

Making the railway system  
work better for society.

## Light Impact Assessment

*Revision of chapter 7.5 (change management) of Regulation 454/2011 (TAP TSI) and chapter 7.2 (change management) of Regulation 1305/2014 (TAF TSI)*

	<i>Elaborated by</i>	<i>Validated by</i>	<i>Approved by</i>
<i>Name</i>	Martin Schroeder	Oana Gherginescu	
<i>Position</i>	Economic Evaluation Officer	Head of Sector Economic Evaluation	
<i>Date</i>	20/04/2018	20/04/2018	Enter a date.
<i>Signature</i>	(signed)	(signed)	

### *Document History*

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comments</i>
0.1	17.04.2018	Initial draft
0.2	19/04/2018	Review by OG
0.3	20/04/2018	Produce clean version, remove some additional editorial errors, address all comments from quality check.
1.0	20/04/2018	Final version



## *Contents*

1.	Context and problem definition.....	4
1.1.	Problem and problem drivers .....	4
1.2.	Main assumptions .....	4
1.3.	Stakeholders affected .....	4
1.4.	Evidence and magnitude of the problem.....	5
1.5.	Baseline scenario.....	6
1.6.	Subsidiarity and proportionality .....	6
2.	Objectives.....	7
2.1.	Strategic and specific objectives .....	7
2.2.	Link with Railway Indicators.....	7
3.	Options.....	8
3.1.	List of options.....	8
3.2.	Description of options.....	8
3.3.	Uncertainties/risks .....	8
4.	Impacts of the options .....	9
4.1.	Impacts of the options (qualitative analysis) .....	9
4.2.	Impacts of the options (quantitative analysis).....	10
5.	Comparison of options and preferred option.....	10
5.1.	Effectiveness criterion (options' response to specific objectives).....	10
5.2.	Efficiency (NPV and B/C ratio) criterion .....	11
5.3.	Summary of the comparison.....	11
5.4.	Preferred option(s).....	11
5.5.	Further work required.....	11
6.	Monitoring and evaluation .....	11
6.1.	Monitoring indicators .....	11
6.2.	Future evaluations .....	11

**1. Context and problem definition**

<p><b>1.1. Problem and problem drivers</b></p>	<p>Currently, the update of the TAP and TAF technical documents in a baseline is a very time consuming process.</p> <p>At first, any changes in the technical documents of TAF and TAP are managed by ERA following a specific change control management procedure, where the sector is strongly involved. This procedure evaluates single change requests and bundles them into baselines.</p> <p>Once a new baseline is established in the framework of the change control procedure, this baseline needs to be adopted by RISC vote, before it can be applied by the sector. This additional approval process is very time consuming and therefore induces administratively driven delays in the implementation of changes which had already been put forward following a thorough change control management procedure.</p> <p>These delays put at stake the timely implementation of such changes which may, in certain cases, become obsolete by the time of the RISC vote.</p> <p>For this reason, the European Commission asked the Agency in the framework of the COMMISSION DELEGATED DECISION (EU) 2017/1474 to simplify the procedure (see Art. 13 (1) and 14 (1)).</p>				
<p><b>1.2. Main assumptions</b></p>	<p>We assume that the additional approval process by RISC is not only time consuming but also cost-inefficient, taking into account, that in 26 Member States:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>One specific Mirror Group is organised with the national sector representatives to discuss the topic and to agree on a common position</i></li> <li>• <i>One specific group meeting is organized within each national stakeholder organization to discuss this topic in more depth and to agree on a common position</i></li> </ul> <p>These consultations are triggered on top of the discussions were already done with all involved stakeholders during the change control management procedure.</p>				
<p><b>1.3. Stakeholders affected</b></p>	<p>All stakeholders who can ask for change requests or who could benefit from change requests, are impacted.</p> <p>In addition the Member States are concerned, as they have to organize the national internal consultation process before the RISC meeting.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="564 1912 1426 2072"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Category of stakeholder</i></th> <th><i>Importance of the problem</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Change Requestors and beneficiaries of change requestssuch as IMs, RUs,</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Category of stakeholder</i>	<i>Importance of the problem</i>	Change Requestors and beneficiaries of change requestssuch as IMs, RUs,	5
<i>Category of stakeholder</i>	<i>Importance of the problem</i>				
Change Requestors and beneficiaries of change requestssuch as IMs, RUs,	5				

