INDUSTRY STANDARDS CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (ISCC)
Approved Minutes of meeting held on 16 May 2014
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Introduction of any new members/guests</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Minutes of meeting of 07 March 2014</td>
<td>The minutes for 07 March 2014 were agreed without amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Review of actions arising from previous meetings’ minutes</td>
<td>Refer to actions table at the end of these minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Quoracy</td>
<td>It was noted that the meeting was not quorate as Network Rail were not represented; members agreed to continue subject to subsequently confirming with Network Rail any decisions that would affect the Infrastructure Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Railway Group Standards post-TSI scope extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Introduction:</td>
<td>This item was presented by Anson Jack (AJ) from RSSB. Its purpose was to discuss the future role of Railway Group Standards (RGSs) once the scope of the Technical Specifications for Interoperability (TSIs) has been extended to the whole railway system that falls within the scope of interoperability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Discussion:</td>
<td>ISCC members made the following comments/observations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Question: Care should be taken to ensure that compatibility with rolling stock is not destroyed. Would any Network Rail (NR) standards be optimised for vehicle compatibility?</td>
<td>Response: There are specific cases where it is known that some areas are done differently to maintain compatibility. Part of the work is to look at the alignment between TSIs and the RGSs and identify and address misalignments. By referencing TSIs in RGSs, it also raises awareness of the TSIs at an early stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Question: Is the process being referred to one that is triggered when the TSI is revised? Or is there something that triggers looking at what needs to change when a TSI is changed?</td>
<td>Response: The trigger is the exercise proposed in the paper to think through the implications of the extension of scope of TSIs – each of the Standards Committees (SCs) is aware of that and will be able to use the results of the exercise to review their proposed plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Minute</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Comment: There will be TSIs voted on at Rail Interoperability and Safety Committee (RISC) in June. Is the industry confident that standards will have been reviewed such that the guidance produced and the Notified National Technical Rules (NNTRs) in place are appropriate? Response: For infrastructure there is a programme and no issues are anticipated as there is awareness of the intended approach from the European Railway Agency (ERA). Response: For Control Command and Signalling (CCS) there is no guidance note as ERA’s guidance was considered to be sufficient. However it has subsequently been agreed that a guidance note is required and a project is underway to produce this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Comment: The Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) would like to attach their letter to NR (relating to their preparedness to engage in interoperability in Control Period 5 (CP5)), and NR’s response, to the minutes of ISCC and will be seeking NR’s permission to do so.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Question: In respect of the Energy (ENE) TSI, it is known that there are RGS gaps and there is a programme in progress to address the gaps, but should the project not ask at the outset with which standards they must comply? Response: Yes but there needs to be a complete set of current and appropriate NNTRs and we are on course to publish them by the end of this year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Comment: One of the concerns of suppliers is that NR is perpetually overlaying standards with project advice notes – because they are not allowed to amend the standard because of their standards freeze. It is more problematic with some disciplines than others. The supply community remains extremely concerned regarding the slow progress with standards change within NR; it is causing significant problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Comment: From the infrastructure point of view, there are examples of good practice among projects but there are examples of bad practice too. It is possible to get a long way through the Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) process before standards are considered. For example, supporting information for a recent deviation identified that ‘standards do not apply’ when they clearly did.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Comment: ORR is addressing the GRIP process and NR will be required to respond at an early stage to identify which standards apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Minute</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Comment: in CCS SC, the NR representatives on the committee asked the chairman to draw ISCC’s attention to their concern that the SC is not necessarily doing the right thing. They are not saying that the SC is not working to the Code but that NR is not necessarily in a position to absorb the changes within their own standards regime. Their particular concern is that not enough is mandated by RGSs – and there is concern about the agreed industry process whereby the SC takes single duty holder requirements out of RGSs when the industry (in this case NR) is not ready to specify the requirements within their own regime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Comment: Referring back to the paper, the industry currently controls specific requirements in GB via NNTRs; is there a risk that this option could be lost or eroded? Response: Some requirements are fully set out in the TSI and it is not necessary to document them in NNTRs. The paper proposes that, where work is done outside of the scope of interoperability, the same requirements (i.e. the TSI and NNTR requirements) are applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Question: The ERA could challenge GB’s NNTRs; should work therefore be done to align more with TSIs? Response: There is potential; the exercise proposed, together with the development of the interoperability route utilisation strategy (RUS) will create an opportunity to identify any areas where there are issues or potential problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Comment: It should be noted that Gerry England is the new champion for NR in terms of interoperability and NR has briefed in the region of 1600 managers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Comment: The RSSB member suggested a high level objective should be that when a member of the industry leading a project contacts either their employer (NR), RSSB, ORR or the Department for Transport (DfT) about standards, they should receive consistent advice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Comment: DfT expressed support for the approach set out in the paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>Comment: Should consideration be given to providing an industry briefing to set out, in simple terms, what will happen post-TSI extension?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>Comment: Yes, The way in which this impacts on GB and, so far as the committee is concerned, the way that RGSs are going to be revised will need to be very clearly set out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>Question: If a project is below the bar and the TSI is silent, what happens then? Response: If it is outside of the scope of compatibility, it may be appropriate to either produce a code of practice for the industry to adopt or suggest using the safety management system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number Minute
r)  Comment: The meeting was advised that NR had sent an email apologising for non-attendance but indicating their support for the general approach proposed. However they have a concern that the blanket adoption of the ‘Apply the TSI plus NNTRs’ approach for below the bar projects may lead to significant costs for NR and that, where this applies, an alternative approach may be needed. RSSB and NR have agreed to work together in the area of infrastructure to identify whether there are areas where the proposed approach would cause difficulties. It was also noted by ISCC that the only way that an RGS can be changed is through the process set out in the RGS Code and therefore the general policy approach being adopted by ISCC would not impose on NR any changes to an RGS to which their representative on the SC did not agree.

