



13th MEETING OF THE EUROPE'S RAIL SRG

22 October 2025

09:30 – 12:00h
Hybrid meeting

<p>1. Introduction</p> <p>The Chair welcomed all participants and in particular the new SRG representatives from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Austria: Ivanka Terzic and Leonhard Hartinger (in replacement of Nina Avramović and Christian Drakulic, respectively) - Israel: Nati Bloch Damti and Reut Cohen – <i>only Ms Cohen was present at the meeting</i> 	<p>09:30- 09:35</p>
<p>2. Approval of Agenda and previous MoM</p> <p>The proposed agenda for the meeting was approved.</p> <p>The minutes of the last SRG meeting were approved with the changes proposed by the Chair and some participants.</p>	<p>09:35- 09:40</p>
<p>3. Update on EC activities</p> <p>Mihaela WILLIAMS, from the European Commission (EC) - Directorate General (DG) MOVE, gave an update on the EU policy developments.</p> <p>The EC is currently proceeding with the revision of the Regulation establishing the ERA. It will not be a major revision, but an outline of its tasks. Within this context, the EC plans to enforce ERA's contribution to uptake innovative solutions for rail. For the time being, this exercise is still in the preparatory phase; some consultation activities will start still this year to gather views from all stakeholders and MS on the elements to be addressed. Next year, the EC will launch a targeted stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>The DG MOVE representative introduced the proposals for both FP10 and European Competitiveness Fund (ECF), currently discussed by the European co-legislators.</p> <p>A four-pillar structure has been proposed for FP10 in replacement of the current architecture. Rail will be in pillar II "Competitiveness and Society". A key principle for FP10 will continue to be simplification.</p>	<p>09:40- 09:50</p>

The overall objectives are clean transition and industrial decarbonisation, and the ECF may include contributions to European partnerships when it is necessary to meet those objectives.

The JU instrument will only be used if no other instrument would deliver. For the time being, the EC is discussing internally and trying to better understand all elements, in particular how the partnership landscape could look under the next MFF. There will be a new SBA with again streamlined provisions for JUs.

Mihaela concluded her intervention by saying that as for the time being it is not clear in which areas there will be partnerships, it is essential to be ready, build the case and advocate for the continuation of the JU. DG MOVE took good note of EU-Rail's High-level paper on the future of rail and will do the same with its annex with flagships under the next MFF, but the role of the SRG should not be underestimated in this exercise.

The Chair thanked Mihaela for her presentation and opened the floor for questions.

The representative of UK was interested in how the proposal to use the ECF will interact with the decision making on FP10. He also wondered if the ECF will fund the deployment phase or the full R&I programme.

The EC representative replied that there are various windows under the ECF, and that for sure there will be a common rule and governance. For each policy window the Work Programme will include innovative actions ensuring investment to manufacturing and deployment and this may include European partnerships. Further details will be provided as soon it becomes clearer the articulation between the ECF and FP10.

The representative of AT raised three questions, First, regarding the objective of simplification, he asked if there will be a new methodology or simplification is to be dealt inside a partnership. Second, in relation to the societal dimension under pillar II, he considers that materially speaking it is about taking it out from pillar II and put in the ECF. So, he asked what this would mean for a future JU under pillar II which seems to be disconnected of the societal dimension, i.e., how to integrate the societal dimension in the mobility sector. Lastly, he asked how this will be done with ERA, because the JU and the ERA are completely different. The question is how to ensure this link and make that innovation happens in Europe.

The EC representative replied to those questions as it follows.

There are some provisions on simplification in the FP10 proposal, e.g. simplification of use and use of lump sums. Also in terms of partnerships, because there will be only two kinds of partnerships: one option by default and one in exceptional cases. It is also planned to have a common set of rules, again in a common SBA that will be based on the lessons learnt from the current SBA. There will be overarching principles to be translated in specific provisions for JUs in the SBA. So, there we will be more specific provisions, but it is early to talk about that.