	wagon keepers, TAP/TAF IT tool suppliers, ticket vendors, travel agencies,..	
	National Contact Points for TAP TSI and TAF TSI	3
	Member State Representatives in RISC	2
	EC (for the budget linked to RISC organization)	2
<p><b>1.4. Evidence and magnitude of the problem</b></p>	<p>As the baseline of TAP TSI and TAF TSI was usually updated once per year in the past, a number of updates already happened where this inefficiency of the updating process became evident.</p> <p>The cost impact of one additional RISC approval process is estimated with approx. 1, 004 Million Euro for both baselines (TAF TSI and TAP TSI) based on the following:</p> <p>(A) Costs for the sector to participate in the mirror groups at Member State level of 1 M EUR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>26 Member State internal consultation procedures are triggered by one RISC approval.</i></li> <li>• <i>In each Member State, the Member State organizes a mirror group with</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>5 national sector representatives for TAP TSI representing RUs, IMs, Industry for railway specific IT tools, ticket vendors, passenger organizations</i></li> <li>○ <i>5 national sector representatives for TAF TSI, representing RUs, IMs, wagon keepers, TAF tool suppliers, multi modal transport operators</i></li> <li>○ <i>The TAF TSI/TAP TSI related discussions consume about 1 working day for each expert including travel time.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>For preparation of such mirror group, each representative sector organizes at national level a preparatory meeting involving about 5 experts. 1 Meeting is needed to come to an agreed position. One meeting consumes about 1 working day per expert including travel arrangements.</i></li> <li>• <i>Average hourly rate of 80 EUR (average over complete EU) including travel.</i></li> <li>• <i>This results for each of TAP TSI or TAF TSI in <math>26*5+26*5*5 = 780</math> working days, which accounts on an average for 0,5 M EUR.</i></li> </ul> <p>(B) Costs for MS/Agency/ERA staff of 0,004 M EUR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>at MS level, Agency level and EC level, one person is in charge of TAP TSI /TAF TSI.</i></li> <li>• <i>It consumes 5 working days for Agency/EC staff to prepare the RISC approval and 1 working day for the MS representative.</i></li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on a hourly rate of 80EUR, this results in additional <math>(26*640+5*2*640)</math> EUR = approx. 0,004 MEUR</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.5. Baseline scenario</b></p>	<p>The problem will persist, if nothing will be done and costs will be spent for each TAF TSI / TAP TSI baseline release adoption by RISC, at the level estimated under the previous point.</p>
<p><b>1.6. Subsidiarity and proportionality</b></p>	<p>Each TAF TSI or TAP TSI baseline is a pre-requisite for interoperability. For this reason the management of the baselines can only be done in a European context.</p> <p>However, it is questionable if an additional RISC approval is still necessary on top of the management of baselines follows the change control management procedure of the Agency. It would be more proportionate to eliminate the additional level of RISC approval as this would significantly reduce administrative burden in the spirit of the EU Better Regulation.</p>

## 2. Objectives

<b>2.1. Strategic and specific objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Europe becoming the world leader in railway safety</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Promoting rail transport to enhance its market share</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Improving the efficiency and coherence of the railway legal framework</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Optimising the Agency's capabilities</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Transparency, monitoring and evaluation</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improve economic efficiency and societal benefits in railways</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fostering the Agency's reputation in the world</li> </ul> <p>To simplify the update of baselines in the framework of TAP TSI and TAF TSI.</p>
<b>2.2. Link with Railway Indicators</b>	N/A

### 3. Options

<p><b>3.1. List of options</b></p>	<p>0: Baseline                  1: Simplified Update Process</p>
<p><b>3.2. Description of options</b></p>	<p>0: Baseline – see points 1.4 and 1.5 above                  1: Simplified Update Process</p> <p>The process proposes that the Agency can publish (and put into force) an updated baseline after it has completed the change control management procedure under the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The updated baseline concerns only changes in the ERA technical documents annexed to the TAF TSI/TAP TSI</i></li> <li>• <i>There is consensus within the sector related to the endorsed baseline.</i></li> </ul> <p>In all other cases, a RISC approval procedure is still necessary.</p>
<p><b>3.3. Uncertainties/risks</b></p>	<p>It is important, that a common consensus about the content of the updated baseline is reached during the change control management procedure managed by the Agency.</p>



4. Impacts of the options

<p><b>4.1. Impacts of the options (qualitative analysis)</b></p>			
	<i>Category of stakeholder</i>	<i>Option Baseline</i>	
	Requestor of Change requests (railway sector in general as beneficiary of the change requests)	Positive impacts	N/A
		Negative impacts	Unnecessary additional consultation procedures within their MS, considering that the consultation has already happened during the CCM procedure (this implies loss of time and additional costs) Losses from a delayed implementation of the change requests Risk that the change becomes obsolete by the time of the adoption
	Member State	Positive impacts	N/A
		Negative impacts	Unnecessary additional consultation procedures within their MS
	The Agency	Positive impacts	N/A
		Negative impacts	Unnecessary consultation between Agency and EC in order to prepare the RISC approval procedure (this implies an unefficient use of resources)
	EC	Positive impacts	N/A
		Negative impacts	Additional costs to treat this as an item on the RISC agenda
	<b>Overall assessment (input for section 5.1)</b>	Positive impacts	N/A
		Negative impacts	Unnecessary consultation procedures for all involved actors, with consequences regarding time losses and administrative costs.
	<i>Category of stakeholder</i>	<i>Option Simplified Update</i>	
Requestor of Change requests (railway sector in general as beneficiary of the	Positive impacts	Faster processing time of change requests (from the request of a change until the change is integrated in a baseline and legally in force) Avoidance of duplicative consultation procedures (one in the framework of RISC and one in the	

