for the work done. She requested to submit detailed comments on both the slides and the accompanying paper by next week.

She appreciated that many priorities for SC2.5 had been taken into account and underlined that some proposals were still missing. She suggested case-by-case discussions for further clarifications.

Then, she highlighted the need for better coordination between the System Pillar and Innovation Pillar, and between results and their recipients. She underlined the importance of ensuring that the remits include this. She also highlighted that the Steering Group is responsible for the annual work plan, while contracts are approved by the SIPB, so consistency between the two must be ensured, and a planning should be provided.

Finally, she suggested including climate-resilient technologies as are included as priorities in IP and STIP. She supported the proposed budget presented by JU.

Carole COUNE (AERRL) added that the budget for the TCS and supervision domain should be significantly increased in order to be coherent with the STIP. She noted that she would follow up with more detailed written comments.

Wawrzyniec PERSCHKE (DG MOVE) recalled that the System Pillar was established in the Basic Act, including as an initiative of the EC, and confirmed support for increasing the budget to manage the proposed tasks. He acknowledged concerns about having sufficient resources to address TSI request items and ensure coherence between the System Pillar, the STIP, and TSI request-related work. He noted the overall concern that adding too many priorities risks weakening prioritisation. In this context, he suggested that removal of Task 5 could be the only point considered. He also emphasised that no new work proposals should be introduced at this stage. He mentioned that the budget should be sufficient to maintain current activities of the System Pillar Steering Group.

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) thanked the members for their recognition of the System Pillar work and reiterated the importance of using member contacts in the SIPB to support securing the proposed budget. He also replied to CER's comments by noting that most priorities had been recognised. He also mentioned that the inclusion of climate resilience, is not feasible under the System Pillar side.

Regarding TCS he noted that each domain had been reviewed from a minimum viable product perspective and any increase in TCS would require a corresponding cut elsewhere.

He confirmed the aim is to maintain current resource levels in Train CS at least until end of 2027. He welcomed detailed feedback and confirmed that the contract for the next 12-month period would be based on this planning and needs to be finalised promptly (beginning of July).

## **8. TRAIN CS DOMAIN AND LINK TO OCORA**

Christoph KLOSE (SPCG) presented a proposal developed jointly within the core group, to align the work of the System Pillar with OCORA. He outlined a three-step approach:

1. Clustering OCORA documents into two categories: content relevant to the System Pillar and documents outside the scope of System Pillar.
2. Mapping of the relevant OCORA content by Train CS to existing STIP items, or the creation of new STIP items if necessary.
3. Scheduling the integration of these elements into STIP or other System Pillar deliverables (*for further details, please refer to the slides*).

Then he noted that only the first step, categorization of documents has been agreed so far and further steps will depend on case-by-case assessment and consensus.

He called for the support of the System Pillar Steering Board and stressed the importance of close collaboration between railways and suppliers to ensure consistent and coherent outputs.

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) acknowledged the proposal presented by Christoph KLOSE and noted that while a way forward has been outlined, complete integration of OCORA has not yet been achieved. He emphasised the need for Steering Group members to engage with their members involved in TCS on the railway and supplier sides in order to foster a more constructive relationship. He also stressed the importance of improving collaboration.

Klaus MINDEL (UNIFE) thanked Ian CONLON and Christoph CLOSE for their contributions and confirmed that from the supply side, there is a commitment to continue a constructive approach to processing inputs from OCORA. He noted significant progress already made, particularly on modularity, and acknowledged the ongoing discussion of topics raised by OCORA.

Regarding the first step of categorising documents, he stressed that it should also consider if new requirements regarding TCS are included. Lastly, he concluded by expressing support for continuing cooperation with OCORA.

## **9. PRAMS**

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) informed the group that, in the absence of Julien BOIS (PRAMS domain lead), he would present on their behalf. He stated that a series of documents are now available in the System Pillar area of the website for consultation with the sector. This includes members of the representative associations and some broader stakeholders.

The documents include:

- On the **PRAMS side**: the performance KPI definitions and the requirements to deploy CBM.
- On the **safety side**: a paper on the evolution management of safety-related systems in a modular architecture, the generic design safety case strategy, and a document on human and organisational factors (*for further details, please refer to the slides*).

Then, he requested from the members to review these documents and provide comments by **19 September**, so that inputs can be incorporated before the end of SC2.4 contract.

Klaus MINDEL (UNIFE) confirmed that UNIFE can release the documents for consultation and expressed readiness to contribute to the review cycle.

