

#	N°	Reference (e.g. Art, §)	Type	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments, Questions, Proposals	Reply	Proposal for the correction or justification for the rejection	Organisation
1	1	7.2.2.2 7.2.2.3	M	CER	As UK has been deleted in the title of these specific cases, corresponding references should also be deleted in the accompanying text.	A		CER
2	2	Appendix B, C1, C2	G	CER	In the final version submitted to RISC, please ensure that the title and text are not separated by page breaks.	NWC	Page breaks are only inserted between consecutive Appendices.	CER
3	3	Appendix A 4.2 Table 2 line 'ETCS stop marker'	M	CER	It is the train which has to be stopped (by the driver), and not the driver who has to stop.  <u>Proposal:</u> <i>ETCS stop marker</i> <i>Harmonised trackside ETCS marker board defined in [2] used to:</i> • <i>identify a potential EOA and,</i> • <i>indicate the location where a driver has to stop <b>the train</b>, if running without an MA</i>	A		CER
4	4	Appendix A 3.2	P	CER	The possibility for a driver to leave the cab should not be an ETCS rule, we think it would suit more in App. B2. Anyway, a driver could leave the cab also by request or need from the signaller, not only to use a fixed lineside phone. For example in EI 8, we can request the driver to activate LX manually. Other examples in Italy are when a driver is requested, in some degraded cases, to check the correct position of a switch, or when a driver is requested to check the completeness of their train. Our suggestion is not to exclude other possible cases.  <u>Proposal:</u> <i>All actions involving the driver assume his physical presence in the driver's cab, unless when required to examine a technical failure of the train at standstill, <del>or</del> obtain signaller's instructions through a fixed lineside phone, <b>or when requested by the signaller/non-harmonized rules.</b></i>	A		CER
5	5	Appendix A 5.1.10	U	CER	The current text could lead - especially in the translation - to the misinterpretation that a driver without release speed would be allowed to overpass an EoA:  <u>Proposal:</u> Option 1: <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Stop Marker:</i> • <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA, or</i> • <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</i> • <i>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i>  Alternative option 2: <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Stop Marker:</i> • <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA, <b>even</b> when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</i> • <i>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i>	R	The proposed addition would only complicate the application of the rule, transferring the responsibility to the driver. The proposed alternative can be misleading when no release speed is provided. The former wording of the rule (App. A ver. 5) was finally retained. It will be up to the driver to decide when exactly to start looking outside in order to identify the SM matching the EoA displayed on his/her DMI. With proper trackside engineering, there should be no ambiguity for the driver on which physical EoA (marked by SM) corresponds to the EoA calculated by the OBU.	CER
6	6	Appendix A 5.1.11	U	CER	The current text could lead - especially in the translation - to the misinterpretation that a driver without release speed would be allowed to overpass an EoA:  <u>Proposal:</u> Option 1: <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Location Marker:</i> • <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA, or</i> • <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</i> • <i>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i>  Alternative option 2: <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Location Marker:</i> • <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA, <b>even</b> when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</i> • <i>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i>	R	The proposed addition would only complicate the application of the rule, transferring the responsibility to the driver. The proposed alternative can be misleading when no release speed is provided. The former wording of the rule (App. A ver. 5) was finally retained. It will be up to the driver to decide when exactly to start looking outside in order to identify the LM matching the EoA displayed on his/her DMI. With proper trackside engineering, there should be no ambiguity for the driver on which physical EoA (marked by LM) corresponds to the EoA calculated by the OBU.	CER
7	7	Appendix A 6.2.5	G	CER	Appendix A section 6.2.5 'The traction unit has to move in SL' is not an operational rule. This is part of the handling of rolling stock and should be defined in the rolling stock manual "how to prepare a loco for SL mode". Appendix A section 6.2.5 should be deleted	R	The conditions for an OBU to enter SL mode and the resulting technical effect of this mode are already described in the Generic ETCS Driver's Handbook. The proposed addition to rule 6.2 "Preparing a movement" is meant for the <u>operational</u> context of SL mode, in coherence with the other cases under that rule. A slave engine can become a leading one at any time during a train run (e.g. when a dual trainset is split in an intermediate station to follow two different destinations). The proposed rule serves to make clear when and how a driver is allowed to exit SL mode when the operational need arises.	CER

8	8	Appendix A 6.12	P	CER	<p>Formatting of the revised text should be adapted so that all bullets corresponding to "If DAS information is available on board:" are correctly displayed below as sub topics.</p> <p><u>Proposed formatting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If DAS information is available on-board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may follow the target advice speed when displayed on the DMI</li> <li>- may coast when is displayed</li> <li>- may respect the stopping points if indicated</li> <li>- may request a stopping point to be skipped if instructed and this option is available on the DMI</li> <li>- may operate the doors when invited to do so by relevant DMI indications</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	NWC	The list is already indented as proposed in the comment, yet it does not appear so in track-change mode (likely a MS Word visualisation issue).	CER
9	9	Appendix A 6.29	P	CER	<p><u>Proposal:</u> [...] When a signaller is informed about poor adhesion conditions, he shall activate the ETCS reduced adhesion function, where possible, and if this is not possible he shall <b>inform all drivers of current and subsequent trains in the affected area take measures as prescribed by the infrastructure manager</b>, until normal operation is restored.</p>	A		CER
10	10	Appendix A 6.41.1.a)	P	CER	<p>Since the movement backwards can be decided by the driver, there are cases in which there are no instructions given by the signaller.</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> [...] the driver shall move the train / shunting movement backwards following any instructions <b>possibly</b> given by the signaller.</p>	R	"any" already reflects this potentiality.	CER
11	11	Appendix A	M	CER	The reference to the 2022 updated version is missing in the cover page of Appendix A in OPE TSI core text. The reference to the previous version 5 issued on 09/04/2019 should be replaced.	NWC	For TSI 2022, App. A will be integrated into the OPE TSI core text, so no need to quote the OPE TSI publication data on the front page of App. A. The version number will however be quoted separately for easier traceability.	CER
12	12	Appendix A	G	CER	ERA and EC commitment to include the Appendix A in the core text of OPE TSI Annex A shall be enforced. This is in particular important to further ensure that the translation of Appendix A by the EC legal service takes place before publication instead of previous publications managed as directly by ERA for such an independent ERA technical document published on ERA website only.	NWC		CER
13	13	Appendix A 6.1.2	U	CER	<p>Manual change of data required for train running number shall be treated by the driver in similar conditions than manual change of data required for the driver identification, i.e. in both cases "while at standstill or, if allowed by national value, while running"</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> If a change is required, the driver shall enter/modify and validate: - the train running number <b>while at standstill or, if allowed by national value, while running</b> - [...]</p>	R	<p>For the Train Running Number, the SRS stipulate that it is always allowed to change it while running, i.e. this action is not configurable by means of a national value.</p> <p>As a general principle, no harmonised operational rule shall restrict a flexibility that is offered by the technical specifications. Removing this possibility in Appendix A is therefore not acceptable. Regulating this possibility through a harmonised operational rule would also go against the principle of responsibility split between IM-RU; whether this operation incurs a risk should be up to the RU to assess (and restrict its use accordingly), not the IM.</p>	CER
14	14	Appendix A 6.22	M	CER	<p>Current text: "the driver shall switch off the main power switch, taking into account the position of the pantographs"</p> <p>The first symbol mentioned in 6.22 shows an announcement signal ("stands at half braking distance before switch-off signal") and informs the driver that he must switch off his traction unit <u>after</u> this section taken into account the position of the pantographs. The current wording is subject to possible misinterpretations and should be corrected.</p>	NWC	<p>Comment not clear.</p> <p>The announcement icon and marker board in this rule indicate the approach to a section that shall be passed with the main switch off. To do this in a safe way, the driver shall operate the switch before the train's pantographs reach the concerned section. This course of actions is already reflected in the current wording.</p>	CER
15	15	Appendix A	M	CER	<p>Supported merge of both "Level 2" and "Level 3" should be transposed into Appendix A for consistency with the CCS TSI. Although the merge of both levels makes sense from a technical point of view – as 95% of the functions are identical – a re-naming as proposed ("Level R") would lead to administrative burdens and an important impact on Human and Organisational Factors (HOF). The costs for changing all documents, manuals, training-material etc. and the knowledge-update of the staff are expected to be high without ANY financial benefit.</p> <p>CER calls for the definition of a pragmatic editorial solution e.g. "Level 2+"</p>	NWC	Appendix A reflects the new level R as of draft version 5.10. The choice of a different naming for the new level is not managed under OPE TSI. This decision has been taken in the CCS WP and the EECT, in compliance with the Change Control Management procedure of ERA.	CER
16	16	Appendix A 4.2 Table 3	M	CER	<p>Missing reference to RMR and ATO need to be added.</p> <p>It could be clarified that RMR corresponds to FRMCS and/or GSM-R.</p> <p>It could be also be clarified that the RMR/FRMCS is not used nor analysed in the 2022 version of the OPE TSI. The RMR/GSM-R as a radio communication is the only one considered in the 2022 version of the OPE TSI.</p>	NWC	<p>ATO was added to Table 3.</p> <p>RMR/FRMCS will not be added since there are no references to either of these in this OPE TSI (system version 3.0 will not be covered in this revision of OPE TSI).</p> <p>The term "RMR" is not added either since there is no need to make the distinction between GSM-R and FRMCS in this OPE TSI edition.</p>	CER

