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Number   Minute                                                                 Action
--------- -------                                                                 -------
1         Governance                                                              
1.1       Introduction of any new members/guests                                 
           Introductions were made for the benefit of new member Peter Harman from Network Rail.
1.2       Minutes of meeting of 22 November 2013                                 
           The minutes for 22 November 2013 were agreed with the following amendments:
           a) Clause 2.4.2a) – ‘EEG’ should read ‘ESG mirror group’
           b) Clause 4.3.2 – add ‘submitted by’ before ‘Cliff Cork’.
1.3       Review of actions arising from previous meetings’ minutes               
           Refer to actions table at the end of these minutes.
2         For Discussion                                                          
2.1       Report from the Chairman of Traffic Operation and Management Standards Committee 
2.1.1    Introduction:                                                         
           This paper was presented by Steve Roberts (SR), Chairman of the Traffic Operation and Management Standards Committee (TOM SC). Its purpose was to:
           a) Update ISCC on the activities of the TOM SC since the previous report in July 2013.
           b) Inform ISCC in regards to the Standards Link Partnership.
           c) Seek endorsement of the GB Mainline Operational Concept (version 2) as a relevant strategy for Railway Group Standards.
           SR took the meeting through various elements of the paper and, in particular, thanked ISCC for their support with the New Approach to the Rule Book. It has been a challenging time but the support of the industry has been invaluable in making the project a success.
2.1.2    Discussion:                                                           
           ISCC members made the following comments/observations:
           a) Question: What status do the Braking RGSs have?  
               Response: They are National Technical Rule (NTR) for managing technical compatibility between train braking system performance and signal spacing’s on the existing network.
           b) Question: Is ISCC content with the Operations (OPE) Technical Specification for Interoperability (TSI)?  
               Response: ISCC supports the way that the agency has written the TSI though there is some concern regarding the influence that other member states may have on the final draft.
           c) Question: Is there a risk (in relation to braking work) that a late change to the OPE TSI on braking requirements would impact on European Train Control System (ETCS) requirements?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: There is already a workstream underway to ensure GB can fully adopt the TSI requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Comment: Support for deviation applications – formal support. TOM SC requires evidence of formal support from the industry so perhaps a re-statement is needed of exactly what is required to support deviation applications?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: TOM SC understands that people are busy – it is a case of getting the balance right. The committee is of the view that if industry parties can see the obvious benefit then why wouldn’t they want to support it. The committee also understands that formal evidence of support is required and will look at ways to help people do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Question: What does the Standards Manual say?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: The Code requires the applicant to present the results of consultation. It is important to ensure that the guidance for deviation applicants makes clear that evidence of support from affected parties is required by SCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Question: In Appendix A, in 1.1.1 it says that ‘the purpose is to provide a methodology for testing’ – why has the word changed from ‘the’ to ‘a’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: There is only one so it will be changed back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Question: On page 46 of the Operational Concept, the triangular diagram has been deleted, so how should the rules be read in conjunction with the operating principles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: A non-track changed version will be sent out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Question: It says these are the principles for operating the railway but where is the requirement for the driver adhering to the speed limit located?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: It is in section 2.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Question: Section 3.3 of the paper: there are no five year reviews, is this because no documents have reached this maturity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Yes that is correct. There are six or seven over the next few months and then a lot more are due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Question: What is an A4 standard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response: It is a Railway Group Standard document published in A4 size – as opposed to the Rule Book and National Operational Principles which are published on smaller page sizes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.3 Decisions: ISCC:

- **a)** **NOTED** the content of the report.
- **b)** **ENDORSED** the GB Mainline Operational Concept (version 2) as a relevant strategy subject to the single change noted above (since the only changes are to the guidance, and not the principles themselves it was considered appropriate for ISCC to approve this rather than sending it back to the RSSB Board).
- **c)** **NOTED** the intentions of the Standards Link Partnership.
2.1.4 Actions:
   a) NB to review the supporting information for deviation applicants to see whether it is clear that evidence of support from affected parties is required.
   b) SR to make the amendments to the Operational Concept as agreed at ISCC.

