INDUSTRY STANDARDS CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE (ISCC)

Minutes (Approved) of meeting held on 12 November 2014
The Montague on the Gardens, Russell Square, London

Present
Tim Gilbert (TG)  Representing: Independent  Status: Chairman
Anson Jack (AJ)  RSSB  Member
Laurence Gregory (LG)  ROSCOs  Member
Tim Shakerley (TS)  Freight Operators  Member
Mark Molyneux (MMo)  Passenger Train Operators  Member
Maya Petkova (MP)  Infrastructure Manager  Alternate Member
Vaibhav Puri (VP)  RSSB  Alternate Member
Mark Morris (MMor)  Office of Rail Regulation (ORR)  Observer
Cliff Cork (CC)  RST Standards Committee Chairman  Guest
Andy Goodwin (AG)  Chairman GEL/9  Guest
Marie Marks (MM)  Secretary

Apologies
Francis How (FH)  Suppliers  Member
Vacancy (Francis How covering)  Infrastructure Contractors  Member
Emma Head (EH)  Infrastructure Manager  Member
Ian Brookes  Infrastructure Manager  Alternate Member
Martin Biggin (MB)  Infrastructure Manager  Alternate Member
Paul Antcliff (PA)  Freight Operators  Alternate Member
Neil Ovenden (NO)  Passenger Train Operators  Alternate Member
Paul Hooper (PH)  Office of Rail Regulation (ORR)  Observer
Ian Jones (IJ)  Department for Transport  Observer
Bridget Eickhoff  INF Standards Committee Chairman  Guest
Number | Minute | Action
--- | --- | ---
1 | Governance | 
1.1 | Introduction of any new members/guests | 
Introduction were made for the benefit of Mark Morris.

1.2 | Minutes of meeting of 19 September 2014 | 
The minutes for 19 September 2014 were agreed without amendment.

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 the Rolling Stock Standards Committee | 
2.1.1 | Introduction: | 
This item was introduced 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 activities report in January 2014.

2.1.2 | Discussion: | 
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Question: In section 3.1.5 of the paper it states “Railway Group Standards (RGSs) may also contain requirements ….. those vehicles outside the scope of Technical Specifications for Interoperability (TSIs)”; is not everything included within the scope of TSIs?
Response: No – metro and heritage vehicles, that operate on the network, for example, are excluded.

b) Question: How are vehicles that are out of scope (but which operate over infrastructure that is in scope) dealt with?
Response: Part of the programme is to bring the associated standards up-to-date to identify what is required for compatibility in these circumstances.

c) Question: The papers says “RGSs ….. that refer to requirements contained in applicable TSIs ….” However, if the vehicles are outside the scope of TSIs, there are no applicable TSIs. The word “applicable” could be replaced with the word “relevant”.
Response: Agreed.

d) Question: The paper says “RGSs may also …. modifications”; is this referring to existing trains? What has been done for below the bar vehicles – how does one know where to go to find the applicable standards?
Response: It is unchanged from today.
e) Comment: The RSSB representative pointed out that clause 2.4 covers the proposals for existing mandatory standards, and that the core proposal is that below the bar, the content of RGS will change to state 'apply the TSI plus the NTRs'. The intention is that people who need to identify the applicable standards will not need to know whether something is above or below the bar, because the content of the standards will be the same, thus simplifying the structure. However, projects will continue to need to identify whether they are above or below the bar in order to determine whether they need an authorisation. As reported, NR have identified that there may be some areas where this is a problem and there is a programme of work to review standards with NR to identify those areas.

f) Question: Page 11 looks at priorities; it identifies that priority one is not delivered but priority 16 is.
Response: Sometimes it is a case of the effort required means that something cannot be delivered as quickly as is desired but it still remains a priority.

g) Comment: So, in simple terms, what is the priority? What has changed?
Response: It has evolved over a period of time and derived from industry inputs. RST SC’s aim is to simplify the acceptance process where, in the past, methodologies between the TSI and RGS approach are different. The aim is to adopt the TSI approach, but ensure GB limits are applied to maintain compatibility with the existing sub-systems.

h) Comment: Is resistance to rollover in gales still on the list?
Response: No because the project has just been completed.

i) Comment: GE/RT8270 is not on the list of priorities.
Response: No because it is currently at the proposal stage and being considered by all the committees.