17	17	Appendix A 4.2 Table 3	U	CER	Missing reference to SL need to be added.	A		CER
18	18	Appendix A 3.2 last sentence	P	CER	<u>Proposal:</u> <i>An End of Authority (EoA) can be physically identified by means of an ETCS Stop Marker or an ETCS Location Marker. The EoA can also be identified by a lineside signal or other <del>marker board</del> non-harmonised trackside information with a stop indication.</i>	NWC	What can such "non-harmonised trackside information" be other than an (active) lineside signal or a (passive) marker board? All possible sources of trackside information fall under one of these two categories.	CER
19	19	Appendix A 5.1.10	U	CER	Current text: 5.1.10 ETCS Stop Marker <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Stop Marker:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</li> <li>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</li> </ul> <u>Proposal:</u> Same meaning to be written within three sentences instead of bullet points: <i>When running with a MA the driver shall stop at approach of the EOA as indicated on de DMI. A ETCS Stop Marker can be indicating the EOA.</i> <i>When running with a MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, the driver shall stop in approach of the ETCS Stop Marker indicating the EOA.</i> <i>When running without a MA the driver shall stop at any ETCS Stop Marker unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i>	NWC	This rule is meant to define the operational purpose of the Stop Marker, i.e. to mark the exact physical location of the EoA. The driver's task to follow the EoA indicated on the DMI needs not be repeated here. The existing wording of the rule is the result of long discussions. The alternative proposal does not add to its clarity.	CER
20	20	Appendix A 5.1.11	U	CER	Current text: 5.1.11 ETCS Location Marker <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to a ETCS Location Marker:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</li> <li>when running without an MA if he has received a specific order by the signaller.</li> </ul> <u>Proposal:</u> Same meaning to be written within three sentences instead of bullet points <i>When running with a MA the driver shall stop at approach of the EOA as indicated on de DMI. A ETCS Location Marker can be indicating the EOA.</i> <i>When running with a MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DM , the driver shall stop in approach of the ETCS Location Marker indicating the EOA</i> <i>When running without a MA the driver shall stop at any ETCS Location Marker only if he has received a specific order by the signaller.</i>	NWC	This rule is meant to define the operational purpose of the Location Marker, i.e. to mark the exact physical location of the EoA. The driver's task to follow the EoA indicated on the DMI needs not be repeated here. The existing wording of the rule is the result of long discussions. The alternative proposal does not add to its clarity.	CER
21	21	Appendix D1	U	CER	<b>Item 'Braking' (Emergency braking and maximum service brake):</b> This check explicitly prescribes to compare the stopping distance at the "design maximum speed" of the train with the maximum braking distance allowed by trackside. This is stated in both the 2nd and 6th column of the table. It is not understood what is the logic being as the line speed may be lower than the train design maximum speed. A lower trackside speed allowed also results in a shorter stopping distance of the train.  <u>Proposal:</u> It is suggested to change the wording to indicate that the stopping distance of the train at either the line speed or the maximum train speed (whichever is lower) must be compared to the maximum braking distance allowed by trackside.			CER
22	22	Appendix D1	U	CER	<b>Item 'Braking' (Thermal capacity):</b> The check for thermal capacity is not quite clear as it prescribes to compare the train data (in kJ) and the track data (gradient profile), which do not match.			CER
23	23	Appendix D1		CER	<b>Item 'Pantograph' (Number of pantographs in contact with the overhead contact line):</b> The data to be compared is in the format [# of pantographs] [distance] [speed]. However, it is unclear what the result is if both speed and distance values differ.  Example: RINF data: [2] [40] [120] and ERATV data: [2] [36] [80] In this example the pantographs are closer together than trackside allows, but the train speed is also lower. In such a case, it is unclear what should be the output of the route compatibility check.			CER
24	1	TSI OPE			Since there has been continuous work with the document after the release of the public consultation, Trafikverket's standpoints on the later versions of the document, will be in accordance with the standpoints sent by EIM.	NWC		Trafikverket
25	2	Appendix A			Since there has been continuous work with the document after the release of the public consultation, Trafikverket's standpoints on the later versions of the document, will be in accordance with the standpoints sent by EIM.	NWC		Trafikverket

34	1	Point 2.1 of the Annex, Appendix I	P/U	Ministry (LT)	<p>Point 2.1 sets that points 4.6 and 4.7 of the Annex apply to staff undertaking the safety-critical tasks <u>associated with accompanying a train</u>. Therefore, it is clear that harmonized health, qualification and work safety requirements apply to those: (a)undertaking the task of driving trains ('driver') and forming part of the 'train crew', (b) undertaking tasks on-board (other than driving) and forming part of the 'train crew', (c) undertaking the task of preparing trains (4.2.1.1. point of the Annex). However, the third sentence of the point 2.1 sets that "For those staff undertaking the safety-critical tasks <u>associated with dispatching trains and authorizing train movements</u>, mutual recognition of professional qualifications and health and safety conditions between Member States shall apply." Therefore, one can understand that for those, who dispatch and authorize trains, national rules may apply. What is more, traffic or maneuver manager, which is a separate profession in LT, is not even mentioned in OPE TSI, even though he is obviously performing safety critical tasks. It is unclear to us, if LT may set health and qualification requirements to traffic managers. Currently, we do apply same health requirements as set in OPE TSI to those accompanying a train. We do also consider that staff, developing SMSs, and staff, working in railway danger area, perform safety critical tasks, but health requirements do not (and should not) apply to them. Last, but not least, Appendix I states that open point is „Professional competences (see point 4.6) — Staff with safety critical tasks <u>other than train drivers</u>;“, however, the requirements are fully harmonized not only for train drivers, but also for those undertaking tasks on-board (other than driving) and forming part of the 'train crew', undertaking the task of preparing trains. We received information from ERA, that there are plans to ammend the respective regulation. We fully support these plans and suggest:</p> <p>1) to define the term "staff, performing safety critical tasks" in Appendix J. It is important, because if a person should not be considered performing safety critical tasks, only railway undertaking/infrastructure manager may set qualification and health requirements to him. 2) clarify open point „Professional competences (see point 4.6) — Staff with safety critical tasks other than train drivers;" unambiguously setting what (health, qualification, etc.) requirements and to whom the state still can apply by setting national rules.</p>		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.	NSA LT
35	2	Point 4.2.1.2.1 of the Annex	P	Ministry (LT)	<p>In point 4.2.1.2.1 of the Annex OPE TSI sets out the requirements for the preparation of the train driver's rule book, which shall consist of the set of common rules and procedures (taking into account the contents of Appendices A, B, C and D). Given that Class B signaling systems are still in use in many countries and their operational principles and rules do not fall within the scope of the TSI, we propose that when using Class B signaling systems, the train driver's rule book must also indicate the operational principles and rules for such systems.</p>		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.	NSA LT
36	3	4.2.1.2.1 of the Annex	P	Ministry (LT)	<p>In point 4.2.1.2.1 of the Annex OPE TSI also specifies that the train driver's rule book shall specify the procedures that shall cover, as a minimum, the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff safety and security,</li> <li>- Signaling and control command,</li> <li>- Train operation including degraded mode,</li> <li>- Traction and rolling stock,</li> <li>- Incidents and accidents.</li> </ul> <p>In our view, these aspects are too general, therefore, it is necessary to extend these aspects, detailing and specifying what they should cover, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incidents and accidents - including the incident reporting scheme, the emergency management plan and the detailed actions to be taken by the train crew in the event of an accident.</li> <li>- Traction and rolling stock, including braking procedures, actions before, during and after the journey and so on.</li> </ul>		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.	NSA LT
37	4	4.2.1.4 of the Annex	P	Ministry (LT)	<p>Point 4.2.1.4 of the Annex, OPE TSI stipulates that persons authorizing the movement of trains must have communication procedures and operating instructions. In our view, these documents alone are not enough, as every infrastructure manager must also have the technology for operating the stations, which clearly sets out the operating principles of the stations, the nature of the work, the signaling equipment and its operation and use, routing procedures and so on. Also, the traffic management detalization in the annexes of the OPE TSI are only principles according to which the infrastructure managers should prepare the local traffic management and control procedures. We suggest OPE TSI to be more detailed in these aspects.</p>		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.	NSA LT
38	5	Point 4.2.2.1, point 7.2.2.1 of the Annex	P	Ministry (LT)	<p>Point 4.2.2.1. of the Annex, OPE TSI sets out the requirements for the marking of the front and rear of the train. It should be noted that these requirements only apply to trains and do not apply to special rolling stock, single locomotives as well as freight trains under non-standard conditions, e.g. driving on an irregular railway track, pushing a group of wagons, and so on. In our view, OPE TSI should specify all variants for the marking of trains, including other rolling stock, also running them under non-standard running conditions. Also, we would like to ask to set a new specific case next to section 7.2.2.1 of the Annex or in LOC&amp;PAS TSI (please, see our proposals for LOC&amp;PAS TSI as well). We kindly ask you to let us know if the separate form for this request should be filled out. During the cleaning up process of the national safety rules, one rule indicating marking of the rear end of the train was found to be unacceptable. The rule is applicable for a long time up to today in the 1 520 mm track gauge system, also in the third countries, and is still relevant. It goes like this "The end of a passenger and mail and luggage train running on a single-track railway and on a double-track railway on a regular or irregular track shall be marked with three red lights during the day and at night.":</p>		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.	NSA LT

