

#	N°	Reference (e.g. Art, §)	Type	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments, Questions, Proposals	Reply	Proposal for the correction or justification for the rejection
1	1	4.13.3	M	CER	Typo: it is written 4.3.13.i instead of 4.13.3.i	A	
2	2	4.5.1	P	CER	<p>Framework for a harmonised RCC with regards to the verification of dynamic compatibility of vehicles with High Speed Load Model (HSLM) compliant structures is missing</p> <p>Whereas, the standard for HSLM (EN 1991-2) is not mature to be included in the TSIs, as RfS (Request for Standardisation) is needed for CEN TC250 SC1 WG3 TG DIBRST to enhance the EN1991-2 Annex E with corresponding rolling stock requirements for dynamic compatibility with HSLM compliant structures,</p> <p>The need for further description of L&P requirements for dynamic compatibility with HSLM compliant structures should be reflected in the L&P TSI 7.5.1.1 'Axle load parameter (clause 4.2.3.2.1)' with the following tasks for future revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - L&P requirements should further be developed based on finding from CEN TC250 SC1 WG3 TG DIBRST enhancing EN1991-2 Annex E with corresponding rolling stock requirements for dynamic compatibility with HSLM compliant structures, - new ERATV parameter 4.5.1.2 of "Compliance of vehicle design with the High Speed Load Model (HSLM)" should be created, - a harmonised process should be referenced accordingly for RCC purposes in OPE TSI Appendix D.1 based on RINF parameters 1.1.1.2.4.2 and 1.1.1.2.4.4, and ERATV Parameter 4.5.1.2 - Documents required in RINF parameter 1.1.1.2.4.4 should be harmonised as far as possible to facilitate automatic RCC. 	R	<p>Following CR 172/179, the clause 4.2.3.2.1 has been revised to require that RST is categorised against EN line category including the associated documentation related to the payload. In addition, other characteristics of the vehicle as unit length, design speed etc are to be provided. At route compatibility check, the dynamic compatibility checks for trains, when necessary in accordance with the information provided by the infrastructure manager, shall be performed according to the procedure(s) or relevant information provided by the infrastructure manager through RINF... Regarding HSLM in the LOC&PAS, this can be introduced as soon as classification method of the Rolling Stock with High Speed Load Model (HSLM) will be harmonised.</p> <p>In addition, clause 7.5.1.1 of LOC&PAS is amended</p>
3	3	4.9.2	P	CER	Especially for non-TSI vehicles, it might be interesting to include the 'type' of track side HABD for which the vehicle have demonstrated conformity. Maybe possible with Optional ('O') value "Other". Motivation: route compatibility.	R	This change proposal would need to be discussed with a Working Party and cannot be introduced at this stage of the revision for the TSI package 2022. A change request can be created to initiate that discussion for a future revision.
4	4	4.10.15	P	CER	<p><u>Problem description:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modification of data format. TSI OPE talks about "Mean contact force curve" for vehicle information. - ERATV parameter should also accept this type of data "curve", being compatible with RINF parameter 1.1.1.2.5.2. - Motivation: route compatibility. <p><u>Current text</u> L&P TSI 6.2.3.20(3) <i>The tests shall be performed for a minimum of 3 speed increments up to and including the design speed of the unit. The interval between successive tests shall be no greater than 50 km/h.</i> RINF parameter 1.1.1.2.5.2 <i>Explanation on data presentation:</i> <i>The force is either given as: a value of the static force and of the maximum force expressed in newtons, or as a formula for function of the speed.</i> ERATV parameter 4.10.15: <i>Mean contact force: [Number] [N]</i></p> <p><u>Analysis:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ERATV would need to accept this data in the shape of a table mirroring the curve. Currently only accepts a single value which corresponds to the "maximum design speed" - L&P TSI requires "a minimum of 3 speed increments", thus at least 3 points, one being at (maximum) design speed are needed <p><u>Solution Proposal:</u> Change ERATV parameter 4.10.15 to accept a combination of data (as e.g. in 4.6.4) o accept 3 values of mean contact force: [number] [N], combined with o corresponding speed for which the vehicle was assessed, last value being the maximum design speed as per ERATV parameter 4.1.2.1 Note: last value is the one currently registered in 4.10.15 Corresponding changes have an impact on the development of ERATV and on the data that is currently registered. A sound implementation deadline should thus be defined and described in ERATV Decision</p>	R	This change proposal would need to be discussed with a Working Party and cannot be introduced at this stage of the revision for the TSI package 2022. A change request can be created to initiate that discussion for a future revision.
5	1	4.5.1.1	P	NSA ES	In the proposal, it's mandatory to register the parameter 4.5.1.1 <i>Categorization of the unit into EN line categories</i> for Special vehicles. However, the TSI application is not mandatory for OTMs which might be certified against NTRs. Hence, it may be possible that this information is not available. Therefore, it is proposed to identify this parameter as optional (O) for 4. Special vehicles.	R	<p>Independantly if the OTM is compliant or not with the TSI requirements (chapters 4, 5, 6), the OTMs are in the scope of TSI and table 17 in clause 7.1.2 f LOC&PAS providing the BDCs list applies to them.</p> <p>At RCC, RU needs to know the OTM categorisation for performing the static and when relevant the dynamic compatibility check (see OPE TSI appendix D1) using ERATV and RINF information.</p> <p>Not having the OTM line category defined in ERATV, an RU cannot perform RCC as required by OPE TSI.</p>

6	2		P	NSA ES	<p>It is proposed a new parameter 4.5.1.2 "<i>Compliance of vehicle design with the High Speed Load Model (HSLM)</i>" to allow the dynamic route compatibility checks. This proposed parameter is related with RINF Parameter 1.1.1.1.2.4.2 "<i>Compliance of structures with the High Speed Load Model (HSLM)</i>".</p> <p>This proposed parameter should also be included in Appendix D.1 of OPE TSI.</p>	R	<p>Following CR 172/179, the clause 4.2.3.2.1 has been revised to require that RST is categorised against EN line category including the associated documentation related to the payload. In addition, other characteristics of the vehicle as unit length, design speed etc are to be provided. At route compatibility check, the dynamic compatibility checks for trains, when necessary in accordance with the information provided by the infrastructure manager, shall be performed according to the procedure(s) or relevant information provided by the infrastructure manager through RINF... Regarding HSLM in the LOC&PAS, this can be introduced as soon as classification method of the Rolling Stock with High Speed Load Model (HSLM) will be harmonised.</p>
15	1	Annex II - Table 2	P	NSA IT	<p>All the Conditions for the Use (CfU) provided by the applicant are written in the EC Declaration of verification. In many cases there are a lots non-coded CfUs and it is very difficult to transfer all this conditions in the specific field of ERATV. So the best solution is to make reference in ERATV register to EC Declaration of verification for the related CfUs, in order to avoid mistakes (otherwise we should copy all CfUs in the specific field of ERATV, also in case the formats of some CfUs are not suitable to be properly written in the non coded restrictions field). So for the above reason it should be better to add the following parameter as mandatory in the ERATV register for all types of vehicles:</p> <p>3.1.3.X.4 bis - EC Declaration of verification: Reference of EC Declaration of verification [character string] (possibility to indicate several EC Declaration of verification, e.g. Declaration for rolling stock subsystem, for CCS, etc.)</p>	NWC	<p>There is an ongoing reflection in the Agency about the implementation of the CfUs in ERATV, but this activity isn't in the scope of the TSI revision. Your proposal is transmitted to the Unit in charge.</p>