2.1.3 Decisions: ISCC:
a) NOTED the key activities of RST SC as set out in the report.

2.2 Report from the Chairman of the Infrastructure Standards Committee

2.2.1 Introduction:
This paper was presented in the absence of Bridget Eickhoff, the Chairman of the Infrastructure Standards Committee (INS SC). Its purpose was to update Industry Standards Co-ordination Committee (ISCC) on the activities of the INS SC since the previous report in May 2014.

2.2.2 Discussion:
ISCC members made the following comments/observations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Question: In respect of section 3.2.2 relating to gauging standards, a tremendous amount of work was done with industry yet still over 1400 comments were received. It may be either that the process has somehow failed, or that gauging is such an emotive issue that this was to be anticipated. Is there a lesson to learn? Response: Possibly. However it was a significant number of standards (6) and it’s a culmination of several pieces of work: pantograph sway, stepping distances etc - people have different views on these. The workshops that were held prior to the consultation had good feedback but inevitably this is a key compatibility issue and it does have an impact and interest for many players in the industry. The amount of responses and the engagement at the recent workshops was, in the opinion of the RST SC Chairman, appropriate given the scale of the endeavour of the overall programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Comment: The consultation comments reflect some fairly significant changes, in particular to the lower sector gauge, and RSSB could have better explained what the changes meant. So an independent review (ie by a party not involved in the project) might be helpful in future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c)     | Comment: In relation to clause 3.2.7 and 3.2.8 of the paper, the quality of deviation applications still seems to be a problem. The message does not appear to be getting through. Response: There is a lot of project work going on at the moment and each project goes through a learning cycle. The SCs’ problem is that everything is put into the deviation application – including spreadsheets for example. This means that the deviation applications are often significantly longer than they often need to be. For example, the pack for the INS SC today, is 960 pages. There are six teams of people from projects attending INS SC to present deviation applications. Applicants need to carefully consider what it is that they are asking the committee to agree.  

[Post meeting note: The INS SC Chairman has a 1 hour slot at the Network Rail Buildings & Civil Engineering Discipline Review Group Meeting on 9 December 2014 to talk about INS SC’s concerns with deviation applications.] |
| d)     | Comment: It is often the case that those who have learned the lessons, move on to other roles. The other issue is the last minute submission, often of a significant number of deviations for Christmas works to go ahead. |
| e)     | Comment: Is not one of the first tasks for projects to consider with what standards there is a need to comply? Response: Yes and there is guidance available on RSSB’s website. It is contact within the projects at an early stage that is important. |
2.2.3 Decisions:

ISCC:

a) **NOTED** the key activities of INS SC as set out in the report.

2.3 Report from the Chairman of the GEL/9 Committee

2.3.1 Introduction:

This item was presented by Andy Goodwin (AG), Chairman of the GEL/9 Committee. Its purpose was to inform ISCC of developments being undertaken in the electrical Euronorms and particularly those of interest to the UK.

AG added that the UK members are Mike Tatton, George Bearfield and Roger Short.

2.3.2 Discussion:

ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Comment: In respect of clause 4.6.6 – published software standards – on what basis is it deemed that this is adding cost to industry?

Response: On the rolling stock side, SC9XB had an emergency meeting to review this and voted to extend the 2001 standard (which was less onerous). The experience of applying the 2011 standard was that it cost more money because it pushed independent assessment into lower safety risk levels. SC9XB considered that there was little understanding of the costs involved in doing this, for no apparent benefit.

b) Comment: AG offered to bring a paper to ISCC that includes cyber security. This was accepted.
2.3.3 Decisions:

ISCC NOTED the content of section 4 and the associated significant engagement by the mirror groups in section 5 for the EN50126 workstream.

2.3.4 Actions:

AG to bring a paper to ISCC covering cyber security.