39	6	Point 4.2.2.4 of the Annex	P	Ministry (LT)	<i>In point 4.2.2.4 of the Annex, OPE TSI establishes the general principle that loads must be securely lashed and remain so throughout the journey. The additional recommendations detail the need for risk analysis and implementation of general cargo handling principles to ensure the safe transport of cargo. In our view, these provisions are not sufficient to ensure the safe transport of goods, given the different experiences of railway undertakings, in the absence of competencies regulation of the undertakings which load and secure the cargo. It should be noted that for each type of load, specific means must be developed for their attachment, based on mathematical calculations, assessing the stability of the load and the dynamics of movement. In view of the different types of freight transport in the countries, we propose to provide for an exemption allowing the parties to set requirements for the securing of goods if necessary.</i>		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.	NSA LT
40	7	Point 4.2.3.6.2 of the Annex	P	Ministry (LT)	<i>Point 4.2.3.6.2. of the Annex, OPE TSI establishes the general principle that the Infrastructure manager must, within the limits of his competence, provide information to train drivers in non - standard situations. We propose to clarify and detail the responsibilities of the infrastructure manager, e.g. the infrastructure manager must provide information on safe stopping places in the event of an accident, information relating to the characteristics of dangerous goods and the means of protection, etc.</i>		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.	NSA LT
41	1	Appendix A, 3.2, page 10	P	Emile Maarten	Proposal to remove the three sentences on page 10. They are not in line with the EoA being the end of a MA where the target speed is zero, as defined in section 4.2 of Appendix A and in Subset 026 (version 3.6.0) section 3.8.1.1.b. Furthermore these sentences do not provide any additional information as the possibility of an EoA located at markerboards is already identified in table 2.	R	There is no inconsistency between these sentences and the definition in section 4.2 of Appendix A and in Subset 026 section 3.8.1.1.b. The EoA is not necessarily the end of a (technical) MA (see definitions in Subset 023), it can be the end of any authorisation provided to the driver, or even the location of the train after coming to a standstill (e.g. after an unconditional emergency stop). These sentences are only meant to provide a global view of how a physical EoA is identified.	NL ERTMS
42	2	Appendix A, 4.1, page 11	G	Emile	Is the EN-19464:2023 already available? If not, it seems odd to use it as a reference here.	A	The current version EN 16494:2015 will be referenced, however the operational rules affected by the new harmonised marker boards will have place-holders for them, properly marked as such, already in this revision.	NL ERTMS
43	3	Appendix A, 5.1.10 and 5.1.11, page 19	G	Emile Maarten	These proposed additions to 5.1.10 and 5.1.11 are welcomed and considered essential to make it possible to properly adhere to these rules (otherwise it is not clear when a stop marker is 'indicating' an EoA) and to prevent undesired behavior leading to lower capacity on short block, high density lines (when drivers are tempted to align their braking in order to come to a stop at one stop marker too early).	NWC		NL ERTMS
44	4	Appendix A, 6.2.4, page 23	P	Emile Maarten	Proposal to limit the permission to use Override EoA exclusively to European Instruction 01. The new text "If EU7 that allows an SMB to be passed, the driver is allowed to pass it using the override function .." makes European Instruction 07 more ambiguous and increases the chance of using Override EoA when this was not permitted.  Also, in many cases also when starting in SR it is not necessary to use Override EoA as Baseline 3 allows sending balise lists that can be passed without the need for Override EoA. In other words: it is not always required nor wanted to use override EoA when the driver has an authorisation to pass an SMB. As a consequence, authorising the use of Override EoA based on European Instruction 07 is unsafe as it kills a mitigation to stop a train in SR passing an SMB at a wrong location. I.e. when the balise group at this location is not contained in the SR BG list the train will not be tripped due to the Override function.  If the Override function is required to pass the SMB this shall separately be identified, a possibility is to use European Instruction 01 if the override function is required. See also 6.41.2 where European Instruction 01 is used instead of European Instruction 02.	R	Override is by default always required to pass an EoA, even when there is no technical protection in place (e.g. "stop if in SR" balise or balise not contained in the list of expected balises in SR) requiring the override procedure. This has been agreed as a high-level operational principle to ensure safety. The mitigation for improper use of "override" is to always require an authorisation from the signaller. This has also been agreed as a high-level operational principle and is reflected in the sequence of actions under sections 6.2.4, 6.14 and 6.39 of App. A.  Therefore, the following clause in section 6.2.4 serves to spare the need for an additional EI 1 when starting (by means of an EI 7) from a location other than in front of a stop marker: "If the train is not located at an ETCS stop marker this authorisation is valid from the current location of the train to the first ETCS stop marker in the direction of travel. If European Instruction 7 allows this ETCS stop marker to be passed, the driver is allowed to pass it using the override function and proceed up to the next ETCS stop marker." Once the train reaches the SM, the driver is allowed to override and pass it without asking the signaller for another permission through an additional EI 1.	NL ERTMS
45	5	Appendix A, 6.2.4, page 23	P	Emile	Proposal to remove the possibility for allowing multiple uses of Override EoA based on a single European Instruction. Override EoA disables most of the train protection that ETCS offers and should only be used when necessary, and in such a way that the chance for human error is minimized. Executing multiple Override EoA's based on a single European Instruction will lead to significantly higher changes of human failure than the use of a single European Instruction for a single use of Override EoA.	NWC	This has been a controversial issue in the ERTMS Operational Harmonisation WG of ERA. The wording in 6.2.4 was proposed as a compromise. In any case, it is up to the IM to issue the relevant EIs, so the signaller can opt to only authorise the passing of one EoA per EI.	NL ERTMS

46	6	Appendix A, 6.22, page 41	P	Emile	Replace 'shall switch off the main power switch' and 'shall keep the main power switched off' with 'shall not apply traction power'. This allows the railway undertaking to define how a train driver should achieve this. In some countries, train drivers do not switch off the main power, but rather refrain from applying traction power. This leads to a shorter time of driving without traction power and to a positive effect on travelling time i.e. capacity.	R	In some configurations, not applying traction power may not be sufficient. In such cases, the most conservative approach has to be adopted, i.e. to switch off the main power switch. If an RU can establish that it is equally safe for their trains to simply refrain from applying traction power, they can instruct their drivers accordingly.	NL ERTMS
47	7	Appendix A, 6.29, page 45	P	Emile	On busier networks, drivers are not always informed on slippery track conditions personally by the signaller; some inframangers and railway undertakings communicate this information using digital means. The reflect this, the following change is proposed. Instead of: " <i>If the driver is not informed by the signaller before selecting "slippery rail", he shall inform the signaller.</i> " it is proposed to state: " <i>If the driver is not informed before selecting "slippery rail", he shall inform the signaller.</i> " And also instead of: " <i>When a signaller is informed about poor adhesion conditions, he shall activate the ETCS reduced adhesion function, where possible, and if this is not possible he shall inform all drivers of current and subsequent trains in the affected area, until normal operation is restored.</i> " it is proposed to state: " <i>When a signaller is informed about poor adhesion conditions, he shall activate the ETCS reduced adhesion function, where possible, and if this is not possible he shall make sure all drivers of current and subsequent trains in the affected area will be informed, until normal operation is restored.</i> "	R	The proposed change would make the text incoherent. It can also be argued that even the digital notification will be coordinated by the signaller, thereby being consistent with the existing wording.  Concerning the second proposal, the wording has in the meantime been amended further to accommodate more generic operational procedures: "[...] and if this is not possible he shall take measures as prescribed by the IM, until normal operation is restored."	NL ERTMS
48	8	Appendix A, 6.33, page 47	P	Emile	In some cases, it might not be necessary to explicitly order a train to remain at standstill. It is proposed to let the signaller decide for himself whether a European Instruction 3 is required. So instead of: " <i>Once the train is at a standstill and before making traffic arrangements, the signaller shall order the driver to remain at a standstill by means of European Instruction 3 or other available means and to delete any MA remaining onboard if required</i> " is it proposed to state: " <i>Once the train is at a standstill and before making traffic arrangements, the signaller may use European Instruction 3 to keep the trains at standstill and to delete any MA remaining onboard if required.</i> "	R	The existing wording already offers to the signaller the possibility to not use EI 3, if another means is available. The alternative wording proposed does not safeguard that the train will finally be ordered to remain at standstill.	NL ERTMS
49	9	Appendix A, 6.38, page 52	G	Emile	In case of route unsuitability, the infra manager and affected railway undertaking will typically consult each other to decide how to handle this train. At least in the Netherlands, it is not up to the signaller to decide on his own how to handle this incident.	NWC	The existing wording covers this course of actions as well. It is understood that each of the two main actors (signaller and driver) will communicate with their respective back offices to coordinate this (normally very seldom) operational situation.	NL ERTMS
50	10	Appendix A, 6.39, page 53	P	Emile	Although the proposed definition of EoA indicates that this rule also applies to situations in which an ETCS stop marker needs to be passed by a train in without an MA (usually in SR mode), it is still advisable to make it explicit in this rule that it is also intended for this situation in which a train without an MA has to pass an SMB.	NWC	Comment not understood. Rule 6.39 applies <u>only</u> when the train does not have an MA allowing it to pass the EoA. When in possession of an MA, rules 6.12, 6.13 and 6.15 apply instead.	NL ERTMS
51	11	Appendix A, 6.41.2/6.41.3, page 57	P	Emile	In some cases, it might not be necessary to explicitly order a train to remain at standstill. It is proposed to let the signaller decide for himself whether a European Instruction 3 is required. So instead of: " <i>The signaller shall order the driver to remain at standstill and to perform End of Mission by means of European Instruction 3</i> " it is proposed to state: " <i>The signaller may use European Instruction 3 to keep the train at standstill and to perform End of Mission if required.</i> "  Note that in general, a train driver does not need a European Instruction to execute an End of Mission. In most cases, it will not be necessary for the signaller to order the driver to execute End of Mission.	R	The existing wording already offers to the signaller the possibility to not use EI 3, if another means is available. The alternative wording proposed does not safeguard that the train will finally be ordered to remain at standstill.  Concerning 6.41.3, the signaller shall anyway issue EI 3 to keep the train at standstill, so ordering the EoM can be easily achieved by ticking the respective box.	NL ERTMS
52	12	Appendix A, 6.41.2, page 57	P	Emile Maarten	6.41.2 b) Why should the signaller order the driver driver to stand stil and perform an end of mission? The signaller will inform the driver to proceed in the opposite direction. No order is required. All the other instructions are obvious to proceeed in an opposite direction. Propose to delete the added section b.	R	Rule 6.41.2(b), to which the comment refers, defines a specific course of actions applicable in that situation, which is not assumed to be an emergency any more. However obvious, these actions still need to be listed, if only to set them apart from the emergency backward movement performed in PT mode (covered under 6.41.1a).	NL ERTMS
53	13	Appendix A, 6.47, page 62	P	Martin	Although rule 6.39 should be used tot allow the train to continue, this will not always be possible. As rule 6.39 indicates, this is only possible if all conditions for the route have been met, which might take some time. Proposal to change: ' <i>the signaller shall authorise the driver to pass the EOA by applying (rule "authorising the passing of an EOA" (section 6.39) ' to 'the signaller shall authorise the driver to pass the EOA by applying (rule "authorising the passing of an EOA" (section 6.39) when all conditions for the route have been met. '</i>	R	There is no need for the additional text. Rule 6.39 already states that before issuing the European Instruction authorising the driver to proceed, the signaller shall first ensure that all conditions for the route are met.	NL ERTMS
54	14	Appendix A, 6.48, page 62	P	Maarten	6.48. a) b) Why is only Level 2 mentioned? This should also apply for Level 3.	A	Corrected to "Level R", following the merger of L2 and L3.	NL ERTMS
55	15	Appendix A, 6.57, page 67	G	Maarten	This rule specifies the required actions in case of joining a train, but should a similar rule not be added to cover splitting of a train? In that case it is also necessary to change the train data.	R	A new rule 6.56 for train splitting was equally proposed in an earlier draft of App. A. Both rules 6.56 and 6.57 were finally decided to be withdrawn from App. A as already sufficiently covered by other App. A rules (e.g. 6.2, 6.4)	NL ERTMS
56	16	Appendix A, 6.57, page 67	G	Maarten	Is a generic instruction missing that if the mission has ended the driver shall perform an End of Mission? While this seems logical, Appendix A does not seem to mention this anywhere.	NWC	This has been considered as a trivial driver's task, not requiring a dedicated rule.	NL ERTMS