2.1.3 Decisions: ISCC:
   a)  NOTED the points set out in the paper.
   b)  CONFIRMED the general approach proposed in sections 2 and 3 subject to the reassurances set out in the notes of this meeting.

2.1.4 Actions:
   a)  AJ agreed to draw this item (2.1) to the attention of NR.  AJ
   b)  PH to seek approval from NR to circulate the ORR’s letter (relating to their preparedness to engage in interoperability in CP5) and NR’s response.  PH

2.2 Report from Chairman of the Infrastructure Standards Committee

2.2.1 Introduction:
This paper was presented by Bridget Eickhoff (BE), Chairman of the Infrastructure Standards Committee (INS SC). Its purpose was to update ISCC on the activities and achievements of INS SC over the last six months. BE took the meeting through some of the key items in the report.

2.2.2 Discussion:
   ISCC members made the following comments/observations:
   a)  Question: What are the implications for an interoperability project?
       Response: It would start with the TSI, then apply NNTRs to comply with specific cases and open points, then present to the NoBo. The compatibility check would be via RGSs. No inconsistencies have been identified so far.
   b)  Comment: ORR thanked BE for agreeing to attend the remaining ERA TSI INF working party meetings.

2.2.3 Decisions:
   ISCC NOTED the key activities of the INS SC as set out in the report and ENDORSED the INS SC strategic plan.
2.3 Report from the Chairman of the Rolling Stock Standards Committee

2.3.1 Introduction:
This item was presented by Cliff Cork (CC), Chairman of the Rolling Stock Standards Committee (RST SC).

Its purpose was to seek approval for the draft RST SC Strategic Plan for Year 1 of CP5 (2014-2015).

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

a) Comment: Currently SCs are on course to undertake a measured process to review the RGSs. What has arisen following discussion with NR is that there is a need to do some work to establish whether there are any issues. If it is possible to establish this by the end of the year it will be possible to work out whether there are any big issues for projects that might drive a change to the standards review timetable.

b) Question: Section 2.3 of the paper states that non-notified technical rules are to be looked at. Is it legal to publish these?
Response: If there are things that need to be mandated on the industry but are not within the scope of the TSIs; these might become part of Railway Industry Standards (RISs) – or consideration could be given to whether they should represent a challenge to the TSI.

c) Question: Having identified them, it is worth looking at whether they should be notified or the TSI challenged?
Response: Yes, if it is identified that there is a clear gap in the scope of a TSI, the ERA may in future be more amenable to changes.

d) Question: Is a new category of NNTR being created? Is that allowable?
Response: RSSB agreed to produce a paper to explore this.