2.4 Priorities for aligning RGSs with the scope extended TSIs

2.4.1 Introduction:

This paper was presented by Anson Jack (AJ) from RSSB. Its purpose was to consider the impact on the content of Railway Group Standards (RGSs) once the scope of Technical Specifications for Interoperability (TSIs) has been extended to the whole railway system that falls within the scope of interoperability. AJ emphasised that, having given it some serious consideration, RSSB has concluded that there is not a crisis for the domestic standards regime associated with the TSI scope extension. The situation is no different from that which exists today – there are no significant incompatibilities. However, it does not mean that it will be forgotten – but the movement toward having RGS that state simply that the requirements (below the bar) are the same as in the relevant TSI, plus the NTRs can be done on the basis of the priorities agreed by standards committees.

2.4.2 Discussion:

ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Question: The example circulated to ISCC was the draft standard on audibility and visibility of trains. Why does it not refer to the specific related TSI clause number?

Response: This has been considered and the decision was made not to do that – as it is referring to the generic requirements of the TSI, also references can quickly become out of date when the TSI is updated. However, it may be worth submitting a consultation comment to the effect that it would be helpful to document the TSI clause number and RSSB could think further about how to effect this without having to change an RGS every time an amendment is made to a TSI.

b) Comment: As an issue that will affect all standards – not just this one, it was agreed that SC chairmen be asked to consider the issues arising out of consultation (in respect of anything applying to all standards) and develop an approach that can be applied consistently to all standards. It was agreed that SC Chairmen would be asked to come back to ISCC with their preferred approach, for endorsement.
c) **Question:** When will the joint RSSB and NR review of standards be completed?

**Response:** The first phase of the trial analysis will have been completed by the end of November. It should be possible to identify where there are inconsistencies and incompatibilities (for plain line rail – which has been used to test the methodology). This should enable us to identify the scale of the task and potential problems.

d) **Comment:** BE to be requested to provide an update to the January 2015 ISCC meeting on progress with the joint RSSB and NR review of infrastructure standards.

e) **Question:** NR has an issue with commissioning a project that needs to be authorised under interoperability but at an interim stage. How do RGSs help NR to allow for the commissioning at an interim stage?

**Response:** The development of the AC standards project was explicitly undertaken to support the commissioning activities. If NR have any particular wishes or needs from RGSs in relation to this issue, RSSB would welcome hearing about them.

f) **Question:** How does the strategy help with respect to compatibility?

**Response:** The strategy is not designed to sort out all interface issues. It is addressing the question put by ISCC about priorities in the context of the scope of the expansion of interoperability. NR agreed to this approach on the basis of a review to identify and address any issues that arise from the review.

g) **Question:** How can RSSB help NR at an interim stage for authorisation? How can NR advise its projects on what they need to take into account?

**Response:** That is a bigger question than the one addressed by the paper. The standards regime is TSIs, NTRs, RGSs (if not Railway Interoperability Regulations) and NR company standards. The owner of the project must decide which of that regime will be used to implement the project.

h) **Comment:** But at the moment what is available is not that well defined.

i) **Comment:** This is outside of the scope of this paper, however RSSB would be very happy to help if a request, setting out the problem, is forthcoming from any member.

j) **Comment:** The east west rail project has nothing to authorise compatibility because there is no standard setting out the limits in the area of CCS for class B systems.

**Response:** The paper is only attempting to address the effects of the extension of scope of TSIs. The issue about class B systems should be raised at the CCS SC or, if not dealt with satisfactorily, when the CCS SC Chairman reports to ISCC.
k) Comment: At the Network of Representative Bodies meeting (stakeholders and ERA) ERA gave a presentation on the work being done to clean up national rules. All agreed about the four categories for NTRs but at the end, a comment was made about the need to retain an archive of all the rules. On that basis, no rules would ever be withdrawn. It may be that the suggestion from the ERA about the archive related to an existing train, not covered by RIR, and knowing what rules to use.

Response: UK philosophy is that you build or maintain an asset to the current standards.