<p>Concerning the societal dimension in pillar II of FP10, there will be some elements such as EU missions, inclusions, gender issues, etc.</p> <p>With regard to the cooperation between the JU and ERA and what can be done to ensure innovation happens, what comes out of the JU is an important input for ERA to accelerate implementation. ERA role is key for certifications on interoperability. Innovative solutions should be taken up by ERA, so we can be in a position of authorising innovative solutions used on the EU railway system.</p> <p>The Chair concluded the discussion by saying that the topic of ERA would need a separate dedicated meeting. He considers that the technical specification for interoperability cannot be the tool which will increase the price for rail transport. To make it competitive it is necessary to look at how TSIs will help to achieve that. The goal must not to increase the cost for rail transport.</p>	
<p>4. Update on EU-Rail's on-going activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report on System Pillar (SP) work <p>Ian CONLON, Head of SP at EU-Rail, updated SRG Members on the latest developments, and in particular on the last SP meeting held on 4 June. Two important pieces of work were approved on Trackside Asset Control System Release B4R4 (TACS) specifications and on cybersecurity.</p> <p>The EU-Rail standardisation and TSI Input Plan were for approval in the next meeting planned for 24 October. The same was for the FRMCS System Pillar Report version 2.</p> <p>Ian also informed on the status of the ongoing activities. There were only a few delays on some of the activities, but largely speaking the SP is delivering according to the plans.</p> <p><i>Additional details are present in the provided PowerPoint presentation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High level overview of Innovation Pillar (IP) activities <p>Nicolas FURIO, Head of IP at EU-Rail, provided a detailed update on each flagship and exploratory research projects focusing on the new elements since the last SRG meeting in May.</p> <p><i>A full report by flagship is provided in the PowerPoint presentation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Report on High-Level Deployment Group (DpG) work <p>Ian CONLON explained the latest development of the DpG. He reminded that the work of this group is largely of voluntary nature.</p> <p>He introduced the initial outcome of the FRMCS subgroup. The subgroup has provided a possible way on how to approach the authorisation, a toolbox for possible migration scenario, and provide recommendations to ERA.</p> <p><i>Additional details are provided in the PowerPoint presentation.</i></p>	<p>09:50-10:20</p>

The BE representative asked Ian in relation to the FRMCS questionnaire as EY had contacted them. Ian replied that the two requests are different exercises and the JU will look into their coordination.

The AT representative asked about pre-deployment and in particular what could be done to promote mitigating strategies for reducing the risk of unsuccessful deployment. Ian replied that the work done so far in the JU is about spreading the risk, because the process to develop the specifications and requirements is designed not to work with one operator. The partnership is a fundamental mitigation of risk. The only way discussed at EU level is the partnership approach, thus a coordinated approach. This question is also part of the current discussion for FRMCS.

- **Ongoing and upcoming communication and dissemination activities**

Ian CONLON presented the main ongoing and planned communication activities.

The Women in Rail Awards that took place on 1 October in Krakow, with four awardees. A successful Brokerage event held also in Poland, during the TRAKO fair, in collaboration with EU-Rail PKP S.A. and the National Contact Point for research. The plan is to organize an online information day by flagship area in November 2025.

For the Innotrans fair of September 2025, a joint stand with the Commission and ERA is confirmed. On the Commission side, there will be not only DG MOVE but also DG INTPA. The plan is again to have a programme for a train journey from Brussels to Berlin, with the support of DB and the JU private members.

The TRA event of 18-21 May 2026 in Budapest will have a joint stand with EU-Rail, SESAR, Clean Hydrogen and Clean Aviation JUs.

EU-Rail will continue with the production of [podcasts](#) and pushing for more digital publications and further website development.

- **Outcome of 2025-01 call and launch of 2025-02 call**

The ED informed on the outcome of the first call for proposals of the year with the topic *HORIZON-JU-ER-2025-FA7-01: Further Technological Development of Maglev-derived Systems*, including a breakdown of the contributions per country.

The proposal selected for funding which is now in the grant agreement preparation phase.

The second call for proposals of the year will be a big call, comprising the 2nd wave of flagship projects and the last batch of exploratory activities. It was published on 8 October on the [Funding & Tenders Portal](#) and will remain open until 11 February 2026.

The ED presented the call configuration and full list of destination topics and budgets.

An Info Day was held on 10 October, with more than 250 participants, which shows great interest. The event included a connection with GREENET, the network of Cluster 5 National Contact Points, presented by the PL representative at the SRG. Also, a

B2platform has been set up for interested applicants to connect, with already more than 500 users.