2.2 Report from Chairman of the Rolling Stock Standards Committee

2.2.1 Introduction:
This paper was presented by Cliff Cork (CC), Chairman of the Rolling Stock Standards Committee (RST SC). Its purpose was to update ISCC on the activities of the RST SC since the previous report in May 2013.
CC took ISCC through various elements of the report and mentioned that deviations will go up in the next report as a result of projects applying for deviations against recently up issued National Technical Rules (NTRs). RST SC has given CC permission to approve such deviations outside of the SC meeting.

2.2.2 Discussion:
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:
   a) Question: Regarding appendix A, there are a number of standards listed that do not have anything in ita licis, what is the position with these?
      Response: The intention is that one document will cover all of the standards listed above.
   b) Comment: In respect of the strategy, there is quite a big change coming up in January 2015 (if that is the applicability date for TSIs to be fully implemented). RSSB is considering what the policy should be and it could be a time for big decisions and change.
      Response: What decisions?
      Response: The revised scope of the TSIs and potential impact on current in force Railway Group Standards, for example, it may be appropriate to do a shortened or even grouped consultation in some cases.
   c) Question: The appendix shows that wheelsets requirements will be transferred to a RIS. What safety rules will apply?
      Response: The Appendix is a fairly high level view. Since the paper went to RST SC, it has been identified that there are a couple of compatibility requirements that need to be retained as national technical rules.

2.2.3 Decisions:
ISCC NOTED the key activities of the RST SC as set out in the report.
2.3  Report from the Chairman of the Energy Standards Committee

2.3.1  Introduction:
This item was presented by David Knights (DK), Chairman of the Energy Standards Committee (ENE SC). Its purpose was to update ISCC on the activities of the ENE SC since the previous report in July 2013. DK drew attention to two key issues:

a) The UK industry as set up currently has difficulty in providing the necessary test facilities. It requires a lot of good will – there is no mechanism for provision of test facilities as a right. For example testing the overhead requires a train that meets the performance requirements. Testing a pantograph against the infrastructure parameters requires infrastructure that meets the parameters. Other member states, where the railway is state owned, do not face this issue.

b) Interoperability constituents (ICs): The TSIs contain processes for certifying an IC. The whole electrification system is an IC. However, the UK will require the use of the specific cases permitted by the TSI, but in the opinion of the ERA, it is not permitted to certify an IC that applies a specific case.

2.3.2  Discussion:
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Comment: ORR is going to raise with the Commission the point of a critical error against the ENE TSI. The IC in the ENE TSI is the whole system – not the constituent parts. The system should not be an IC.
Response: It works for manufacturers that produce, test and certify the entire system, which is then placed on the market. In order to certify it, it is necessary to build a piece of overhead line that is big enough to test.

b) Comment: DfT and ORR are going to challenge the European Commission (EC) as to what constitutes an IC.

c) Comment: Presumably the DfT vote will be against the ENE TSI as it is not achievable.
Response: Unless a critical error can be agreed, yes.

d) Comment: In terms of testing, the industry needs to cooperate more to achieve this and ORR is working with NR to achieve this. The message needs to be registered at the highest levels within NR.

e) Comment: What is meant by additional rail systems?
Response: The Conventional Rail (CR) and High Speed (HS) TSIs have now been amalgamated and the scope has been extended to include all “railways”, except those excluded by the member state. The UK member state has published a list of excluded lines. But from the point of view of NR it does now include the parts that were outside the scope of the Trans European Networks (TENs), with the excluded lines being typically “community railways” and metros.
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f)  Comment: A whole tranche of TSIs will come into force in January 2015. In respect of NTRs, how many others are needed and will they be ready for an application date of January 2015?  
Response: It is planned that they will be ready and will align with the application date of the TSI.

2.3.3  Decisions:
ISCC NOTED the content of the report.

2.4  Report from the Chairman of the GEL/9 Committee

2.4.1  Introduction:
This paper was presented by Andy Goodwin (AG), Chairman of the GEL/9 Committee. Its purpose was to inform ISCC of developments in the electrical Euronorms (that are of interest to the UK) since the last report in July 2013.