2.4.3 Decisions:

ISCC:

a) NOTED the points set out in the paper

b) ENDORSED the general approach to changing the content of RGSs, while agreeing that it is not appropriate to apply a different priority to the consequent changes for all RGSs ahead of 01 January 2015.

2.4.4 Actions:

a) SC chairmen to consider the issues arising out of consultation (on the audibility and visibility of trains standard) in respect of anything applying to all standards, and present to ISCC for endorsement an approach that can be applied consistently to all standards.

b) BE to provide an update to the January 2015 ISCC meeting on progress with the joint RSSB and NR review of standards.

2.5 Update on the Infrastructure Register

2.5.1 Introduction:

This item was requested by the Department for Transport (DfT) representative. It was provided by the Chairman of INS SC as a document that had been presented to that committee by way of an update on the Register of Infrastructure (RINF).

2.5.2 Discussion:

ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Question: Were the questions to INS SC satisfactorily resolved?

Response: BE to be asked to comment.

2.5.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) NOTED the briefing provided.

2.5.4 Actions:

a) BE to comment on whether the questions raised in the RINF briefing were satisfactorily resolved at INS SC.
2.6 Results of ISCC’s 2014 survey

2.6.1 Introduction:

This paper was introduced by Tim Gilbert. Its purpose was to provide feedback and agree appropriate actions following the 2014 survey of ISCC members on the functions of ISCC.

2.6.2 Discussion:

ISCC members made the following comments/observations:

a) Comment: It is actually an endorsement of the running of the committee; a good news story.

b) Comment: In respect of 4.2, ISCC does seem to have stopped dealing with specific problems experienced by standards users.

c) Question: There still appears to be a gap between the understanding of those on the committee and those at senior levels in the industry. Perhaps SCs could bring one issue to ISCC at each visit – together with a report about the general position.

d) Comment: The survey questions were somewhat inward looking. They could have addressed some of the outward facing issues. There remains a perceived problem with standards – rather than an actual problem. Perhaps each ISCC member should consider how they could better engage with their constituents.

e) Comment: There is a need to address, for example, why some significant industry parties do not consider ISCC as a priority.

Response: While NR has had understandable difficulties in recent months (with sickness and change of personnel) it is involved fully in all the SCs and indeed in all the influencing mechanisms. IB has committed to attend future ISCC meetings and to meet AJ before the next meeting.

f) Comment: NR has conflicting guidance from ORR and DfT in respect of projects and the applicability of standards.

Response: ISCC needs help to identify to whom they should be speaking to ensure that there is alignment of understanding within the projects.

g) Comment: The Interoperability Regulations are structured for large projects – it is very difficult to apply them on a piecemeal basis.

Response: The interoperability route utilisation strategy (RUS) should help with this.

[Post meeting note: “The ORR is concerned to see these comments and would like to understand the background and meet with the author to resolve whatever issue lies behind them.”]

h) Comment: In respect of clause 6.1b) - the role of standards in facilitating innovation – ISCC agreed to ask FH to produce a paper to discuss the issue at a future ISCC meeting.

RIAFH
Number Minute Action

i) Question: Could ISCC sponsor an award for the best application of standards on a project?

j) Comment: Andrew Simmons has offered to present to ISCC on the application of ETCS. AJ to discuss with TL – MP to approach Andrew Simmons to check on availability.

k) Comment: In respect of membership of ISCC, it was agreed that the suggestion to invite an assessment body to become a guest member of ISCC be followed up. FH to be asked to suggest a Notified Body (possibly the current chair of NB Rail: Malcolm Beard).

2.6.3 Decisions: ISCC:

a) NOTED the survey results.

b) ENDORSED the actions identified below.

2.6.4 Actions:

a) In respect of the role of standards in facilitating innovation – FH to consider producing a paper to discuss this.

b) Andrew Simmons has offered to present to ISCC on the application of ETCS. AJ to discuss with TL – MP to approach Andrew Simmons to check on availability.

c) FH to invite a Notified Body as an ISCC guest member (possibly the current chair of NB Rail: Malcolm Beard).

3 Any other business

3.1 RSSB changes in personnel

Anson Jack announced that a permanent Director, Standards (Mark Phillips) had been appointed at RSSB; he will commence in January 2015.

