

# **TSI-PRM : Meeting-DG MOVE – EDF – BDF 2/3/2021**

## **Présents:**

- X, DG MOVE, Head of office
- Leonardo Dongiovanni, DG Move - Policy Officer
- Catherine Naughton
- Marie Denninghaus
- Mher Hakobyan
- Pierre Gyselinck
- Benjamin Laureys
- Olivier Magritte

## **M7 dossier:**

PG en BL: schets van het M7-dossier van 2014 tot nu  
-niet langs WG gepasseerd

## **Aanpassing van TSI-PMR regeling**

Probleem: TSI meestal gevolgd, maar niet toegankelijk

- Aan te passen
- Ook in andere staten
- Duur
- Nood aan volle Europese harmonisering
- Grote probleem: verschillende treinen en perronhoogtes

Denninghaus: hoe beginnen we aan de harmonisering? Hoe kunnen we jullie helpen?

## **The Recovery & Resilience Facility Funding (RRF)**

PG: helaas geen toegang tot de plannen  
Geen garantie om te gebruiken voor toegankelijk vervoer  
Hoe vooruitgang boeken?

## **Discussie**

Keir Fitch: rollend materiaal >

MD: geld investeren > moet richting harmonisering op lange termijn

- Behoeftte aan gemeenschappelijke visie

KF: Hoe gaan we nu om met niet-TSS-overeenkomstige treinen?

Aanpasbare treinen zijn interessant.

MD: 1 perronhoogte als doelstelling > in meerdere landen (Oostenrijk, NL, Zwitserland, ...), maar niet altijd overleg met buurlanden. Jammer, want veel vervoer over de grenzen heen.

Keir Fitch: intermediaire oplossingen zijn haalbaar, verregaande normaanpassingen niet. Is er een draagvlak voor intermediaire oplossingen?

MD: te bespreken met onze achterban

Leonardo: Het blokkeert op perronhoogtes, wat jammer is.

MD: toch op aandringen, ook al is het moeilijk

KF: ik zal zien wat mogelijk is.

Michaela Strohschneider: graag beter dossier en minder anekdotisch > meer mogelijkheden

MD: we bezorgen jullie onze resolutie. Bedankt voor jullie openheid.

## Note préparatoire EDF + BDF

### 1. Process of launching the next TSI revision to fix problems with the current ones (independent boarding, circulation within the trains, etc.) – example of Belgium

→ We have of course tried to address this issue in the previous revision but our comments were not included. The example of Belgium and from other Member States show that it is urgent to fix those gaps in the Regulation because otherwise EU legislation will not be taken seriously anymore and we cannot promote a Regulation that results in trains which are still not accessible. The Commission is currently not planning a future revision but they claim the current text has to be implemented first.

- I suppose that we will not get a revision of the scheme.
- A negotiation between the EU and the Member States with a final decision is needed:
  - The height of the platforms should be harmonized on a European level or ...
  - ... or the material must be able to adapt to the different platform heights
  - If the second solution is preferred, the material must be really efficient. In my opinion, this solution will be much more expensive in the long run.

### 2. Work of the TSI-PRM advisory body and delay of the “Common Priorities” document

→ The Advisory Body is an obligation under the Regulation and has to produce the “Common Priorities” document to facilitate implementation of the law. However, this Body is awfully inefficient and unproductive and it is very frustrating for passengers’ organisations to participate because the Member States are not doing their jobs and just try to stall everything. AGE Platform and the European Passengers’ Federation have even threatened to leave the Advisory Body altogether. We want to highlight this frustration and push the Commission to be more ambitious and get the Member States more involved.

- Up to now, the Advisory Body has not worked efficiently.
- On the subject of the height of platforms and ordering new rolling stock, the Belgian working group was not consulted (in time). In Belgium there are still 3 different heights of platforms. When ordering carriages, SNCB opted for a compromise height. This compromise height does not correspond to any platform height.

- The result is that SNCB has placed an expensive order that is not suitable for disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility... and that in a country with an ageing population...
- The result is rolling stock with limited accessibility for at least the next 30 years.
- Disabled persons organizations have insisted on a unique platform height, a principle that NMBS/SNCB now applies when working (76cm).
- The EU has existed for 70 years and has adopted the mobility of persons as a fundamental principle (one of the 4 basic freedoms of the EU)... Another 30 years means almost 100 years of immobility in the field of mobility! It would be bad for the EU's image if we had to celebrate the centennial like this.
- Together with Unia, CAWaB and other organisations, the National High Council for Persons with Disabilities has put pressure on the SNCB. The NMBS/SNCB has had the model of the second order adjusted. It is quite an improvement (almost the right platform height), but the slope to the compartment is too steep for wheelchair users. For the next generation of coaches, the NHRPH demands fully accessible coaches.

### 3. Harmonized platform levels – vision for the future

- This is a highly political issue and we are aware that a solution (i.e. the same platform level all over the EU) is unrealistic at the moment. However, we want the Commission to have a vision of where it should lead – if it is a political decision we have to think about who we need to lobby and where the initiative should originate. If it takes 50 years so be it but we have to think about it and start planning. It would solve many accessibility issues.
- BDF proposes to use “40 years” instead of “50 years” : it would match with the centennial of the EU
- Unfortunately, the NHRPH only achieved a partial victory with regard to the rolling stock already ordered... The NHRPH was involved too late.
- This shows that constructive consultation and cooperation within an advisory body leads to better decisions and thus to savings!!!

### 4. Use of the Recovery & Resilience Facility Funding (RRF) to improve accessibility of rail

- We are already working on this (e.g. in our Board Resolution for next week we included a paragraph on transport). It makes sense to lobby for this on national level but we still need the Commission to do its part, for example including accessibility in the TEN-T Regulation etc.
- Real work on Belgian R&RF plan is impossible for advisory councils
- The BDF has been questioning the different governments of Belgium about it since July 2020. The only elements that might be included by the Secretary of State are general requirements: the BDF and the CSNPH have not been given access to the technical datasheets. They could therefore not provide efficient advice. We have no concrete idea of the content regarding train transport...
- There is no systematic consultation between the different governments in Belgium. We hope that the EU can put pressure on the member states by demanding that R&RF funds require a consultation process.
- The consultation process of member states such as Denmark should be given as an example.