



## **FRMCS subgroup of the Deployment Group – Second Meeting**

**2<sup>nd</sup> October 2024**

**9:00 – 11:00**

**On-line meeting**

### *Participants*

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Present</u>
1. Jesús Santiago	ADIF	Yes
2. José Alberto González	ADIF	No
3. Sara Caramés Saa	ADIF	Yes
4. Jean-François Caubet	AERRL	Yes
5. Pierre Cotellet	Alstom	Yes
6. Jose Antonio Quintano	CAF	Yes
7. Jean-Philippe Gachot	CER	Yes
8. Bernacik Paweł	CER	Yes
9. Dittrich Jaroslav	CER	Yes
10. Achim Vrielink	DB	No
11. Holger Lietz	DB	Yes
12. Markus Neubacher	DB	Yes
13. Morten Schläger	DB	Yes
14. Bardo Schettini	EIM	Yes
15. Giuseppe Miccoli	EIM	No
16. Maria Cataldo	FSI	Yes
17. Leonardo Malesci	FSI	Yes
18. Luca Di Dio La Leggja	FSI	Yes
19. Cataffo Vittorio	FSI	No

20. Felice Iusto	FSI	Yes
21. Arild Nybrodahl	Bane NOR	Yes
22. Johann Lienhart	OEBB	Yes
23. Erik Hadl	OEBB	Yes
24. Manfred Schienbein	Siemens	Yes
25. Eric Giraud-Desjuzeur	SNCF	Yes
26. Simon Gouyou-Beauchamps	SNCF	Yes
27. Pascal Désaunay	SNCF	Yes
28. Pipsa Hallner	Trafikverket	Yes
29. Mats Malmström	Trafikverket	No
30. Dan Mandoc	UIC	Yes
31. Michael Mikulandra	UNIFE	Yes
32. Jorgen Mattisson	UNIFE	No
33. Martin Schroeder	ERA	No
34. Giacomo Potenza	ERA	Yes
35. Wawrzyniec Perschke	DG MOVE	Yes
36. Karel Van Gils	EU-RAIL	Yes
37. Alfonso Lorenzo	Ineco	Yes

### *Agenda*

1. Introduction
2. MoM last meeting
3. Finish remits subgroup
4. Discussion workplan
5. AOB

### *Minutes of the Meeting*

#### **1. Introduction**

Karel Van Gils (EU-RAIL) welcomed the members, including two new CER representatives: Bernacik Pawel and Dittrich Jaroslav.

Karel Van Gils explained the aim of this second meeting is preparing the input for the next High-Level Deployment Group meeting on October 22<sup>nd</sup>. He also indicated a Teams group was created to share files. Some members indicated that they have no access to the shared files. *[Action: resend the invitation to those members that have not accessed yet]*

## **2. MoM last meeting**

The MoM on the 5<sup>th</sup> of September meeting approved. Actions were taken and finalised.

## **3. Finish remits subgroup**

The '10-point plan' included in the remits of the subgroup was reviewed and adjust by considering the comments from the members.

The following points agreed:

- The estimation of necessary capacities (point 2) will be based on input coming from the national (and organisation) plans. Based on this data, the group will identify difficulties or issues that require –high level- EU coordination (e.g. cross-border coordination or EU deployment capacity). It is clarified the EU Commission will not impose any FRMCS deployment plans to the Member States. FRMCS has to be seen as replacement investments for current communication systems.
- Coordination between trackside and on-board deployment is necessary. According to the CCS TSI, the infrastructure managers should notify 5 years in advance when the GSM-R will be decommissioned and replace by FRMCS.
- Funding and financing topics will be analysed on point 3. It is expected that most of the investment will come from national funds, but also possibly from EU (MFF) funds or private money. If the return of investment is proved, private investors could be interested on be involved on the FRMCS deployment. Additionally, the approach used for funding and financing topics in on country could be used as lesson learnt for other countries. Investments consider for retrofitting and new trains.
- It is not clear what DB means with “solution space” in their proposal for point 7. *[Action: rephrase the sentence “The number of migration scenarios need to cover the relevant part of the solution space” to clarify the meaning of “solution space” in point 7]*
- National plans are relevant in the risk assessment, for example, in the coordination of the cross-border deployment. *[Action: update the point 8 explaining the reason of including national plans in the risk assessment]*
- Keep in point 10 the reference to “taking into account the Public procurement rules /buy European Act”. I will be developed in the workplan.
- Several small editorial adjustments were made directly in the text.

## **4. Discussion workplan**

Pipsa and Wawka introduced the structure and a first draft of the workplan of the FRMCS subgroup.

The following comments were indicted by some members:

- Michael Mikulandra (UNIFE) indicated a steering group or similar to provide coordination and synchronisation between workstreams and activities, and to aggregate the data from them is necessary.
- Dan Mandoc (UIC) considered the division between on-board and trackside topics could not be useful to face some issues such as cross-borders or migration scenarios. He proposed starting with two thematic focussed groups: one focused on cross-border topics and other to define the migration scenarios.
- Jesús Santiago (Adif) mentioned the necessity of establish a fixed timeline for the activities. He saw difficulties on having the national plans with enough detailed in the following months.

## 5. AOB

An extra meeting on the 7-11 October week is agreed to continue the revision of the workplan and the adjustment fo the the '10-point plan' (remit) that will be proposed in the following High-Level Deployment Group meeting on October 22nd. [Action: send a doodle to select the timeslot for the next meeting]

### Action List

No.	Action	Owner	Deadline	Status
1	Resend the invitation to those members that have not accessed yet	Alfonso Lorenzo	ASAP	Open
2	Rephrase the sentence " <i>The number of migration scenarios need to cover the relevant part of the solution space</i> " to clarify the meaning of " <i>solution space</i> " in point 7	Markus Neubacher	ASAP	Open
3	Update the point 8 explaining the reason of including national plans in the risk assessment	Alfonso Lorenzo	ASAP	Open
4	Send a doodle to select the timeslot for the next meeting	Alfonso Lorenzo	ASAP	Open