57	17	Appendix A, 6.58, page 67	P	Maarten	Why is this section required? This failure is already covered by the clause in appendix B.15: Failure of on-board equipment <i>The railway undertaking shall determine the cases in which a failure of an on-board equipment affects the running of the train.</i> Section 6.58 does not add anything to this clause. Proposal to delete 6.58.	NWC	This rule applies to (former) level 3 implementations. Although it can be considered to be covered by the generic App. B2.15 rule, it was decided to keep it in order to stress that it concerns implementations where the integrity needs to be confirmed, i.e. (former) level 3 systems.	NL ERTMS
58	18	Appendix A, 6.58, page 67	P	Maarten	This rule regarding TIMS failure also applies when starting in LNTC, L0, L1, and L2 areas as the train may enter a L3 area at a later time. Proposal: all levels shall be identified in the 'level' box.	R	The applicability of this rule to other levels in the way described in the comment is already implied. The reason for only mentioning level 3 (or level R as of a later draft) is because this rule is not relevant for operation in any other level.	NL ERTMS
59	19	Appendix A, 7.11, page 70	P	Emile	In busier networks, forced deregistration by a train driver could have serious consequences for traffic management. It is proposed to remove the second bullet. In that case the signaller can still request the other party to register based on rule 7.4.	R	The second bullet of rule 7.11 is only applicable if a driver is allowed to directly call another driver and ask him/her to deregister. 7.11 already allows for non-harmonised rules preventing the driver from initiating the process of calling another driver to sort out this situation, so there is no need to remove this bullet.	NL ERTMS
60	1	Appendix C2, 3	U	Emile	The added sentence 'In case of verbal communication of a European instruction, the signaller shall only read out the first and second identifier figure of every field. Where a third identifier figure also exists, its field qualifier will be read out instead.' is hard to interpret. It is advised to add an example to assure identical interpretation.	A	While processing the enhanced European Instructions for this revision cycle, a third identifier has been accepted for some fields (e.g. to indicate the unit of measurement) because it will be indispensable for digital transmission. In order to not add any complexity for vocal transmission, the use of this third identifier was decided to be limited to the digital transmission of the European Instructions only. However, based on your comment and considering that the transmission of EIs is not fully regulated, the rule in question will be removed completely from the TSI text and introduced into the Application Guide as recommended practice. Further harmonisation of the transmission process may be introduced if this rule proves to be adequate.	NL ERTMS
61	2	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	In this section it is stated that: 'This "x" may only be replaced by the number of the European instruction when transmitting this instruction digitally.' There seems to be no clear reason however why the identifier should not have an 'x' identifier when transferred digitally. It would be possible to replace the 'x' with the actual European Instruction number when a European Instruction is used in operational context, but in this case it would make sense to also do so in verbal communication. Proposal to remove this statement, or to allow replacing the x with the actual European Instruction number in all cases.	R	The goal of the identifier starting with "x" is to facilitate MS and IM in their ambition to create a single form for multiple European Instructions (e.g. one form for the issuing of a European Instruction 1, 2 or 7 as a permission for movements), in order to have one single tick box and fields which have the same identifier and content on different European Instructions. The replacing of the identifier "x" by the actual number of the European Instruction (1 - 9) has been reserved to digital forms and transmissions, because in case of the standard verbal radio transmission, a driver may only have the template of the European Instruction (as in the App. C.2) at his disposal instead of the national design of the European Instruction. Therefore, the "x" has to be kept on the national design of the European Instructions, except in case of a digital transmission. This will be made clear in the Application Guide.	NL ERTMS

62	3	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	European Instruction fields 1.20 and 2.11 (proceed in SH) seem to have an identical meaning. If this is not intended, then it would be better to more clearly define the difference between the two fields. If an identical meaning is intended, then it is proposed to rename both fields 'x.20'.	R	<p>The former European Instruction 1 edition 2019 had 2 options in the title (EOA or signal showing a stop aspect/stop indication) without any tick boxes to clarify whether the permission was for an EOA or a stop signal, while the former European Instruction 3 edition 2019 also had 2 options in the title (remain at standstill or carry out EOM) with 2 tick boxes (3.10 and 3.11) to clarify the obligation.</p> <p>Given this inconsistency, we have introduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the harmonised logic to reserve the numbering .10 and .11 to clarify the type of permission or obligation on the new European Instructions 1, 2 and 7, always preceded by the actual number of the European Instruction instead of "x";</li> <li>- the wording "Is allowed to" for the tick boxes indicating a permission on the new European Instructions 1, 2 and 7.</li> </ul> <p>So although both instructions 1.20 and 2.11 (and also 7.11) essentially require the driver to proceed in SH, the above mentioned consistent principles for the numbering of tick boxes and the wording of a permission prevail.</p> <p>This will be made clear in the Application Guide.</p>	NL ERTMS
63	4	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	It seems odd that European Instruction 2 does have the fields x.90/x.91/x.92 for examining the line, while European Instructions 1 and 7 do not have this option. It does make sense to limit these fields to these European Instructions that result in driving under restrictions (European Instruction 5, 6, 9) but that would imply that these fields x.90/x.91/x.92 should be removed from European Instruction 2. If it is intended to provide these fields in European Instruction 2, then one would also expect them in European Instruction 1 and 7.	A	<p>On the former European Instructions edition 2019, the tick box and fields for the examining of the line were only present on the European Instructions 2, 5, 6 and 9. During the enhancement of the European Instructions, no proposal to extend their availability to other European Instructions has been received.</p> <p>On the former European Instruction 2 edition 2019 and the new European Instruction 2 edition 2022, the examining of the line can be necessary in the event of an emergency that triggers the transition to the mode TRIP (i.e. by the Unconditional Emergency Stop). In such a case, the restarting after a TRIP with the instruction to examine the line may be useful.</p> <p>While no such use can directly be foreseen for the European Instructions 1 and 7, it is agreed to include fields x.90/x.91/x.92 into these EIs as well, considering also that if collective forms are used, these fields will already be included as they are used in other EIs. MS and IM can anyway choose to keep them or not on their national version of the EIs, under the provisions of section 6 of App. C.2.</p>	NL ERTMS
64	5	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	European Instruction 3 offers a new field 3.20: 'Delete the available MA'. This seems to be a different action than EoM, as that is referred to in field 3.15. But which action should the driver perform based on this field? Should the driver use Override EoA? In that case it seems better to make this explicit.	R	<p>The new tick box 3.20 with the instruction to delete the available MA has been introduced to facilitate the harmonised rule in the new Appendix A v5.09 Section 6.33.1 (B) of the TSI OPE 2022 uploaded for public consultation, without any mention in this Appendix A on how the MA should be deleted. Some RUs prefer the EOM since "Override" also enables the train to proceed, which would incur some risk.</p>	NL ERTMS
65	6	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	In the format for European Instructions, the fields 5.67 and 5.68 seem intended to indicate if the speed restrictions are also visible on lineside signalling. These fields could also be interpreted however as the instruction to observe lineside signalling, which is probably not intended. Proposal to change the text above 5.67 and 5.68 to 'Speed restriction also indicated by lineside boards'.	A	<p>The former European Instruction 5 edition 2019 only mentioned "Lineside boards - Yes or No" and for consistency in the MS where these instructions edition 2019 are already in use, there was no proposal during the enhancement of the European Instructions to alter this wording.</p> <p>The proposed change of the wording into "Speed restriction indicated by lineside boards" would indeed eliminate the possible misinterpretation stated in the comment and is therefore retained.</p>	NL ERTMS