Additional details are present in the provided PowerPoint presentation.

The UK representative asked if the proposal selected under call 2025-01 had new partners. The ED replied that some were new, but there is also continuity with past participants.

The UK representative commented that it is critical for the programme that the consortia include potential new entrants, and that this should be the message to convey to EU-Rail private members.

The UK asked for the following message to be conveyed to the EU-Rail Governing Board: *“UK wishes to express our deep concern to the Governing Board on the openness of the consortia to newcomers to the programme. We recognise that the ERJU Members are best placed to lead and build these consortia, as we do need the Members to participate in the projects to ensure the Private Members in-kind contributions, but we also need to be certain that they are actively seeking new innovators from businesses and academia to include in their teams to improve the quality of their proposals and the resulting projects.”*

The DE and FR representatives agreed. The DE representative informed having hosted a national networking event at the end of September to actively encourage German universities to apply for the second call.

The ED reassured that the message will be passed on to EU-Rail’s GB - **Action**

He added that in the call 2025-02 text, the following requirement was already added for each Flagship Project topic: *“It is expected that the Flagship Project stemming from this topic: - will involve sufficient European geographical representation of academia, and ensure that all needed expertise for the described activities reflects the Special skills and/or capabilities expected from the Applicant(s) as described in the specific topic conditions.”*

The FR representative asked for the actual incentives to ensure wider participation than having only the contribution from the EU-Rail members.

The ED replied that there are different elements to reply to that question. First, the members of the EU-Rail have to commit in-kind contributions, so they should participate to R&I activities because they committed to that in the EU partnership. Second, members need to respond to all capabilities asked in the call topic text. Each of them may not have all internal skills therefore when replying, their consortia should most probably be enlarged. Mainly this happens with their affiliated entities, but it may be also with direct beneficiaries or subcontractors. Third, in the Flagship Projects topic call text it is indicated that *“sufficient European geographical representation of academia”* is expected,, which means that this is part of the evaluation. He mentioned

<p>as an example an ongoing Flagship Project involving already many more entities than the 30 (including the 5 new associated members) private EU-Rail members.</p> <p>The ED also clarified that only EU-Rail Members can contribute with in-kind contributions to the budget of the EU.</p> <p>The AT representative commented on another aspect which is that in Cluster 5 they are facing a disproportional number of proposals due to the use of AI in proposal drafting. He asked if EU-Rail was also experiencing the same, e.g. for exploratory topics. The ED replied that EU-Rail had not suffered from this issue in past calls, and that EU bodies are paying particular attention.</p> <p>The UK asked that for the next SRG meeting, information is provided on the number of newcomers to the programme that are partners in consortia for the call for proposals, especially for the Flagship Area Topics - <u>Action</u></p> <p>- Other information points</p> <p>The ED informed the SRG Members of the decisions adopted at the least Governing Board meeting of 24 June. He also pointed to the termination of the membership of THALES on 24 July, due to the takeover of another JU member, HITACHI. The ongoing grants participated by THALES were taken by HTACHI, and the in-kind contribution commitment for future R&I activities have been taken up by different JU private members including HITACHI.</p> <p>The ED continued explaining the status of three ongoing calls for tenders; one of them (Multi-Project Collaborative Tool) had to be cancelled due to the non-fulfilment of the minimum requirements of the tender specifications.</p> <p>The draft agenda of the EU-Rail's General Assembly of 2025 scheduled for 2-3 December was presented, and the ED reminded the SRG contribution needed for the 2nd day (10 minutes presentation). As usual, the SRG Chair will present the annual report of national R&I activities in the General Assembly.</p> <p>The plan for 2026, including the main meetings and decisions to be taken by the Governing Board, was also presented.</p>	
<p>5. Regional Matchmaking Days</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome of Brokerage event in Gdansk of 24 September 2025 - Presentation of proposals for 2026 - Open discussion on how to ensure effective competition and participation from new innovators in the 2025-02 call for proposals <p>As already commented, the Brokerage event held in Gdansk during the TRAKO fair on 24 September was very successful. Unfortunately, the event foreseen in the UK in October had to be cancelled.</p>	<p>10:20- 10:30</p>