2.3.3 Decisions:
ISCC APPROVED issue one of the RST SC Strategic Plan for year one of CP5 (2014-2015).

2.3.4 Actions:
RSSB agreed to produce a paper to explore whether a new category of NNTR is being proposed and if this is allowed.

2.4 Update from the subgroup on issues associated with GB’s input into the TSI drafting process

2.4.1 Introduction:
This paper was presented by Anson Jack (AJ), from RSSB. Its purpose was to update ISCC on the issues associated with GB’s input into the TSI drafting process (identified by the subgroup set up by ISCC) and the proposed ways of resolving the issues.
2.4.2 Discussion:
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Comment: It should be noted that, as the assimilation exercise is undertaken with NR, a number of issues may be identified that should have been raised as specific cases. A consequent risk may be that GB is viewed as ‘misbehaving’ in some way by the ERA. ISCC agreed that it is better to do this than to ignore the issue.

b) Comment: Occasionally telephone calls are received seeking advice on whether High Speed 1 (HS1) will be affected. It might be worth adding a reminder to ask HS1 for advice and to share their experience.

c) Comment: For some people involved in the process, the ISCC paper may not be sufficiently ‘user friendly’ to be of real help. It may be worth producing an explicit guidance note, drawing attention to existing guidance and emphasising the points made in the paper?

2.4.3 Decisions:
ISCC:

a) NOTED the issues raised in the paper and the proposed solutions.

b) NOTED the next steps, including the intention to hold a ‘lessons learn’ event.

c) Agreed to COMMUNICATE the contents of the paper (together with supporting guidance) with people in their respective member categories who are involved in the drafting, implementation and assessment of TSIs.

2.4.4 Actions:

a) AJ to produce guidance to support the issues associated with GB’s input into the TSI drafting process. 

2.5 ISCC Strategic Plan - review of Control Period 4

2.5.1 Introduction:
This paper was introduced by Anson Jack (AJ) and its purpose was to provide a review of achievements against ISCC’s Strategic Plan for Control period 4 (CP4).

2.5.2 Discussion:
ISCC members made no comments or observations.

2.5.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) NOTED the key achievements against its Strategic Plan for CP4 and

b) NOTED the achievements against its Strategic Plan for Year five of CP4.
2.6 Review of ISCC’s remit and membership

2.6.1 Introduction:
This paper was introduced by Anson Jack (AJ) and its purpose was to provide ISCC members with an opportunity to review its remit and to consider whether to review its membership in light of RSSB’s increased membership.

2.6.2 Discussion:
ISCC members made the following suggestions:

a) Suggestion: Since NR rarely occupies both seats, they could be asked to give up one of their seats to another IM.

b) Suggestion: NR should definitely have one seat as conventional rail IM and, recognising HS1’s valuable input as a co-opted member, one other seat should be made available for a high speed infrastructure owner/manager.

2.6.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) ENDORSED that no changes are required to its remit.

b) NOTED that the opportunity has arisen to consider its membership.

c) DECIDED that, since NR was not in attendance, a decision was unable to be taken on options.

2.6.4 Actions: ISCC:

a) AJ to summarise proposal and discuss it with NR.

RSSB/AJ

2.7 Proposed guidance on ‘applicable NNTRs’ for projects

2.7.1 Introduction:
No paper was provided for this item which was introduced by Paul Hooper (PH) from the ORR. The situation was described as arising from late changes to NNTRs as projects neared completion and an excessive number of applications for deviations received to apply previously notified NTRs.

There is a provision in the directive to impose a ‘standards freeze’ but the ORR is not in favour of the blanket application of this as it allows projects not to be concerned about what comes later.

ORR has sought legal advice to confirm that a project can continue to use an NNTR that is no longer notified and the draft ORR guidance note was shown to the meeting. When finalised, this note will be published on the ORR web site.

ISCC noted that this is for vehicles and trackside CCS only at this stage – not infrastructure.