2.4.2  Discussion:
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a)  Question: Section 5: what are the implications for existing rolling stock?  
Response: It is being considered currently. The issue is that the worst case power supply and the smallest bonding would appear to present a problem. It is not yet clear what the implications are for existing rolling stock. AG to follow-up with MMO.

b)  Comment: section 5.7 talks about the vehicle bonding sizes being incorrect; in what way?  
Response: new rolling stock will require larger bonding than existing rolling stock (particularly freight). It is hoped that GB and Europe can align to find a mutually acceptable level.

c)  Observation: Operating over the DC network requires 95mm bonds – not 35mm.

d)  Question: What do the Train Operating Companies needs to be told?  
Response: It is not yet clear, there is more work to be done.

e)  Comment: Is it possible to make part 1 of EN50126 align with CSM (which requires an Assessment Body rather than an Independent Standards Assessor). Is it possible to cross-reference to the European Rail Agency (ERA) guidance on this?  
Response: No because under European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardisation (CENELEC) rules it is necessary to make it usable by all members (including those not trying to build a TSI compliant train). This therefore means that for some users an independent safety assessor will be required as they do not apply CSM and therefore do not have the rule that states only an ASBO assessment is required.
Decisions:

**ISCC:**

a) **NOTED** the content of section 3.1 detailing the extension to the use of EN50128:2001 version.

b) **NOTED** the content of section 4 on the setting up of a management audit of the EN50126 project.

c) **NOTED** the content of section 5 and **SUPPORTED** the coordination of the UK rolling stock/power supply interface requirements with the ongoing European project of SG19.

d) **NOTED** the content of section 6 on the new Euronorm for on-board data records.

### 2.5 Overview of activities supporting development of TSIs

#### 2.5.1 Introduction:

This item was introduced by Nick Boreham (NB) from RSSB. Its purpose was to provide ISCC members with an overview of activities supporting the development of Technical Specifications for Interoperability (TSIs).

NB drew attention to the following:

a) The opinions at the Railway Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) are agreed by qualified majority so a vote against a TSI by the UK will not necessarily stop it coming onto force.

b) Two significant changes (on the subject of equivalent conicity) have been made to the Infrastructure (INF) TSI. They were made at the final working party meeting and were introduced by Austria and Spain. The ERA did not inform other affected parties. The changes were only identified because Bridget Eickhoff compared the two versions. Union des Industries Ferroviaires Européennes (UNIFE) has drafted a change request which the UK representative is going to support.

c) The message from the ERA is that the publication of all TSIs will be by the end of June 2014 – they will come into force 20 days later and the application date will be 01 January 2015.

#### 2.5.2 Discussion:

**ISCC** members made the following comments/observations:

a) **Comment:** In respect of the Control, Command and Signalling (CCS) TSI the paper states ‘it will have consequences for GB’ – what will these be?

   **Response:** In respect of Thameslink, vehicles have been procured against one version of the European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS) and another will be in force before they are operating.

b) **Comment:** Thameslink is not currently part of the national ERTMS roll out plan so there may be more latitude for that project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Comment: On the RSSB webpage on TSIs, the status chart documents only TSIs currently in force. Is it worth adding this activity chart to record what is coming in the future? Response: Agreed.</td>
<td>RSSB/NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Comment: ORR thanked RSSB for the table but noted that GB appears to be caught more and more by last minute changes. A subgroup of ISCC was suggested, to look at how GB engages with the drafting of TSIs? Response: Agreed. RSSB will set up an ad hoc group to consider and make recommendations</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) **NOTED** the overview of the activities being undertaken by RSSB staff in support of the development of TSIs.

2.5.4 Actions: ISCC:

a) NB agreed to update the TSI activity chart on the RSSB website to include future work.

b) AJ agreed to convene a small subgroup of ISCC to consider and make recommendations on the issues associated with GB’s input to the TSI drafting process.

2.6 Update on Completeness of National Technical Rules

2.6.1 Introduction:

This item was introduced by Jon Taylor (JT) from RSSB. A paper was presented to ISCC on 22 July 2011 which set out the conclusions of an RSSB review to identify the rules that are in principle necessary to check the technical compatibility of a vehicle and the network on which it is intended to run and then to identify those rules which are currently ‘missing’ from Railway Group Standards (RGSs).

A paper providing an update on the actions being taken to fill the identified gaps in RGSs was provided to ISCC on 14 September 2012. This paper provides a further update on the actions being taken to fill the gaps.

2.6.2 Discussion:

ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Question: What should projects do when there is an open point in a TSI, and there is no national technical rule to fill that open point?