<p>The UK representative said that unfortunately there was not an event in the UK, unlike the event in Poland, but that the main point was that not enough registration of EU-Rail private members were observed. The UK does not object to consortiums formed by EU rail members but proposes strongly advise the GB that they should be seeking new innovators and not only work always with the same suppliers. They need to be engaging in the pitch events happening. This should be part of their role as JU members.</p> <p>The ED reassured once more that the message will be passed on to the GB members.</p> <p>The ED also informed that a new action is planned, which is to organize online events for each flagship area in November 2025, where the flagship projects results will be presented. The format will be online, led by the flagship project coordinator, and supported by private members' participation in each session.</p> <p>The Chair referred to the necessary cooperation with UNIFE, in the same way as with ERA. He proposed for the next SRG meeting to have a dedicated discussion. To do so, he will distribute questionnaire so SRG members can address questions - <u>Action</u></p> <p>The Chair also referred to regional expectations and proposals for 2026. It is about how to work more actively with MS and JU Members.</p> <p><i>More details are provided in the PowerPoint presentation.</i></p>	
<p><i>Coffee break</i></p>	<p>10:30- 10:45</p>
<p>6. Election of SRG Vice-chair Following a presentation of the process by the ED, the Chair invited the only candidate to Vice-chair, the ND representative Johanna Nes to say a few words. She expressed her motivation and engagement with rail and her belief in EU-Rail as a very important player for the harmonisation of rail and future TSIs.</p> <p>Following the procedure established in Article 4.1 of the SRG rules of procedure, Johanna Nes was appointed Vice-chair of the SRG by consensus.</p>	<p>10:45- 10:55</p>
<p>7. Points for SRG decision – SRG opinion for GB meeting of 2 December 2025</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">- Draft Amendment of Work Programme 2025-2026</p> <p>The ED explained that the intention of this amendment is to make the necessary transfers to the 2025 budget, to ensure proper consumption by year end. It is only a shifting between titles in the budget and no content change.</p> <p>For transparency, once finalised it will be shared with the SRG Members.</p> <p>On this basis, SRG provided a <u>positive opinion</u> to this second amendment of the WP 2025-26.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">- Draft Work Programme 2026</p>	<p>10:55- 11:15</p>

The ED explained that the draft WP 2026 is an extract from the WP 25-26, and that generally the activity remains the same. The main difference in content is for the call for proposals which will include two topics.

One is covering the flagship area (FA) 6 and 7, for a value of 3.1M€ EU funds. It covers the R&I for a low TRL rolling stock development for regional lines under FA6 and on the other side integrate further developments on the concept of moving infrastructure (FA7) as presented by Nicolas FURIO when describing the ongoing project Pods4rail.

The other topic comes as a result of a request by the European Parliament to the EC to finance more work on the safety aspect for hyperloop solutions. The EC will provide a Contribution Agreement to EU-Rail of 3M€ to implement this project.

To a question by the UK representative, the ED clarified that if an EU-Rail member participates in any call, then the contribution is required.

The Chair proposed that a sentence is added saying that there is a need for coordinating this topic with the future military mobility needs. This is to fulfil the criteria for resilience and dual use. The ED agreed with the Chair's proposal - **Action**

The SRG provided a positive opinion to the WP 2026.

- **Annex of High-level Paper on the Future of Rail**

A dedicated SRG meeting on this topic was held on the day before, which provided an extended overview of the matter.

The ED reminded members that there will be revisions of the annex during the course of 2026, so the SRG will be able to contribute further. The ongoing discussions on the MFF will have to be taken into account. The only new element in the version of the annex that was initially shared, is the presented high-speed flagship initiative, which will also evolve following the publication of the high-speed master plan announced by the EC.

The ND representative commented that she found the draft annex very ambitious. She made a point in relation to common digitalised systems. She considers that the suppliers' sector is very conservative and a new way of thinking is needed. Another point was in relation to authorisation and certification. She considers that coordination at EU level is required, and EU-Rail is in good place to provide this coordination, but the question is how to include more parties in this coordination and all working together, e.g. for upgrading trains.

The Chair agreed with the ND proposals, but for him it is necessary to remain conservative because rail is the bone of mobility in all times. So, if rail fails, due to blackout or not sufficient energy supply, we should have a plan B because mobility must be ensured. This needs to be included in the R&I programmes and projects.