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

a) Question: How will this be communicated to the DeBos?
Response: This message has been communicated via the NoBo Forum and, when finalised, will be published.
b) Comment: Is there something that requires due cognisance of any changes to the NTRs?
Response: Yes.

c) Question: What happens if a project chooses, in order to avoid the costs of reassessment, to use ORR guidance instead?
Response: That is the ideal solution – the aim is to avoid excessive costs either through the re-assessment or the deviation process.

d) Comment: It is a case of the cost of a late stage deviation versus the cost of doing this analysis.

e) Comment: It is up to the contracting entity to tell their NoBo or DeBo what to assess against – the DeBo should not be identifying what applies.

f) Question: What happens when Euronyms (ENs) or TSIs change?
Response: The TSIs call up dated references to ENs, (though it may not be an EN called up in the TSI). There is provision for a derogation against a changed TSI – but they also describe what constitutes a project at an advanced stage; these would be notified to the EC by the member state.

g) Comment: This applies where there is a changed NNTR; what about where there is no NNTR and the project must determine what to do?
Response: It may continue to use what was proposed at the outset of the project.

2.7.3 Decisions: ISCC:
a) NOTED that the ORR will be seeking comments on their proposed guidance.

2.7.4 Actions: ISCC:
a) PH to seek comments from ISCC members on the proposed guidance.

2.8 Control, Command and Signalling (CCS) Standards Committee (SC) Strategic Plan, CP5, Issue one – 2014-2015

2.8.1 Introduction:
This paper was introduced by Tom Lee (TL), Chairman of CCS SC. Its purpose was to seek ISCC’s endorsement of the CCS SC Strategic Plan for year one of CP5. TL took the meeting through the key points in the plan.

2.8.2 Discussion:
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:
a) Comment: In 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 of the paper mentions a possibility of duplication between RSSB-led standards and work by NR developing standards and expecting to lead on them.
Response: this work is being done in conjunction with NR.
b) Comment: Why is a RIS proposed for mobile communications gateways?
Response: Because the industry cannot yet agree that to do the same thing is appropriate. Nevertheless, the application of the process set out in the strategy will lead to the requirements being specified in the most suitable form.

c) Comment: Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) is an interesting situation because, when applied to automatic selective door operation, the trackside equipment is there solely to manage the railway undertaking’s risk.

d) Comment: The four stage process sounds like it is going back to basics a little too far.
Response: It is both looking at first principles and reviewing what we already have. It is applied on a case-by-case basis and not globally across the whole subsystem.

e) Question: Regarding the CSM RA and guidance for CCS systems – there is guidance about application of CSM RA already, why is there a need to produce something CCS specific?
Response: This is a potential idea at the moment, to address a perceived lack of understanding within signalling projects.
Comment: But that is about awareness of the CSM RA – not CCS specific.
Response: Whether there is a need to develop something that is CCS-specific is what is being considered now.

f) Question: Are the resources available to deliver all of this work? Is there a resourced plan?
Response: Everything listed in appendix A is resourced, but some of the timescales are long.

g) Question: What happens when something new comes along and priorities change? Is there sufficient guidance for SC members in this respect?
Response: It is up to the members of SC to represent the views of their constituents.
Comment: It would be helpful to be able to see when projects are due to be implemented so that standards can be delivered to align with the needs of projects.
Response: The detail is often not available to SC members.

2.8.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) **ENDORSED** the CCS SC Strategic Plan for year one of CP5.

b) **EXPRESSED** some concern as to its viability in terms of resourcing to deliver in CP5 and asked TL to flag any resourcing issues as soon as they arise.
Any other business

3.1 Feedback from the Board on annual report

The report was in the ‘not for discussion’ section however AJ highlighted that it was linked to the strategic plan and that the declining number of standards and deviation applications was considered to be a good indication that standards are healthy. The good feedback on the work relating to the common safety methods was also noted. RSSB directors were encouraged to consider whether they felt the ‘good report’ on standards is justified and if not to bring any issues to RSSB’s attention. There have been no comments in response to this invitation.