Response: The project will need to propose a ‘project specific’ technical rule to DfT. Section 13.3 of the Standards Manual makes provision for projects to submit their proposed technical rule to the relevant standards committee for observations and comments, in the case where the missing national technical rule to fill an open point should be a requirement in a RGS.
b) Question: A couple of years ago GB advised the ERA of the GB rules for electro-magnetic compatibility (EMC). The ERA is now intending to write a standard on EMC. It would be useful if GE/RT8015 (Electromagnetic Compatibility between Railway Infrastructure and Trains) was aligned with this.

NR/PHa

c) Question: Could Maya Petkova (from NR) be invited to the next meeting of ISCC to give an update on where ERA is with EMC?

Response: Yes.

d) In response to a question, the Chairman noted that lower sector infrastructure and vehicle gauges have been defined and are currently going through consultation. NR has agreed to maintain the infrastructure to this lower sector gauge. An attempt is now being made to define some gauges above solebar level. This commenced with ‘suburban’ gauge (based on a 20 metre long vehicle). The aim was to try to optimise the gauge to suit the existing infrastructure across the whole network. This has now been done, with a proviso in terms of suspension, effectively creating a 20 metre ‘go anywhere’ gauge. There will be a list produced identifying points where the infrastructure does not conform to the gauge. The intention is to propose that that gauge is included in a Railway Group Standard.

e) A gauge for a 23 metre vehicle is now being developed. Following that, the next will be a locomotive gauge, then an intercity (or 26 metre vehicle) gauge. The intention is to publish the locations conforming to these gauges in the sectional appendix (as happens with the ‘W’ freight gauges). Ultimately, it should be possible to reference the sectional appendix in order to understand where a train can run.

f) The Chairman reminded ISCC that there had been a workshop at the DfT looking into whether an Interoperability route utilisation strategy (RUS) was required. In his view, a gauging strategy was needed, as strategies are in effect already in place for the other TSIs (for example, the national implementation strategy for ERTMS). As an output from the workshop, Peter Knight (from NR) was going to develop a draft interoperability strategy, probably in the form of a RUS, but this was not yet available

g) It was suggested that, as NR is aiming at a Network RUS for interoperability, then a component of that could be a gauging strategy and therefore that ISCC could welcome this proposed approach.

2.6.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) NOTED the content of the paper, the current actions being taken to fill the gaps and the next steps.
2.6.4 Actions: ISCC:
   a) PHa agreed to invite Maya Petkova to the next meeting of ISCC to provide an update on where the ERA is with EMC.

3 Any other business

3.1 Invitation to the ERTMS briefing

3.1.1 ISCC members were reminded about the invitation to the ERTMS briefing.
   Comment: ORR agreed to circulate some comments already gathered on known issues.

3.2 DV29 draft EN03

3.2.1 This is due to be voted on at RISC this month. DfT and ORR met with ERA to discuss. It now includes in its scope, roles and responsibilities under the Safety Directive.

3.3 CCS SC

3.3.1 The Train Operators’ representative on ISCC asked that the following be brought to the attention of Network Rail projects: There were no deviation applications in the CCS pack for the December 2013 meeting – but several were presented outside of the meeting late in December for work taking place over the Christmas period. These took a significant amount of time to process for the Chair to sign off outside the formal meeting. This is a common occurrence before Christmas. The Committee has asked that better planning and discipline be applied in future and suggested that future requests may not be considered until the next appropriate standards committee meeting.

   Response: the NR representative agreed to raise the issue of late deviation applications for Christmas works within NR.

4 Items proposed as Not For Discussion

4.1 RSSB Standards Activities Report – end of year

4.1.1 Introduction:
   This paper was submitted by Marie Marks (MM), Head of Standards Management at RSSB. Its purpose was to update ISCC on the key standards activities undertaken by RSSB.

4.1.2 Discussion:
   ISCC made the following comments/observations:
   a) Comment: clause A.3.9 (Figure 14) is entitled ‘…. Publication …’ but it only concerns withdrawals.

   Response: It is about publishing the information around the withdrawal. In order to describe activities as a whole, the word ‘publication’ is used. This can be reviewed for the future.
b) Comment: Figure 16: (last row on page 12) says ‘Locomotive Gauge – due for publication in February 2014’ – this is incorrect as T955 is currently on hold.

Response: the majority of work is related to the gauging package and will go ahead in February 2014. However the note needs to be clarified.

c) Comment: Figure 16: contains some review dates in January 2013 – should this be 2014?