66	7	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	If it is deemed necessary to allow the use of Override EoA as a part of European Instruction 7, it would be best to make this explicit. Refer to Appendix A section 6.2.4 stating: 'use the override function if requested'. This request should be a part of European Instruction 7, but the current format only includes field 7.20 which allows 'passing an EoA'. In the proposed definition of EoA this could also be a stop marker board which could be passed without the need to use Override EoA. It is proposed to add an additional field 7.21 'using override EoA' that can be ticked or left open.	R	<p>"Override" is by default always required to pass an EoA, even when there is no technical protection in place (e.g. "stop if in SR" balise) requiring the override procedure. This has been agreed as a high-level principle for safe operation; section 6.39 of Appendix A v5.09 of TSI OPE 2022 uploaded for public consultation reflects this requirement:          "To pass the EOA, the driver shall:          - [...],          - use the override function,          - [...]"</p> <p>It is therefore not necessary to repeat it in EI 7, and definitely not appropriate to make it optional under a new field 7.21.</p> <p>The wording in section 6.2.4 of App. A (quoted in the comment) "(use the override function) if requested" is only applicable when the train is authorised to start from a location other than in front of a stop marker. In that case, no "override" is needed to start (unless the train is not in SR mode yet but the driver should then know how to get into SR).          Field 7.20 actually serves then to authorise the driver to pass the first EoA he/she will encounter <u>after</u> having started from a distance in rear of it, as explicitly stated in section 6.2.4 of the new Appendix A v5.09 of TSI OPE 2022 uploaded for public consultation: "If the train is not located at an ETCS stop marker this authorisation is valid from the current location of the train to the first ETCS stop marker in the direction of travel. <u>If European Instruction 7 allows this ETCS stop marker to be passed, the driver is allowed to pass it using the</u></p>	NL ERTMS
67	8	Appendix C2, 6	P	Emile	In the format for European Instructions, the fields 9.67 and 9.68 seem intended to indicate if the power supply restrictions are also visible on lineside signalling. These fields could also be interpreted however as the instruction to observe lineside signalling, which is probably not intended. Proposal to change the text above 9.67 and 9.68 to 'Power supply restriction also indicated by lineside boards'.	A	<p>The former European Instruction 9 edition 2019 only mentioned "Lineside boards - Yes or No" and for consistency in the MS where these instructions edition 2019 are already in use, there was no proposal during the enhancement of the European Instructions to alter this wording.</p> <p>The proposed change of the wording into "Power supply restriction indicated by lineside boards" would indeed eliminate the possible misinterpretation stated in the comment and is therefore retained.</p>	NL ERTMS
68	9	Appendix D3	G	Emile	The new Appendix D3 is a useful addition to the TSI OPE. In current operation, it sometimes leads to discussions as to what ERTMS related information the infra manager should provide. This Appendix will help to avoid these discussions.	NWC	<p>Many thanks for this very much appreciated feedback.          This Appendix D3 may be complemented with additional information in the future.</p>	NL ERTMS
69	1	TSI OPE, Art 4.2.1.2.1	M	NSA SE	The text "Predefined messages and forms shall at least..." should perhaps be "Predefined messages and Operational Instructions shall at least...", bearing in mind that "forms" in the preceding bullet point has been changed to "Operational Instructions".	A (part.)	"Operational Instructions" was added for clarity but "forms" was maintained to make it clear that the provision concerns the actual (physical) forms of the operational instructions.	NSA SE
70	2	TSI OPE, Art 4.4.3 and 4.2.2.1.3.2	U	NSA SE	The text in art. 4.4.3 has been updated to better reflect the current situation regarding the AMOC:s. NSA SE agrees that it might be misleading if the old text were to be left unchanged. However, the text in art. 4.2.2.1.3.2 seems also to be outdated, as was the old text in art. 4.4.3, since it refers to reports that were to be delivered in 2020. Should the text in art. 4.2.2.1.3.2 also be updated in order to reflect the current situation regarding reflective plates?	A	The final OPE TSI draft will be updated to reflect the obsolescence of these clauses.	NSA SE
71	3	TSI OPE, Art 4.6.2.2	U	NSA SE	Is it appropriate to use "forms" in the bullet point "- complete the <i>forms</i> associated with the use of the Book of Operational Instructions" or should it rather be "- complete the <i>instructions</i> associated with the use...?"	R	This particular clause is not about the competence of the driver to understand the instructions provided to him/her in the IM's language; this is covered in the first two sub-bullets of 4.6.2.2a. This third sub-bullet is about the driver's capacity to properly write down the instructions received on the actual forms provided for that purpose.	NSA SE
72	4	TSI OPE, Appendix D3, Note 3	M	NSA SE	In note 3 a reference is made to "Item 7". However, it seems not to exist an item 7 in the table that follows.	A	"7" referred to a former numbering of this list. Error corrected to "1.5"	NSA SE
79	1	Appendix B 18)	G	Denis Garnier	Amendment proposal: Replace "is/are at a standstill and will remain at a standstill" by "will not move towards the train entering the occupied track".	A	<p>Although this proposal was never brought up while processing this rule, it is sensible and therefore tentatively accepted for the final draft.          It will be subject to the sector's consent, once the final draft is made public.</p>	NSA FR

89	1	Appendix B, 14 (1)	P	TD	<p>It is proposed to add the text "or using any other available means" to the end of point (1) below. Furthermore, in particular:</p> <p>(1) Any driver made aware of a danger to their train shall stop as soon as it is safe to do so and alert the signaller immediately to the danger using the emergency call or using any other available means.</p> <p>(2) Any signaller made aware of a danger shall alert all drivers as appropriate through an emergency call or using any other available means.</p>	NWC	<p>Unlike the signaller who may have several alternative means available to notify drivers and/or stop their trains, drivers only have the emergency call.</p> <p>It is clarified though that by "emergency call" all emergency communications are to be understood (e.g. the dedicated GSM-R Railway Emergency Call function, a vocal announcement "mayday-mayday-mayday" or any other equivalent action).</p>	NSA IE
99	1	Appendix C, point C2, section 1. page 56	G / U	NSA Belgium	<p>The last sentence in this part was added: "Whenever the signaller needs to issue an operational instruction for which a European instruction exists, the signaller shall use this European instruction."</p> <p>In the TSI OPE WP this was briefly explained as follows "•Section 1 – last paragraph that was added in the proposal: The WP asked for the clarification of the scope of this sentence. It was indicated that in some countries specific national instructions for class B systems are already in use. ERA informed that in cases where national instruction covers additional aspects than already included in EI, such national instruction may be used. In case all national fields are covered by EI, EI needs to be used."</p> <p>In our opinion this is not a good reason to add this sentence, certainly not on this place in the text. At the beginning of C2, section 1 there is already "Railway undertakings and infrastructure managers shall use European instructions in the communication procedure in the following cases: n°1 to n° 9" and further in the text there is also "The use of the European instructions numbers 1-5 and 7 are is mandatory for ETCS, in accordance with the rules of the Appendix A".</p> <p>This all together makes it very confusing. Please take these 3 sentences together and explain once when which instruction (European or national) is mandatory to use, and when they are not.</p>	NWC	<p>In principle, EIs should replace pre-existing national operational instructions with the same purpose.</p> <p>When elaborating the EIs in the multidisciplinary Task Force, a great effort was made to accommodate all national requirements so that there would be no more need to use the national version of an operational instruction.</p> <p>In light of this, the clarification provided in the OPE WP meeting has only a theoretical value, since this instance should in principle never be encountered.</p> <p>If however, despite this effort, a national operational instruction contains more information than its EI counterpart, the IMs are encouraged for the sake of operational interoperability to use the "additional information" field of the EI instead of reverting to the national operational instruction.</p> <p>The use of the national instruction instead of the EI with the similar content should therefore only be limited to very few exceptional cases, duly justified.</p> <p>These will be made explicit in the Application Guide too.</p>	NSA BE
100	2	appendix C, point C2, section 6, page 58	U / P	NSA Belgium	<p>We have a concern with the last sentence added (just before the instructions themselves): "<i>The infrastructure manager and the railway undertaking may add guidance on how to fill in and read the forms of the European instructions, under the condition that this guidance is not part of the communication procedure.</i>"</p> <p>What guidance are we talking about? It is not clear whether this is a part of the "Book of Operational Instructions" or this is rather an internal guidance of the IM /RU.</p> <p><b>Proposal: It is maybe better to put this sentence in the guidance of the TSI OPE, and explain this a little bit more. In that case it would also be possible to explain, why this cannot be part of the communication procedure.</b></p>	NWC	<p>The main principles for when and how to use the EIs are listed under App. C2.</p> <p>All operational actors (esp. signallers and drivers) are expected to know these (each party (IM/RU) shall ensure that its concerned staff will be trained on the use of the EIs).</p> <p>The "guidance" in question is essentially the "user instructions" appearing at the bottom of each EI. These instructions were present in the former ERTMS Written Orders (part of the OPE App. A until version 4) but were removed from the EIs when these were introduced under Reg. 2019/773.</p> <p>These instructions are now reinstated in the enhanced EIs. Yet, they need not appear on the actual forms used by the signallers and drivers and they will certainly not be read out when transmitting the EI (this is to be understood by "the guidance is not part of the communication procedure").</p>	NSA BE
101	3	appendix C, point C2, section 8, page 78	G / P	NSA Belgium	<p>We have a concern with the following sentence: "the way of delivering each operational instruction, <u>including whether it is allowed to be written down by the driver while running</u>", especially the last underlined part of this sentence.</p> <p>In the guidance of the TSI OPE, page 67, the following is explained "<i>In principle when it is necessary for an operational instruction to be written down by the train driver, the train must be at standstill. However, the RU and IM may jointly undertake a risk assessment, which could, as a result, define the conditions under which it is safe to deviate from this principle. The results of this risk assessment should set out the controls necessary (i.e. procedures) in the SMS of the IM and RU, which will ensure safe operation.</i>"</p> <p>We therefore think the added sentence is not clear enough, in case the reader doesn't read the guidance of the TSI OPE. <b>We would thus like the underlined part of the sentence above to be removed from the TSI OPE</b> (and possibly moved to the guidance). It is important that every party that is making decisions about <u>how</u> the instructions should be delivered understands that, for safety reasons, in principle, when it is necessary for an operational instruction to be written down by the train driver, the train must be at standstill.</p>	NWC	<p>The clarification provided in the guidance is in line with the App. C2 clause in question:</p> <p>If the IM and the RUs can agree that it is safe for a EI to be written down by the driver while running, the IM can include this information in the Book of Operational Instructions handed over to the RUs (it can be reasonably assumed that the IM will apply the same principle for all RUs operating in its network).</p> <p>In any case, even when a EI is allowed to be written down while running, nothing prevents the driver from stopping before doing so.</p>	NSA BE