3.2 David Edge and Keith Watson retiring

It was noted that both David Edge and Keith Watson will be retiring and will therefore no longer attend ISCC. ISCC wished to place on record their sincere thanks for the invaluable support and input provided by Keith and David and wished them both well in retirement.

3.3 RSSB Standards Director

It was noted that RSSB is currently in the process of recruiting for the position of Director, Standards and when the process is complete, the successful candidate will become the RSSB member of ISCC.

3.4 Request for work for RSSB on cyber security

It was noted that RSSB has received a request from the DfT to pick up the function of supporting the industry on cyber security. This was debated by the RSSB Board who agreed. It will initially involve material being published on the website and could, subject to further industry agreement, lead to development of an industry standards capability in that area.

4 Items proposed as Not For Discussion

4.1 Contracts supported by Standards Committees

4.1.1 Introduction:

This paper was submitted by Anson Jack (AJ) from RSSB. Its purpose was to provide ISCC with an update on the contracts supported by Standards Committees and ISCC.

4.1.2 Discussion:

ISCC made no comments/observations.

4.1.3 Decision:

ISCC:

a) **NOTED** the final spend for 2013/14 set out in Annex A and the forecast spend for 2014/15 set out in Annex B.
4.2 Fourth Railway Package (draft paper to RSSB’s Board)

**Introduction:**
This paper was submitted by Anson Jack (AJ), from RSSB. Its purpose was to provide a briefing on the European Commission’s proposals for the Fourth Railway Package and the potential implications to GB railways.

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

a) Comment: clause 3.6 should be removed as this has now been superseded.

b) [Post meeting note: the author of the paper, Ian Moreton, suggested the following as a replacement instead of a complete removal of section 3.6:

“The CER ERA Steering Unit has produced a position paper on proposed amendments for the Interoperability Directive, Safety Directive, and ERA Regulation. ATOC have contributed to this paper with support from RSSB and continue to represent these agreed positions through various European forums engaged on the proposals.”]

**Decision:** ISCC:

a) **NOTED** the content of the report (with the caveat that clause 3.6 should be edited or removed).

4.3 The Common Safety Method on Risk Evaluation and Assessment and the update of Taking Safe Decisions

**Introduction:**
This paper was submitted by George Bearfield (GB), from RSSB. Its purpose was to make ISCC aware of the work to launch the Rail Industry Guidance Notes on the application of the CSM RA (Commission Regulation (EC) 352/2009), which will take place in tandem with an update on Taking Safe Decisions.

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

a) Comment: ORR’s guidance on the CSM on RA is also due to be revised shortly.

**Decision:** ISCC:

a) **NOTED** the content of the paper.