Some organisational changes have been made at RSSB but nothing major for the Standards directorate.

Cliff Cork has decided to retire at the end of 2014.

ISCC thanked Cliff for his outstanding contributions to Standards and to ISCC over the years.

4 Items proposed as Not For Discussion

4.1 Contracts Supported by Standards Committees

4.1.1 Introduction:

This paper was submitted by Marie Marks (MM) from RSSB. Its purpose was to provide ISCC with an update on contracts supported by Standards Committees and ISCC.

4.1.2 Discussion:

ISCC made no comments/observations.

4.1.3 Decision: ISCC:

a) NOTED the content of the report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Forward Agenda Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>RSSB Standards Activities Report - <strong>January</strong> and July 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Traffic Operation and Management (TOM)</td>
<td>RSSB/GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards Committee – <strong>January</strong> and July 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Energy (ENE) Standards Committee – <strong>January</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and July 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Report from the Chairman of GEL/9 Committee/High Integrity Software</td>
<td>RSSB/AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group – <strong>January</strong> and July 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>ISCC’s strategic plan – review of progress for FY2014/15 and key</td>
<td>RSSB/VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities for FY2015/16 – <strong>January</strong> 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Control Command and Signalling (CCS)</td>
<td>RSSB/TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards Committee – <strong>March</strong> and September 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of EOSRG – <strong>March</strong> and September 2015</td>
<td>RSSB/TL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report from ISCC to RSSB Board</td>
<td>TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Plant (PLT) Standards Committee – <strong>March</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and September 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Contracts supported by Standards Committee – <strong>May</strong> and November</td>
<td>RSSB/MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Infrastructure (INS) Standards Committee –</td>
<td>RSSB/BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May</strong> and November 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Report from Chairman of Rolling Stock (RST) Standards Committee</td>
<td>RSSB/MJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>May</strong> and November 2015</td>
<td></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>
<tbody>
<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. Update: 19-09-2014: Outstanding. Update: 12-11-2014: Outstanding. [Post meeting note: FH has requested that this action be closed as, though there was interest in learning the lessons at the time, NR is now focussed on other priorities and is unable to provide resource to address this action.]</td>
<td>RIA/FH</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. Update: 19-09-2014: a group has been formed to look at lessons learned and a workshop is planned on 10 December. Update: 12-11-2014: [Post meeting note: agenda item 2.5 at 21/01/2015 meeting - closed]</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</td>
<td>Closed</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. Update: 19-09-2014: Spoke to Simon Scott but it has not yet been decided. Update: 12-11-2014: Lack of progress relates to this has not been the top priority when NR has had some difficulties in filling the position of Engineering Director. AJ is meeting Ian Brookes to discuss. [Post meeting note: AJ met with Ian Brookes and provided appropriate background papers.]</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2014-09-19 – 01 | ISCC members to identify which fora they would like RSSB to attend to explain the change; in particular the Network Rail projects.  
Update: 12-11-2014: CC has already attended an ATOC forum. CC is due to attend Freight Technical Committee. CC regularly meets with the leasing companies. RIA will also be approached. MP will discuss with Ian Brookes to identify the appropriate forum within NR.  
[Post meeting note: MP invited VP and AJ to attend acceptance panel.]                                                                                                           | MP/IB | Open   |
| 2014-09-19 – 02 | VP to circulate to ISCC members the RGS that has been reviewed and redrafted along the lines discussed above (ie to incorporate the rationale and guidance for each requirement within the RGS).  
[Post meeting note: Circulated on 20/10/2014. The general feedback from SCs on the new format has been very positive and the RGS has not encountered any major issues or objections. Closed.] | RSSB/VP | Closed |
| 2014-09-19 – 03 | In respect of the scope extended TSIs, RSSB to categorise RGSs based on the nature of the change required and suggest timescales for revision together with an idea of what the effect on other work would be.  
Update: 12-11-2014: Agenda item 2.4 – closed.                                                                                                                                   | RSSB/AJ | Closed |