Response: Yes.

d) Comment: Appendix A5 – objective 3.6 – what does ‘substantially achieved’ mean? Either the target was hit or it was not.

Response: Rather than list 13 projects separately and identify whether or not it was achieved, as 12 out of 13 were achieved, it was considered that this was ‘substantially achieved’. RSSB will review the wording for next time.

e) Comment: Appendix A5 – objective 3.8A – when will Notif-IT be fit for purpose?

Response: This is not yet known.

f) Comment: The graphs in A.1.1 and A.4.4 paint a positive picture – proposals are down, deviations are down – therefore standards have improved. Is it now time to go back to those who wrote the critical reports about standards, and tell them how things have improved?

Response: It was agreed that the ISCC report to the RSSB Board could include an item on trends in standards, proposals and deviations over the last five years and ISCC’s view on how to interpret this information.

4.1.3 Decision:
ISCC NOTED the content of the report.

4.1.4 Actions:
a) TG to include an item in the ISCC annual report to the RSSB Board relating trends in standards, proposals and deviations over the last five years

4.2 ISCC Strategic Plan - Approval

4.2.1 Introduction:
This paper was submitted by Nick Boreham (NB) from RSSB. Its purpose was to seek approval of the ISCC strategic plan for Control Period 5.

4.2.2 Discussion:
Not discussed

4.2.3 Decision: ISCC:
a) APPROVED the ISCC strategic plan for control period 5.
4.3 National Safety Rules relating to structural subsystems

4.3.1 Introduction:
This paper was submitted by Nick Boreham (NB) from RSSB. Its purpose was to provide a briefing for ISCC members on the use of national safety rules (NSRs) relating to structural subsystems in demonstrating technical compatibility at route level.

4.3.2 Discussion:
Not discussed.

4.3.3 Decision: ISCC:
a) NOTED the content of the paper and AGREED that it closed out action number 2013-09-20 – 02.

5 Forward Agenda Items

5.1 Report from Chairman of Plant (PLT) Standards Committee – March (MJ unable to attend but will submit paper) and September 2014