	change requests)		framework of the change control management) All this results in time and cost savings and reduction of administrative burden									
		Negative impacts	N/A									
	Member State	Positive impacts	They can focus the discussions/approvals in RISC on important and strategic items and not on items which are very narrow in technical scope and which have been already pre-consulted within a change control management procedure.									
		Negative impacts	N/A									
	The Agency	Positive impacts	Optimized use of resources for the management and updating of the TAF TSI/TAP TSI baselines									
		Negative impacts	N/A									
	EC	Positive impacts	Efficiency gains for RISC meetings Application of the Better Regulation guidelines									
		Negative impacts	N/A									
	<b>Overall assessment</b> <i>(input for section 5.1)</i>	Positive impacts	Faster and more efficient procedure for updating the baseline. Time and cost savings, less administrative burden									
		Negative impacts	N/A									
	<b>4.2. Impacts of the options (quantitative analysis)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category of stakeholder</th> <th>Cost savings of Option 1 Simplified Process compared to the Baseline*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Railway Sector (Requestors of change Requests)</td> <td>1 M EUR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ERA/EC/Member State</td> <td>0,004 MEUR</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Overall</b></td> <td><b>1,004 MEUR</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Category of stakeholder	Cost savings of Option 1 Simplified Process compared to the Baseline*	Railway Sector (Requestors of change Requests)	1 M EUR	ERA/EC/Member State	0,004 MEUR	<b>Overall</b>	<b>1,004 MEUR</b>
		Category of stakeholder	Cost savings of Option 1 Simplified Process compared to the Baseline*									
		Railway Sector (Requestors of change Requests)	1 M EUR									
		ERA/EC/Member State	0,004 MEUR									
<b>Overall</b>		<b>1,004 MEUR</b>										
* See detailed assumptions in section 1.4												

**5. Comparison of options and preferred option**

<b>5.1. Effectiveness criterion (options' response to</b>	Based on the findings from section 4.1, assess the extent to which the various options respond to the specific objectives, from 1-very low
---	--

<p><b>specific objectives)</b></p>	<p>response to 5-very high response and calculate the average score (<b>effectiveness</b>).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="564 353 1262 562"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>Option 0 (baseline)</i></th> <th><i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Effective update of baselines</i></td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Option 0 (baseline)</i>	<i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i>	<i>Effective update of baselines</i>	1	5						
	<i>Option 0 (baseline)</i>	<i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i>											
<i>Effective update of baselines</i>	1	5											
<p><b>5.2. Efficiency (NPV and B/C ratio) criterion</b></p>	<p>Based on the findings from section 4.2, rate the <b>overall efficiency</b> of the various options as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>› 1 if B/C ratio &lt;1 or NPV &lt;=0</li> <li>› 5 if B/C ratio &gt;1 and NPV &gt;0</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="564 808 1262 994"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>Option 0 (baseline)</i></th> <th><i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Efficiency</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Option 0 (baseline)</i>	<i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i>	<b>Efficiency</b>	1	5						
	<i>Option 0 (baseline)</i>	<i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i>											
<b>Efficiency</b>	1	5											
<p><b>5.3. Summary of the comparison</b></p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="564 1122 1262 1420"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>Option 0 (baseline)</i></th> <th><i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Effectiveness</i></td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Efficiency</i></td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Overall rating</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Option 0 (baseline)</i>	<i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i>	<i>Effectiveness</i>	1	5	<i>Efficiency</i>	1	5	<b>Overall rating</b>	1	5
	<i>Option 0 (baseline)</i>	<i>Option 1 (Simplified Update)</i>											
<i>Effectiveness</i>	1	5											
<i>Efficiency</i>	1	5											
<b>Overall rating</b>	1	5											
<p><b>5.4. Preferred option(s)</b></p>	<p>Preferred option is option 1</p>												
<p><b>5.5. Further work required</b></p>	<p>Adapt by consequence the internal procedure of the Agency for change control management (e.g. applied by TAP TSI, TAF TSI, CCS TSI, registers etc.) – the relevant change requests for simplification are already established.</p>												

**6. Monitoring and evaluation**

<p><b>6.1. Monitoring indicators</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>6.2. Future evaluations</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>