<p>The ND representative considered that this was more a resilient point than software, and that with software you cannot be conservative.</p> <p>The AT representative said that for him it is both points. Resilience cannot be dissociated from the general discussion and the military dimension. There is a link to European defence, so we should look at solutions in case the system fails.</p> <p>The Chair concluded the debate by saying that the final SRG opinion on the High-level paper Annex will be provided in the next days. The ED asked for all contributions to be sent to the JU by Thursday 30 October cob, if possible, in track-changes on the document already distributed in advance to the meeting. - <u>Action</u></p> <p>On this basis, the SRG will provide <u>positive opinion</u> to the draft Annex.</p>	
<p>8. Report from the SRG - Update on national research projects/activities + state of play of proposed actions by the JU</p> <p>The lists of R&I activities (policies, programmes and projects) at national and regional level are published on EU-Rail's website.</p> <p>SRG Members were invited and update their national lists with any changes by 14 November cob, to allow sufficient time for analysis and preparation of the report to the General Assembly by SRG Chair (according to Articles 20(9)(10) of the SBA) – <u>Action</u></p> <p>The Chair emphasized that the countries with no activities declared so far should send the information in order to complete the picture, even if it is to say that they have no R&I activities. The objective is to improve efficiency of R&I synergies.</p> <p><i>Additional information is provided in the PowerPoint presentation.</i></p>	11:15 11:30
<p>9. Presentation of results of survey on the functioning of the SRG by the Chair The Chair briefly presented the final results of the survey with the participation of 14 countries. He reminded the role and mission of the SRG in EU-Rail.</p>	11:30- 11:40
<p>10. AoB and closing remarks - Exchange with the ED of ERA</p> <p>The ED of ERA, Oana Gherghinescu, thanked the SRG Chair for the invitation and opportunity to have an exchange of views with the State representatives. For those who did not know her, she has been working in the Agency since 2013. She has an economic background, which plays a role, while of course remaining fully open to continue learning from the technical aspect related to the job.</p> <p>Rail is a wide ecosystem in which ERA and EU-Rail are a key part. It is not only about the EC and the sector. ERA and EU-Rail are bringing technical solutions which have an impact. This is where there is a link with economics.</p>	11:40- 12:00

Ms Gherghinescu gave her priorities for her mandate, all of them are areas with room for progress:

1) Interoperability and cost effectiveness needs

This is big topic. When looking at the technical specifications on interoperability we are bringing forward, she would like to see several improvements. One of them is getting mature content and kept stable in the higher step possible. Without risking that we are becoming irresponsible to needs. She thinks there is a balance we can get. We need to make the changes smarter and allow a breathing space for investors. We would like to keep this path of the changes in TSIs in a sustainable manner.

On ERTMS deployment for ERA, it is important we get the right level of details. Historically we have seen the toolbox was a very wide toolbox, it allowed to pick and choose combinations that turned into a wide variety, alternative options. We are going down in the details trying, with the input from all stakeholders, to get to defining in precision. Another area is the streamlining of the compatibility testing. These are areas in which the more we harmonise the higher chances we have for cost reduction, and to also have safer business case with higher volumes.

Still under the first pillar of interoperability there is room to continue working on borders, ground to continue the very good work, and MS to continue remove the consistent obstacles at the borders. We also need to ensure cooperation with EU-Rail and never sacrificing safety.

2) Safety

The monitoring of the national safety measures must continue, but this is not sufficient. There is a need to accompany that with a broader picture. In the remit of the role of the Agency, we need to achieve a strong capacity building before accidents and incidents happen. Another aspect is enhancing data collection and data analysis, to proactively learn from data collection where nothing happens, to be predictive and try to improve the situation. Reacting to disasters is not the right way to boost services. She rather prefers to be proactive.

3) Need to remain very open to the challenges and opportunities around us

FRMCS is a clear one. We are working intensively to come across the obstacle and challenges with a clear objective to put in law a set of specifications with a clear deployment plan. We should avoid now creating specifications which would not be good enough.

Innovation is part of this, but we need to cover the resilience part and also the military context, cyber and climate. Those topics are keeping us very busy, and we need to find the right balance for preparing the specifications to react to those.