102	4	appendix C, point C2, section 8, page 78	M	NSA Belgium	<p>The last (underlined) part of the last sentence of section 8 was added: "<i>These shall be collected by the railway undertaking and given to the driver. It is recommended that railway undertakings operating in more than one IM network provide to the driver the generic forms of the European instructions, even when some fields are not used by some infrastructure managers on the networks of which the railway undertaking will operate.</i>"</p> <p>We do not agree with the added part and therefore we would like to have this underlined part removed. Arguments:</p> <p>1) it is up the the RU to make a risk assessment regarding to their specific situation. Then the RU can take risk based decisions about the way they want provide information to their train drivers.</p> <p>2) in a legislation using the wording "it is recommended" adds nothing.</p>	R	<p>The information will always be provided to the drivers in the same structured way, using the unique field identifiers of each EI, as explained in detail in the App. C2 clauses.</p> <p>The use of the same "full" EI forms by the drivers will allow operational interoperability and will lead to less mental load for them, compared to the use of different national or even RU-specific variants of the EIs, each with a different subset of the "full" EI.</p> <p>This will therefore be mandated, since indeed "recommended" has no legal value in a TSI text.</p> <p>It is noted that this requirement only concerns the RUs; IMs can use their national "variants" of the EIs as they will never need to use the extra fields.</p>	NSA BE
103		Appendix D1, table, page 82, subject "train detection systems"	M	NSA Belgium	Please add a cross in de column "train level". There are some limitations in number of vehicles (so on train level) for some train detection systems.	A	"X" added in the "train level" column	NSA BE
104	5	Appendix D3, introductory notes, page 95	M	NSA Belgium	<p>Note 3 says: "<i>Item 7 lists the minimum set of ETCS National Values required to be made available to the railway undertakings. Infrastructure managers shall also provide upon request to a railway undertaking the complete set of National Values, e.g. to serve as default values for ERTMS/ETCS on-board units operating locally.</i>"</p> <p><b>We think this "7" is a mistake. There should be "1.5".</b></p>	A	"7" referred by mistake to a former numbering of this list. It has now been corrected to "1.5"	NSA BE
105		Appendix D3	U	NSA Belgium	There is no explanation in this appendix about the way the IM should provide the information to the RU's. Will the IM be able to choose the way of communication of this information to the RU's? Maybe it is a good idea to clarify this in de guidance?	A	<p>This is not regulated, similar to App. D2.</p> <p>The IM can in principle decide how to communicate this information to the RUs.</p> <p>Both appendices (D2 &amp; D3) are only meant to list what shall be communicated, not how. This can be clarified in the Application Guide.</p>	NSA BE
106	6	Translation problems in the French version of TSI OPE	G	NSA Belgium	<p>For several European instructions in the published OPE TSI 2019/773 we have found problems with translations.</p> <p>The French terminology of the following EIs is not the good translation:</p> <p>a. Formulations that are not adapted to the formulations for the languages used in Belgium, such as:</p> <p>i. <b>IE 6</b> : there is « Obligation de marcher à vue », there should be « <b>Obligation de circuler en marche à vue</b> »</p> <p>Explanation: "Marche à vue" is a noun in French used as title of COR n° 9. "Marcher à vue" is currently not an existing word as a verb in French, but rather "circuler en marche à vue" is used in French. Therefore we would prefer that the title of EI6 is changed (in the same way as used in the first sentence of COR n°9).</p> <p>ii. <b>IE 2, 5, 6 and 9 field x.50</b> : there is « Présenter ses conclusions à » there should be « <b>Faire part de ses constatations</b> ».</p> <p>b. Formulations that do not fully correspond to the formulations in English, such as:</p> <p>i. IE 7 there is : « Autorisation de se remettre en marche en SR après préparation d'un mouvement de train », there should be « <b>Autorisation de se mettre en marche en SR après la préparation du mouvement</b> ».</p> <p>ii. <b>IE 7 field 7.20</b> there is : « Est autorisé à franchir une fin d'autorisation de mouvement à », there should be « <b>est autorisé à franchir une EoA au ...</b> ».</p> <p><b>I would like to inform you that we have had a discussion with the French NSA on this matter, and they agree with our proposals.</b></p>	NWC	<p>ERA does not manage the translations of any TSI.</p> <p>There is also no legal basis for intervening and/or coordinating any such translations.</p> <p>Linguistic issues should be addressed to the translation services of the Commission and should be coordinated by the sector and authorities at national level, before the final TSI text is published, to prevent inconsistencies.</p> <p>The involvement of NSAs as well as their cooperation among states using the same language have been encouraged also by ERA.</p>	NSA BE
111	1	OPE TSI Annex, Table of contents	U	PH	Appendix D3 is missing in the tyable of contents	A	Added	DB Cargo Scandinavia
112	2	OPE TSI Appendix D3	M	PH	Reference in note 3. There is no item 7. Is it item 1.5 that is meant?	A	<p>Assumption is correct.</p> <p>"7" referred to a former numbering of this list. Error corrected to "1.5"</p>	DB Cargo Scandinavia
121	1	Rule §6.55.2 (point 1)	P	1	<p>Add in the rule 6.55.2, the following <u>symbols for skipping the stop point</u> of the document ERA_ERTMS_015560 v3.6.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skip Stopping Point Inactive: <i>ATO_17.bmp</i></li> <li>• Skip Stopping Point requested by ATO-TS: <i>ATO_18.bmp</i></li> <li>• Skip Stopping Point requested by driver: <i>ATO_19.bmp</i></li> </ul> <p>The symbols would be according with the ETCS Driver Machine Interface document already included in Annex A of CCS TSI.</p>	NWC	<p>When elaborating rule 6.55 it was decided to not detail all possible DMI indications related to ATO unless linked to critical operations. Skipping a stopping point has not been considered as such an operation.</p> <p>This function will be covered in the Generic ETCS driver's handbook, which will be updated after the new CCS TSI enters into force. The driver is expected to know how to operate these controls. The App. A rule only states the conditions for the driver to do so.</p> <p>To be noted that the same principle applied to the complement of rule 6.12 for DAS operation.</p>	NSA ES

122	2	Rule §6.55.2 (point 3)	P	1	<p>Add in the rule 6.55.2, the following <u>door opening and closing symbols</u> of the document ERA_ERTMS_015560 v3.6.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request driver to open doors on both sides: <i>ATO_10.bmp</i></li> <li>• Request driver to open doors on left: <i>ATO_11.bmp</i></li> <li>• Request driver to open doors on right: <i>ATO_12.bmp</i></li> <li>• Doors are open: <i>ATO_13.bmp</i></li> <li>• Request driver to close doors: <i>ATO_14.bmp</i></li> <li>• Doors are being closed by ATO: <i>ATO_15.bmp</i></li> <li>• Doors are closed: <i>ATO_16.bmp</i></li> </ul> <p>It is according to the similar procedure for driver as rule number 6.20. <i>Passing a section with lowered pantograph(s)</i>, and the symbols would be according with the ETCS Driver Machine Interface document already included in Annex A of CCS TSI.</p>	NWC	When elaborating rule 6.55 it was decided to not detail all possible DMI indications related to ATO unless linked to critical operations. Operating the doors has not been considered as such an operation. This function will be covered in the Generic ETCS driver's handbook, which will be updated after the new CCS TSI enters into force. The driver is expected to know how to operate these controls. The App. A rule only states the conditions for the driver to do so. To be noted that the same principle applied to the complement of rule 6.12 for DAS operation.	NSA ES
131	1	TSI OPE, incl. App A .....	G	1	As FOT participates in the WP TSI OPE (Bruno Revelin) and OH ERTMS (Marcel Hanhart) there are only few additional comments in the framework of this public consultation.	NWC		NSA CH
132	2	4.2.2.1.3.2 rear end signal (Freight trains)	P	1	The general "context" text under this point could be deleted (if coherence allows) or put in past "tense". For instance: "Reports : At the latest by 30 September 2020, the concerned Member States <b>had to ( instead of shall)</b> deliver to the Commission reports on their use of reflective plates..." . "Cooperation with neighbouring countries": In the meantime MS concerned , in particular at the request of RUs, <b>had to perform ( instead of shall)</b> an assessment... which <b>had to be based (instead of shall)</b> ... This assessment <b>had to be completed (instead of shall)</b> ...etc. "Phasing out: By 31 March 2021, the Commission <b>had to (instead of shall)</b> , on the basis of a recommendation from the Agency...etc.	NWC	The OPE TSI text will be updated to reflect the obsolescence of these provisions.	NSA CH
133	3	App B / B1	P	1	Add a 7th FOP: "Safety must never be dependent on establishing a communication link." Without this principle many operational processes in many European countries may have a kind of safety gap.		To be processed in the next revision cycle. A CR should be submitted.	NSA CH
134	4	App C / general	P	1	As the requirement for quality (safety) of transmission varies depending on the meaning and effect of the content, the content of a transmission should be categorised and assigned to a procedure depending on its importance. A possible categorisation may be for instance (no concrete text proposal): A message shall be transmitted, depending on its safety relevance, as follows: - protocol-required (logging) or - acknowledgement-required (acknowledge) or - informative (informing). This proposal may need further discussions in the future before implementing in App. C of TSI OPE.	NWC	Comment not mature enough to be considered at this stage. To be processed in the next revision cycle.	NSA CH
135	5	App C1 / 3 (communication rules)	P	1	Add as a new number 3.3 (or in another way): "Messages are to be formulated logically and positively." This rule helps to avoid misunderstandings in oral communication.	R	This is covered in the SMS requirements (EU REG 2018/762 req. 4.4)	NSA CH
136	6	App C2 / 2 (last paragraphe)	P	1	"Notwithstanding the above provision, a European instruction n° 3 can also be revoked by a European instruction n° 1, 2 or 7 without requiring a dedicated European instruction n° 4." Our proposal is to add EI no 8 ("... European instruction no 1, 2, 7 or 8 without ..."). In case of an accident or an unclear situation at a level crossing it may be necessary to issue an EI no 3. After clarification of the situation it may be that an EI no 8 has to be issued. In this case, it should also be possible to go without EI no 4.	R	EI 8 cannot be assumed to provide a permission for movement. If this assumption would be accepted, then other EIs (e.g. EI 5, 6 or 9) could also be considered to provide a permission for movement, given the wording "run". EIs 5, 6, 8 and 9 are meant to define the modalities for a movement, not the permission to start it, which is rightfully a much stricter instruction. If the train needs to be authorised to restart after being stopped before a LX via a EI 3, then either EI 4 (if the driver is still in possession of some movement authority, technical or operational, allowing him/her to proceed) or EI 1 (if the driver does not have a movement authority to continue) can be used.	NSA CH
137	1	Core TSI OPE - 4.2.2.1.3.2.	M	1	The sections about reports and phasing out should be deleted/updated as they point at things in the past	A	The final OPE TSI draft will be updated to properly reflect the obsolescence of these clauses.	NSA DK
138	2	Core TSI OPE - Appendix A	M	1	Should point at the correct version of the document if this is not included in the core TSI as mentioned.	NWC	For TSI 2022, App. A will be integrated into the OPE TSI core text. The version number will anyway be quoted separately for easier traceability of the evolution of its provisions.	NSA DK
139	3	Core TSI OPE - Appendix B2 rule 18	P	1	It is a pity that the text is limited to a station. For Denmark, we don't have stations and the principle is used for all trains entering an occupied section all over the network. And in addition there is not one common definition of station in Europe. Proposal to change to: Entering an occupied track section	NWC	This proposal has been raised in the ERTMS Operational Harmonisation wg of ERA and dismissed because it would create larger issues with permissive driving and the authorisation to pass an EoA on the open line, where trains are supposed to always be oriented and run in the same nominal direction.	NSA DK