5.2 Report from Chairman of Control Command and Signalling (CCS) Standards Committee – March and September 2014

5.3 Report from Chairman of EOSRG – March and September 2014

5.4 Update on ISCC Strategic Plan – review of FY2013/14 – May 2014

5.5 Contracts supported by Standards Committee – May and November 2014

5.6 Report from Chairman of Infrastructure (INS) Standards Committee – May and November 2014

5.7 Report from Chairman of Rolling Stock (RST) Standards Committee - May 2014 and November 2014

5.8 RSSB Standards Activities Report - July 2014 and January 2015

5.9 Report from Chairman of Traffic Operation and Management (TOM) Standards Committee – July 2014 and January 2015

5.10 Report from Chairman of Energy (ENE) Standards Committee – July 2014 and January 2015

5.12 Report from the Chairman of GEL/9 Committee – July 2014 and January 2015

5.13 ISCC’s strategic plan – review of progress for FY2014/15 and key activities for FY2015/16 – November 2014
## Actions Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Number</th>
<th>Description of action (updates in blue)</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2013-09-20 - 01 | **Add resolution of the issues with compliance with the ENE TSI to the agenda of the Future Electrification Group (FEG) and raise it formally at a future ISCC.**  
  Update 22-11-2013: outstanding.  
  Update: 24-01-2014: discussed under the ENE SC chairman’s report. Closed.                                                                                                         | ORR/PH  | Closed   |
| 2013-09-20 – 02 | **Report back on the position in respect of with CCS SC NSRs.**  
  Update: 22-11-2013: A paper has been produced and will be circulated to ISCC members separately. Outstanding.  
  Update: 24-01-2014: Agenda item 4.3 – closed.                                                                                                                                         | RSSB/TL | Closed   |
| 2013-09-20 – 07 | **Establish with the ORR the workload required in relation to their proposal and to consider the implications of supporting the ORR in the work of the Geographic Interest Group, including the impact on other work, and when resource might be made available.**  
  Update: 24-01-2014: ORR is in the process of recruitment and looking at the priority of the work and whether it can be accommodated within the ORR’s capacity. Remains outstanding – action transferred to PH. | ORR/PH  | Open     |
| 2013-11-22 - 01 | **Try to establish how the French, German and Spanish rail communities undertake assessment of ballast pick-up for both RST and INF.**  
  Update: 24-01-2014: completed – closed.                                                                                                                                              | HS1/KW  | Closed   |
| 2013-11-22 – 02 | **Write to the Commission to object to the process applied to the introduction of the new open point in the INF TSI relating to ballast pick-up – particularly as there is no assessment process identified and no know way to assess the requirement.**  
  Update: 24-01-2014: DfT was not convinced that writing to object to the process was a valid approach. In terms of it being an open point, DfT is seeking a legal view on this. ISCC considered that it was still worth raising the issue of introducing changes to the TSIs at the eleventh hour. DfT agreed to take this up at RISC. It remains the case that there is an open point in the TSI that is not assessable. Outstanding. | DfT/SA  | Open     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Number</th>
<th>Description of action (updates in blue)</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-22 – 03</td>
<td>Approach a member of the NOBO forum - to raise the issue with the Commission – objecting to the new requirement in the INF TSI (relating to ballast pick-up) which is not assessable. Update: 24-01-2014: Both the NOBO representative on INS SC and on RST SC have been approached to alert them to the issue. Closed.</td>
<td>RSSB/BE</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-22 – 04</td>
<td>Include within the scope of the NNTR study, how standards other than RGSs come into force. Update: 24-01-2014: Completed – closed.</td>
<td>DfT/SA</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-22 – 05</td>
<td>Confirm that the process for notification is agreed as being via the use of spreadsheets in the foreseeable future, given that Notif-IT is considered not to be fit for purpose. Update: 24-01-2014: confirmed – closed.</td>
<td>DfT/SA</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-22 – 06</td>
<td>Make amendments to the ISCC strategic plan and key activities and submit the final draft to ISCC in January 2014 for approval. Update: 24-01-2014: Agenda item 4.2 – closed</td>
<td>RSSB/NB</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-22 – 07</td>
<td>Send the remit, the previous minutes and invitations to ESG mirror group to ISCC members. Update: 24-01-2014: completed – closed.</td>
<td>RSSB/NB</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-11-22 – 08</td>
<td>Identify appropriate people within member organisations to attend ESG mirror group. Update: 24-01-2014: completed – closed.</td>
<td>All ISCC members</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01-24 - 01</td>
<td>Review the supporting information for deviation applicants to see whether it is clear that evidence of support from affected parties is required. [Post meeting note: supporting information reviewed; it clearly states that evidence is required.]</td>
<td>RSSB/NB</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01-24 – 02</td>
<td>Make the amendments to the Operational Concept as agreed at ISCC. [Post meeting note: completed – closed.]</td>
<td>RSSB/SR</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01-24 – 03</td>
<td>Update the TSI activity chart on the RSSB website to include future work. [Post meeting note: completed – closed.]</td>
<td>RSSB/NB</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Number</td>
<td>Description of action (updates in blue)</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01-24 – 04</td>
<td>Convene a small subgroup of ISCC to consider and make recommendations on the issues associated with GB’s input to the TSI drafting process.</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01-24 - 05</td>
<td>PHa agreed to invite Maya Petkova to the next meeting of ISCC to provide an update on where the ERA is with EMC.</td>
<td>NR/PHa</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01-24 – 06</td>
<td>Raise the issue of late deviation applications for Christmas works within NR.</td>
<td>NR/PHa</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2014-01-24 – 07 | Include an item in the ISCC annual report to the RSSB Board relating trends in standards, proposals and deviations over the last five years  

[Post meeting note: completed – see agenda item 2.3 - closed.]                                                                                                                                 | TG      | Closed |
Future meeting dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISCC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSB Board</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISC - previously called A21C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted dates are different to those previously shown in this table.

**APPROVED**

______________________________ __________________________
Date Tim Gilbert, Chairman

Marie Marks, Secretary, ISCC    Tel: 020 3142 5575    Fax: 020 3142 5669    Email: marie.marks@rssb.co.uk
**INDUSTRY STANDARDS CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE**  
*Friday 24 January 2014*  

**List of appendices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Traffic Operation and Management Standards Committee (paper and two appendices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Rolling Stock Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Energy Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of GEL/9 Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overview of Activities supporting development of TSIs (paper and attachment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Update on completeness of National Technical Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RSSB Standards Activities Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ISCC Strategic plan (paper requesting approval, plus plan itself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>National Safety Rules relating to structural subsystems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>