## **10. TASK 2 TRANSVERSAL**

Ralph MULLER (EUG/DB) presented the status of a deliverable intended for formal approval within Europe's Rail by the end of August, with a view to internal publication. They explained that the public publication is scheduled for **September 2027** to allow sufficient time for testing, as standards must be validated before publication.

Then, he presented the design of the end-to-end process: from data model and preparation to configuration, which starts with the ERA ontology and he described the digital process for configuration data (*for further details, please refer to the slides*). Additionally, he mentioned that extensive consultations were held with domain teams, mirror groups, and associations to integrate feedback. Finally, he presented a roadmap and requested support from the Steering Group.

### **AOB**

- **Request for response to train positioning questionnaire**

Ian CONLON (Europe's Rail) referred to the work in the TCS domain concerning improved odometry performance, which is recognised as a weak point in ETCS. A questionnaire had been circulated to gather sector feedback on the importance and feasibility of improving odometry accuracy. Only six

responses had been received so far, so the response period would be extended by two weeks, 18<sup>th</sup> of June. He requested members to encourage broader participation by circulating the questionnaire further.

#### **- Organisation of future specifications**

Klaus MINDEL (UNIFE) presented a proposal concerning the continuation of System Pillar specification, based on CCS/TMS experiences. Firstly he presented the background and motivation highlighting the importance of maintaining and updating the technical specifications developed within the System Pillar, noting that feedback from future implementation projects will be critical. Without a plan for continuation, there is a risk that valuable results and implementation progress could be lost.

He also presented the organisation of future specification work (*for further details, please refer to the slides*). Then, he mentioned that UNIFE ask DG MOVE and ERA to initiate a clarification process involving relevant sector organisations, starting with the definition of key organisational principles. He stressed that these principles would not define a new JU structure, but rather serve to guide future arrangements. He expressed willingness to contribute to the process and called for leadership from DG MOVE and ERA.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) gave support to the UNIFE's initiative, stating that it is a good time to begin reflecting on what comes next.

Giorgio TRAVAINI (Europe's Rail) thanked UNIFE and EIM for their interventions. He emphasised that the governance of Europe's Rail is shared between the EU and the rail sector's members. Therefore, any clarification on the continuation of the System Pillar work should first be addressed within this public-private partnership, rather than immediately to DG MOVE or ERA. He acknowledged the importance of maintaining the outputs of the System Pillar but suggested that the request should be reconsidered and first discussed within the partnership structure.

Klaus MINDEL (UNIFE) clarified that his intention was not to shift responsibility to others. He affirmed that UNIFE is fully committed to contributing actively.

Bardo SCHETTINI GHERARDINI (EIM) clarified that his intention was simply to support the idea of starting a reflection on the topic, which he considers a good initiative, but without entering into the details on how the things can be done.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) agreed with the need to begin preparations on the topic, supporting the earlier intervention by Giorgio TRAVAINI. He noted the importance of this issue also depends on developments such as the MFF and whether there will be a successor to Europe's Rail. He emphasised that preparations cannot wait for complete clarity or the adoption of a basic act for a future Joint Undertaking. He further agreed with Mr Travaini view that the initial phase of this reflection should begin within the current group. He proposed that the group itself should discuss how the work should be organised, including what processes to follow. Based on that, the group could formulate recommendations possibly addressed to EC or ERA. He suggested returning to the topic in this group for a more detailed discussion.

#### **- Standardisation conference**

Paolo UMILIACCHI (CENELEC) informed the group about the 8th edition of the *ICT for Railways* workshop, organised by CENELEC, will be held in Madrid on 2–3 October. This international workshop focuses on innovation products and services of standardisation, regulation, and research, aiming to explore how these can influence the evolution of the railway sector. The event will take place at Comillas Pontifical University and is expected to attract participants from across the railway sector, including operators, infrastructure managers, industry, SMEs, associations, and universities.

He invited members to contribute and participate, and extended a specific invitation to Mr LUECKING (DG MOVE) and Mr Conlon (Europe's Rail) to join as keynote speakers.

Joachim LUECKING (DG MOVE) thanked participants for their contributions and announced that the next meeting of the group is planned for **23 October**. He noted that in the meantime, there may be written procedures for votes or opinions, and he encouraged everyone to respond to the email regarding FRMCS by the indicated deadline to support timely progress on that important matter. He then closed the meeting and thanked all participants.