140	4	Core TSI OPE - Appendix C2 point 6	P		1	Last paragraph says: " <i>The infrastructure manager and the railway undertaking may add guidance on how to fill in and read the forms of the European instructions, under the condition that this guidance is not part of the communication procedure.</i> " Should be operational instructions instead of European instructions as the forms have to filled in and read?	NWC	The "guidance" in question is essentially the "user instructions" appearing at the bottom of each EI. These instructions were present in the former ERTMS Written Orders (part of the OPE App. A until version 4) but were removed from the EIs when these were introduced under Reg. 2019/773. They are now reinstated in the enhanced EIs. Non-harmonised (national) operational instructions are not covered by this provision, being out of scope: App. C2 defines the conditions governing the coexistence of EIS and national operational instructions, yet without prescribing how the latter shall be composed or transmitted.	NSA DK
141	5	Core TSI OPE - Appendix C2	M		1	The old European instructions should be deleted.	NWC	The former EIs have been deleted in the OPE TSI draft. This is shown in track-change mode, like all other changes to the document. The EIs being embedded pdf documents, however, their deletion appears as a single horizontal red line over the entire EI form.	NSA DK
142	6	Core TSI OPE - Appendix D1 (first box)	P		1	Should the reference to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland be deleted?	NWC	Reference to UK will be removed however reference to Northern Ireland will remain owing to specific provisions of the UK withdrawal agreement, in order to safeguard cross-border operations between Ireland and Northern Ireland.	NSA DK
143	7	Appendix A - 5.2	P		1	Proposal to delete 5.2 as this will not influence the numbering.	NWC	This is a place holder for a future set of Radio principles	NSA DK
144	8	Appendix A	G		1	When referring to other rules sometimes the name of the starts with a capital letter (6.14 and 6.57) and sometimes not.	NWC	Comment not understood. From the editorial point of view, reference to other rules is consistent.	NSA DK
145	9	Appendix A - 6.14	P		1	Current proposal: in ETCS level 1 without trackside signals, in ETCS level 2 without trackside signals, and in ETCS level 3, when approaching the next ETCS stop marker, inform the signaller and apply Rule "Authorizing the passing of an EoA" (section 6.39) unless already authorized to pass this ETCS stop marker by means of a European Instruction. The stopping of the train is missing. Proposal: in ETCS level 1 without trackside signals, in ETCS level 2 without trackside signals, and in ETCS level 3, when approaching the next ETCS stop marker, <b>stop at the ETCS stop marker</b> , inform the signaller and apply Rule "Authorizing the passing of an EoA" (section 6.39) unless already authorized to pass this ETCS stop marker by means of a European Instruction.	R	Mandating a stop at every SM invalidates the possibility offered by the specifications to override while running (e.g. when already in possession of an authorisation to pass this SM). It can therefore not be accepted as a general rule. Any IM wishing to not allow this practice is free to set the relevant national value V_NVALLOVOVTRP to 0, so that a stop is imposed in such situations.	NSA DK
146	10	Appendix A - 6.29	M		1	Slippery rail is written with first capital letter and then without.	A	Corrected	NSA DK
147	11	Appendix A - 7.6	P		1	Should the rule referred be 8.1?	NWC	Not only. A failure of a self test can also occur e.g. when a trainset needs to change orientation in an intermediate station of its route, after having entered service. Assuming another radio system is used (e.g. in double trainsets), it may happen that the self-test of that radio fails. Rule 8.2 will then have to apply, hence the reference to the entire App. B2 rule 8.	NSA DK
148	1	Core TSI OPE	G	EIM OPE		The updated Application Guide version 6 for this draft TSI OPE 2022 for public consultation is not yet available, though it may contain very important clarifications of this TSI OPE 2022. In order to ensure that the content of this Application Guide will match with the amended rules in the final TSI OPE 2022, we would like to have the opportunity to review this Application Guide before its publication.	NWC	The Application Guide will be processed after the OPE TSI is voted. This processing will be done in the OPE WP of ERA, where EIM is represented.	EIM
149	2	Core TSI OPE (p 16) / Section 4.2.2.1.3.2	G	EIM OPE		Section 4.2.2.1.3.2 of the current TSI OPE (EU) 2019/773 has been amended by Regulation (EU) 2021/2238 of 15 <sup>th</sup> December of 2021 regarding the rear end signal of a freight train, but the draft TSI OPE 2022 for public consultation has not yet been amended in accordance to this Regulation (EU) 2021/2238.	A	Neither Reg. 2020/778 nor Reg. 2021/2238 are reflected in this draft, which is based on the Reg. 2019/773 text. The quoted Regulations will be properly reflected in the final draft.	EIM
150	3	Core TSI OPE (p 42) / Section 7.2.2.2	M	EIM OPE		While Northern Ireland has been deleted in the title, it is still present in the rule itself.	NWC	Northern Ireland enjoys a specific regime to ensure cross-border operations with Ireland. This is part of a special arrangement for Northern Ireland within the UK withdrawal agreement.	EIM
151	4	Core TSI OPE (p 42) / Section 7.2.2.3	M	EIM OPE		While the United Kingdom has been deleted in the title, it is still present in the rule itself.	A	Deleted	EIM
152	5	Core TSI OPE (p 44) / Appendix A	M	EIM OPE		The reference to the Appendix A for ERTMS in the draft TSI OPE 2022 for public consultation has not yet been amended to the future version 6 of this Appendix A to the future TSI OPE.	NWC	In the OPE TSI 2022 the entire App. A (ver. 6) will be integrated into the TSI OPE body text, so this reference will no longer appear there. The version number of the new App. A (6) will however be mentioned for traceability purposes.	EIM

153	6	Core TSI OPE (p 44) / Appendix A	G	EIM OPE	For the future TSI OPE (revision 2022), we strongly insist to alter the status of the Appendix A from being a "technical document" (only available in English) to a fullworthy Appendix to the Core TSI OPE (translated into all European Union languages), as committed by the EC representative during the ERA OPE WP on 15 <sup>th</sup> February 2022.	A	In the OPE TSI 2022 the full App. A (ver. 6) will be integrated into the TSI OPE body text and will consequently be translated into all European Languages.	EIM
154	7	Appendix A v5.11 (p 19) Section 5.1.11	P	EIM OPE	In the TSI OPE draft 2022, the following is stated in section 5.1.11 of App. A v5.11 for an ETCS Location Marker: <i>"The driver shall stop on the approach to a ETCS Location Marker:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI , or</i></li> <li>• <i>when running without an MA if he has received a specific order by the signaller."</i></li> </ul> If it is technically allowed to have an EOA at an ETCS location marker <u>without</u> having a release speed indicated on the DMI, the future App. A v6 of the TSI OPE 2022 should take this technical possibility into account instead of excluding it.  Therefore, we propose to alter the wording in the section 5.1.11 of App. A v5.11 as indicated in <b>blue</b> : <i>"The driver shall stop on the approach to a ETCS Location Marker:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA <b>even</b> when a release speed indication is <b>not</b> displayed on the DMI , or</i></li> <li>• <i>when running without an MA if he has received a specific order by the signaller."</i></li> </ul>	NWC	Considering the diversity of views submitted over the proposed changes to sections 5.1.10 and 5.1.11, ERA decided to revert to the wording of App. A ver. 5. It will therefore be up to the driver to decide when exactly to start looking outside in order to identify the SM/LM matching the EoA displayed on his/her DMI. With proper trackside engineering, there should be no ambiguity for the driver on which physical EoA (marked by SM/LM) corresponds to the EoA calculated by the OBU.	EIM
155	8	Appendix A v5.11 (p 54) Section 6.34.2	P	EIM OPE	Given the rules in App. A v5.11 that only foresee the mandatory use of EI 1, 2, 3, 4 or 7, this rule in section 6.34.2 of App. A v5.11 extends the mandatory use of the European Instruction to all available European Instructions in App. C2.  In order to limit the mandatory use of the European Instructions to the specific situations covered in App. A v5.11, we propose to amend the rule in section 6.34.2 of the future App. A v6 of the TSI OPE 2022 as follows and indicated in <b>red</b> and <b>blue</b> :  <i>"To restart trains that have not been tripped and if instructions and / or restrictions are necessary, the signaller shall issue <b>operational instructions to the drivers, by means of</b> <del>an</del> European Instruction <del>(s)</del> <b>if mandatory</b> ."</i>	R	The current wording is sufficiently generic to cover all possible operational situations using European Instructions. The proposed amendment would over-complicate the rule without bringing any added value.	EIM
156	9	Appendix A v5.11 (p 61) Sections 6.41.1	P	EIM OPE	moving backwards in the mode Post Trip as " <i>any other action as necessary to avoid harm or loss</i> ", as well as the obligation for the driver to alert the signaller by means of a radio emergency call. Given this amended harmonised Rule 14 of App. B2, we propose to completely replace the section 6.41.2 a) for an emergency after a Trip, as well as to amend the section 6.41.1 of the future App. A v6 of the TSI OPE 2022, in order to ensure harmonised operations (in ETCS and Class B systems), as follows:  <b>6.41.1 Immediate measures</b> <i>When the following symbol is displayed:</i> <i>the driver shall assume that there is a potentially dangerous situation.</i> <i>When the following symbol is displayed with a flashing frame:</i> <i>the driver shall acknowledge and apply the brakes.</i>  <b>a) In case of an emergency</b> <i>When the following symbol is displayed:</i> <i>the driver shall apply Appendix B2 Rule 14.</i>  <b>b) In all other cases</b> <i>When the following symbol is displayed:</i> <i>the driver shall inform the signaller about the situation and follow any instructions given.</i>  If this proposal for the complete replacement of this section 6.41.1 of the future App. A v6 of the TSI OPE 2022 is rejected, we propose to introduce at least the referral to the rule 14 of App. B2 in order to take "Immediate actions to prevent danger to trains", as follows and indicated in <b>red</b> and <b>blue</b> : <b>6.41.1 Immediate measures</b> <i>When the following symbol is displayed:</i> <i>the driver shall assume that there is a potentially dangerous situation and he <del>shall perform all actions necessary to avoid or reduce the effect of this situation</del> <b>apply Appendix B2 Rule 14</b> . This may include moving the train / shunting movement backwards.</i>	R	App. A rule 6.41 deals with a much more specific operational situation than the generic one under App. B2 rule 14, even in its new wording. The actions defined in App. A rule 6.41 are by consequence focused on this particular situation and as such they are much more effective than the generic provisions of App. B2 rule 14. For instance, although covered by the generic wording of App. B2 Rule 14 "any other action as necessary to avoid harm or loss", it is too far-reaching to assume that moving backwards in the mode Post Trip is the exact action the driver will perform when applying this rule. Not applying this action can however be safety-critical. Furthermore, even without referring to App. B2 rule 14 from App. A rule 6.41, the signaller will be eventually notified (under App. A 6.41.1 -a and -b.). The signaller will then apply App. B2 rule 14 anyway, since the conditions for this will be met (danger to trains).	EIM