With all these developments, she considers that we have a momentum with the current discussions on MFF, to put the light on rail and to actually have the opportunity to maybe catch up with areas not sufficiently supported in the past, e.g. in removing cross border obstacles.

The Chair thanked Oana for her comprehensive presentation. He said that the focus on budget is indeed important. There is a need to stabilise technical specification not to lose money because of changes in TSIs. This process is crucial to stabilise the sector. It is important to work together because ERA is closely working with MS. So, this is the first topic he would like to prioritise. The objective must be not to increase price for customers.

The AT representative commented in relation to the high-speed, but not hyperloop or Maglev but to high speed in the classical sense, that we just need to look at what high-speed has brought to the countries that put the emphasis on it. For him, the question is really what high-speed would bring to the future and the geopolitical challenges facing now. He wonders whether it would be better to adopt a new term instead of high-speed, such as “high- performance”, instead of still emphasizing such a narrow scope focused exclusively on mobility of persons and connecting places which make no sense. High-performance is more polyvalent, it includes logistics, military mobility, etc. He thinks that continuing the debate on high-speed rail misses the point on what is needed for the future. That could be a debate for a long day, but he was interested in having a quick reaction from the ED of ERA.

The ED of ERA said it is all a matter of prioritising. In her opinion, we will know more when the master plan from the EC will be issued. Probably all questions on the table will be addressed. Second, she buys the AT reflection, which looks at the infrastructure side to make it fully modern and equipped, with bringing an additional component, the level of investment that does not look like an integrated map of Europe. ERTMS will increase capacity and match passenger’s needs, but we need to remember freight in traffic is not easy business case. Coordination with MS is an important boost for a stronger business case for sure. There is a clear effort being put but we need to push forward, and infrastructure is the driver for that discussion.

The AT representative clarified what he means by high performance. High performance does not exclude high speed. There is no contradiction. The difference is that high performance is polyvalent, fully interoperable with all kinds of trains and not exclusively reserved to TGVs. He considers that 300 km/h is not an answer to what we need for European resilience and robustness.

The ED of ERA agreed that we should have a follow up on that kind of reflection once we can read the EC mast plan, expected at the end of this year.

The Chair said this discussion makes him think that we need to understand what does high-speed mean and how can we fulfil all the conditions. And infrastructure is not only

rail. All subsystems need to be brought together as a system. And lets the MS decide which subsystems they would like to develop under common rules.

The AT representative raised the topic of the FRMCS authorisation towards the full deployment, to seek the actions performed by ERA. The ED of ERA replied that the agency has a dedicated working group dealing with identifying ways to authorise mass retrofitting; at the moment there is not yet a solution to be proposed. The ED of EU-Rail confirmed also the full collaboration with ERA on FRMCS deployment, in particular with the works of the EU-Rail deployment group and offered to share with the SRG the draft suggestions that had been sent to ERA. - **Action**

The ED of ERA emphasized that she is very open to reinforce the coordination with EU-Rail and take every opportunity to brief the SRG on the progress of their work. The Chair thanked her for her offer and for opening a channel of cooperation on risk, because some SRG representatives are also involved in the risk discussions. The ED also thanked the ED of ERA for her good collaboration.

The Albanian representative informed that ERA is also actively attending the TCT, with the Commission and Western Balkans countries, RPs, including Albania, and the OCs. The aim is at fully implementing of Memorandum of understanding, signed among the EU R & I, and Transport, TCT permanent secretariat, which is available, and the TCT 2025 report on the ERMTS deployment and ongoing implementation. – See links below:

https://www.transport-community.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/MoU_TCT-Shift2Rail-Joint-Undertaking.pdf

<https://www.transport-community.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/TEN-T-Report-Western-Balkans-digital.pdf>

- **Any other business**

It was agreed that a point on the latest activities with ERRAC would be included in the next SRG meeting agenda. **Action**

The Chair deeply thanked Christian Drakulic, who has been the AT representative in the SRG for several years and will now be replaced by Leonhard Hartinger, for a very good cooperation, wishing him all the best in his future endeavours. The ED joined the Chair in expressing his gratitude, highlighting the good work Christian did with all JU staff and for EU-Rail.

- **Dates of next SRG meeting: 19 February 2026**