| 2014-09-19 - 04 | VP to provide relevant references showing that NTRs for technical compatibility with no-TSI conform subsystems are legitimate.  
[Post meeting note: circulated on 29/09/2014 – closed]                                                                                                                       | RSSB/VP | Closed |
| 2014-09-19 – 05 | TS to look into getting a freight representative on ENE SC.  
Update: 12-11-2014: identified a suitable candidate, FOC agreed then the candidate resigned. As soon as the post is filled, they will become the member. Closed.                                                                 | FOC/TS | Closed |
| 2014-09-19 – 06 | DK to circulate the report from the ENE SC Chairman, the ENE SC remit and the ENE SC Strategic Plan.  
[Post meeting note: circulated on 22/09/2014 – closed]                                                                                                                      | RSSB/DK | Closed |
| 2014-09-19 – 07 | All to comment on the ENE SC remit and ENE SC Strategic Plan.  
[Post meeting note: comments received and responded to – closed]                                                                                                                  | All    | Closed |
| 2014-09-19 – 08 | PH to circulate the meeting papers relating to focus groups looking at what placing into service for ETCS might entail.  
[Post meeting note: circulated on 22/09/2014 – closed]                                                                                                                     | ORR/PH | Closed |
<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>2014-09-19 – 09</td>
<td>TL to suggest at EOSRG that the DfT representative is given a detailed briefing on ETCS. <strong>[Post meeting note: completed – closed]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/TL</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-09-19 – 10</td>
<td>GP to consider adding a note regarding ERTMS Level 3 within the current version of the Operational Concept for ERTMS. <strong>[Post meeting note: completed]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/GP</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-09-19 – 11</td>
<td>VP to circulate the electronic copy of the presentation on placing into service and EMC. <strong>[Post meeting note: circulated on 20/10/2014 – closed]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/VP</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-09-19 - 12</td>
<td>ERA will be looking at the National Incident Reporting (NIR) system to see if it is suitable to adopt at a European level. PH agreed to circulate papers. <strong>[Post meeting note: circulated on 22/09/2014 – closed]</strong></td>
<td>ORR/PH</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-09-19 - 13</td>
<td>PH to circulate the ERA document identifying lessons learned from previous experience at working groups. <strong>[Post meeting note: circulated on 26/09/2014 – closed]</strong></td>
<td>ORR/PH</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-11-12 - 01</td>
<td>AG to bring a paper to ISCC covering cyber security. <strong>[Post meeting note: Agenda item 2.3 at 21/01/2015 meeting – closed]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/AG</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-11-12 – 02</td>
<td>SC chairmen to consider the issues arising out of consultation (on the audibility and visibility of trains standard) in respect of anything applying to all standards, and present to ISCC an approach that can be applied consistently to all standards.</td>
<td>SC Chairmen</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-11-12 – 03</td>
<td>BE to provide an update to the January 2015 ISCC meeting on progress with the joint RSSB and NR review of standards. <strong>[Post meeting note: Agenda item 2.6 at 21/01/2015 meeting – closed.]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/BE</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-11-12 – 04</td>
<td>BE to comment on whether the questions raised in the RINF briefing were satisfactorily resolved at INS SC. <strong>[Post meeting note from the INS SC Chairman: the discussion is fully reported in the INS SC minutes but in summary, one question was answered and guidance was given on the other.]</strong></td>
<td>RSSB/BE</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>2014-11-12 – 05</td>
<td>In respect of the role of standards in facilitating innovation – FH to consider producing a paper to discuss this.</td>
<td>RIA/FH</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-11-12 – 06</td>
<td>Andrew Simmons has offered to present to ISCC on the application of ETCS. AJ to discuss with TL – MP to approach Andrew Simmons to check on availability.</td>
<td>RSSB/AJ NR/MP</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-11-12 – 07</td>
<td>FH to invite a Notified Body as an ISCC guest member (possibly the current chair of NB Rail: Malcolm Beard).</td>
<td>RIA/FH</td>
<td>Open</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></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSB Board</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVED

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
Wednesday 12 November 2014
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