4.4 Update Control, Command and Signalling Standards Committee (CCS SC) remit – for approval

**Introduction:**
This paper was submitted by Tom Lee (TL), Chairman of CCS SC. Its purpose was to seek ISCC approval for minor revisions to the CCS SC remit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2</td>
<td>Discussion: ISCC made no comments/observations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.3</td>
<td>Decision: ISCC: b) APPROVED the revised CCS SC remit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Forward Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>RSSB Standards Activities Report - July 2014 and January 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Traffic Operation and Management (TOM) Standards Committee – July 2014 and January 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Energy (ENE) Standards Committee – July 2014 and January 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Report from the Chairman of GEL/9 Committee – July 2014 and January 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Plant (PLT) Standards Committee – September 2014 and March 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Control Command and Signalling (CCS) Standards Committee – September 2014 and March 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of EOSRG – September 2014 and March 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>ISCC’s strategic plan – review of progress for FY2014/15 and key activities for FY2015/16 – November 2014</td>
<td>RSSB/NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Contracts supported by Standards Committee – November 2014 and May 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Infrastructure (INS) Standards Committee – November 2014 and May 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Rolling Stock (RST) Standards Committee - November 2014 and May 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>
| 2014-01-24 – 04 | Convene a small subgroup of ISCC to consider and make recommendations on the issues associated with GB’s input to the TSI drafting process.  
Update: 07-03-2014: Membership has been agreed – now need to coordinate diaries. It was suggested that the membership be expanded to include someone who has had experience of trying to apply the TSI (for example from the North West Electrification Project). MB agreed to identify an appropriate person. The group needs to identify how the process could be more effective in the future – including using for example the EIM representative.  
Update: 16-05-2014: Agenda item 2.4 – closed.                                                                 | RSSB/AJ | Closed |
| 2014-01-24 – 06 | Raise the issue of late deviation applications for Christmas works within NR.  
Update: 07-03-2014: the Chairman of CCS SC has written to NR but PHa’s action remains outstanding.  
Update: 16-05-2014: Martin Biggin (MB) spoke to the professional heads for signalling and electrification. Both felt that the problem originated from projects submitting late deviation requests and seeking a very quick turnaround by the professional heads in order to meet submission deadlines. Both said that they (and others within the respective functions) are working with project managers to improve the quality and timeliness of submissions. MB also shared with them the guidance for applicants. Closed. | NR/PHa | Closed |
| 2014-03-07 – 01 | Remind AG that a response to ATOC is outstanding in respect of what train operators need to do in terms of bonds to be used when operating over the DC network.  
Update: 16-05-2014: AG has responded. Closed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | RSSB/MM | Closed |
| 2014-03-07 – 02 | TL to produce a flow diagram identifying the process from manufacture of a new train to running it in the live environment in the context of EMC.  
Update: 16-05-2014: Ongoing.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | RSSB/TL | 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>2014-03-07 – 03</td>
<td>Produce guidance relating to standards freeze (to prevent the need for deviations) for May 2014 ISCC.</td>
<td>ORR/PH</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> 16-05-2014: Item 2.7 – closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-03-07 – 04</td>
<td>Follow up with Pat McFaddon regarding what needs to be done to enable publication of the Rail Industry Standard for ETCS Onboard.</td>
<td>RSSB/TL</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> 16-05-2014: CCS SC has received necessary assurances from the ERTMS Programme and has approved withdrawal of issue 1 of RIS-0340-CCS, achieved through the publication and immediate withdrawal of Issue 2 of RIS-0340-CCS. This is subject to support from supporting standards committees – closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FH will ask at the ERTMS system body about what learning has come out of this situation – see new action no. 2014-05-16 – 01.</td>
<td>RIA/FH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-03-07 – 05</td>
<td>Update the annual report to the Board incorporating comments at the meeting and circulate for endorsement ahead of submitting it to the RSSB Board.</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[Post meeting note: completed – circulated on 31 March 2014 – closed.]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-03-07 – 06</td>
<td>AJ to produce a paper setting out in more detail the proposal to review and replace RGSs that apply below the bar with simplified RGSs that state ‘comply with the TSI plus NTRs’.</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update:</strong> 16-05-2014: Agenda item 2.1 – closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05-16 - 01</td>
<td>Publication of Rail Industry Standard for ETCS Onboard (related to action 2014-03-07 – 04). FH will ask at the ERTMS system body about what learning has come out of this situation.</td>
<td>RIA/FH</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05-16 – 02</td>
<td>AJ agreed to draw to the attention of NR the discussion around item 2.1 – RGSs post-TSI scope extension. <strong>[Post meeting note: Raised with Simon Scott - completed – closed]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05-16 – 03</td>
<td>PH to seek approval from NR to circulate the ORR’s letter (relating to their preparedness to engage in interoperability in CP5) and NR’s response. <strong>[Post meeting note: letters were circulated on 03 September 2014 – closed]</strong></td>
<td>ORR/PH</td>
<td>Closed</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>2014-05-16 – 04</td>
<td>RSSB agreed to produce a paper to explore whether it is possible to introduce a new category of NTRs. <em>(Post meeting note: completed via email 03 September 2014 – closed)</em></td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05-16 – 05</td>
<td>RSSB to produce guidance to support the issues associated with GB’s input into the TSI drafting process.</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05-16 – 06</td>
<td>AJ to summarise proposal regarding ISCC’s membership – specifically relating to infrastructure managers - and discuss it with NR.</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-05-16 – 07</td>
<td>PH to seek comments from ISCC members on the proposed guidance on how projects should react when NNTRs change. <em>(Post meeting note: completed – closed)</em></td>
<td>ORR/PH</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISCC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSB Board</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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