157	10	Appendix A v5.11 (p 73) Section 6.59	P	EIM OPE	<p>Given the field of application of Rule 15 of App. B2 for all failures of on-board equipment, including the odometer, and given the replacement of the "non-harmonised rules" for many on-board failures by a referral to this Rule 15 of App. B2 in the future App. A v6 of the TSI OPE 2022, we propose to align the new rule for an impaired odometer with the other on-board failures by referring to Rule 15 of App. B2, as follows:</p> <p><b>6.59 MANAGING AN ODOMETER FAILURE</b></p> <p><i>Levels 0, 1, R, NTC</i></p> <p><i>When the following text message is displayed:</i>  <i>"odometer impaired"</i>  <i>the driver shall apply Appendix B2 rule 15.</i></p>	A		EIM
158	11	Appendix B2 (p 48) / Section 11	P	EIM OPE	<p>In ETCS, the driver will always run on sight in the mode SR (or SH) after having received permission to pass a signal showing a stop aspect/indication, unless he has been exempted from running on sight by means of the exemption of European Instruction 1 to that effect.</p> <p>In Class B systems however, there is not yet a harmonised rule in Appendix B.2 for the mandatory running on sight, aligned with the provisions for ETCS. In order to harmonise the use of European Instruction 1 for ETCS as well as for Class B systems, we propose the following amendment (text in blue) to rule 11 of Appendix B2:</p> <p><b>11. AUTHORISATION TO PASS A SIGNAL SHOWING A STOP ASPECT/INDICATION</b></p> <p><i>The driver of the train concerned shall have authorisation to pass a signal showing stop aspect/indication.</i>  <i>When giving authorisation, the signaller shall give the driver any instructions concerning the movement.</i>  <i>The driver shall:</i>  <i>- run on sight if the permission has been given by means of European Instruction No 1, unless exempted from doing so, and</i>  <i>- apply the instructions and shall not exceed any speed restriction, where one is imposed,</i>  <i>until reaching the location where the normal operation may be resumed</i></p>	NWC	<p>The proposed addition is not necessary for the following reasons:  - Running on sight may also be required when the authorisation has not been provided by means of EI 1, e.g. in Class B operation  - Running on sight can also <u>not</u> be required in Class B operation  - If running on sight is required in Class B operation, it will be instructed to the driver under the provision "When giving authorisation, the signaller shall give the driver any instructions concerning the movement." If EI 1 is used for this authorisation, the signaller shall indicate this in the "additional instruction" field.  - Under ETCS, the modalities for passing a stop signal are already covered in rule 6.39 and the use of EI 1 is fully prescribed; there is no need to repeat parts of those provisions in a generic App. B2 rule.  - App. A rule 6.39 and App. B2 rule 11 are fully consistent with each other; there is no need to create an additional overlap between them.</p> <p>These can be clarified also in the Application Guide.</p>	EIM
159	12	Appendix B2 (p 49) / Section 14	P	EIM OPE	<p>In the TSI OPE draft 2022, the following is stated in section 14 of App. B2:  <i>"Any railway undertaking/infrastructure manager staff who become aware of a danger to trains shall take immediate action to stop any trains which may be affected, alert the signaller and take any other action as necessary to avoid harm or loss."</i></p> <p>On some locations and depending on the immediate danger (i.e. in case of a fire in a tunnel), stopping a train on those locations could make the situation worse. Therefore we suggest to add the same wording "as soon as it is safe to do so", in line with the wording for a driver who has been made aware of a danger in section 14 (1) of App. B2, as follows (indicated in blue):</p> <p><i>"Any railway undertaking/infrastructure manager staff who become aware of a danger to trains shall take immediate action to stop any trains which may be affected <b>as soon as it is safe to do so</b>, alert the signaller and take any other action as necessary to avoid harm or loss."</i></p>	R	<p>The proposed provision is already included in App. B2 rule 14.1, applicable for the drivers who are the ones to decide on such a critical issue.  It makes little sense to make this requirement applicable also to the signallers or to any other actor, as proposed in the comment, given that such actors may not have sufficient awareness of the situation so as to judge when/where exactly it is safe for the train to stop.</p>	EIM

160	13	Appendix C2 (p 54) / Section 1	M	EIM OPE	<p>In the TSI OPE draft 2022, the following is stated in section 1 of App. C2:  <i>"The use of the European instructions numbers 1-5 and 7 is mandatory for ETCS, in accordance with the rules of the Appendix A. "</i>  In App. A v5.11 however, there is no explicit rule for the issuing of EI 5 in order to run with a speed restriction, except for the following general use of European Instructions in section 6.34.2 in order to restart the trains in case of an emergency :  <i>"To restart trains that have not been tripped and if instructions and / or restrictions are necessary, the signaller shall issue an European Instruction(s) ."</i>  Furthermore, there is no explicit rule in App. A v5.11 for the issuing of EI 4 in case of revoking an operational instruction, since the rules for revoking EI 3 by means of EI 4 has been deleted in sections 6.33.2 and 6.34.2 in App. A v5.11 given the possibility to revoke EI 3 by means of EI 1, 2 or 7, as stated in section 2 of App. C2.</p> <p>Given that there is no specific mention of EI 4 and EI 5 in App. A v5.11, we propose to adapt the wording in section 1 of App. C. as follows :  <i>"The use of the European instructions numbers <del>1-5</del> 1-3 and 7 is mandatory for ETCS, in accordance with the rules of the Appendix A. "</i></p>	A (part.)	<p>EI 4:  Although no explicit citation of EI 4 is made any longer in any of App. A rules, it is still one of the available options for rules 6.33.2 and 6.34.2. It is therefore imperative to explicitly impose its use when running under ETCS for reasons of operational interoperability. Not doing so would e.g. lead an IM to continue using a national instruction with a similar content (if only wider to meet the requirement of App. C2.1 provision "If an operational instruction related to a class B system requires more information than the European instructions, a national instruction may be used instead. [...])  The national instructions shall contain at least the same content as that for a European instruction.") even for ETCS.</p> <p>EI 5:  Proposal accepted, since this is a generic instruction like EI 6, EI 8 and EI 9, not directly linked with ETCS operation. Its use will continue to be indirectly imposed through the App. C2.1 provision "Whenever the signaller needs to issue an operational instruction for which a European instruction exists, the signaller shall use this European instruction."</p>	EIM
161	14	Appendix C2 (p 54) / Section 1	G	EIM OPE	<p>The mandatory use of the European Instructions in the App. C2 - Section 1 of the draft TSI OPE 2022 includes the following rules, as an overload of rules that will not ensure the harmonised use of the European Instructions, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the introduction phrase: <i>"Railway undertakings and infrastructure managers shall use European instructions in the communication procedure in the following cases: [followed by a listing of the 9 European Instructions available]"</i></li> <li>- the referral to the future App. A v6: <i>"The use of the European instructions numbers 1-5 and 7 is mandatory for ETCS, in accordance with the rules of the Appendix A.;"</i></li> <li>- the additional rule for the signaller: <i>"Whenever the signaller needs to issue an operational instruction for which a European instruction exists, the signaller shall use this European instruction."</i></li> </ul> <p>In order to clarify the mandatory or recommended use of the harmonised European Instructions, we propose to amend the section 1 of App. C2 of the future TSI OPE 2022 as follows:</p> <p><i>The numbers 1 to 20 for operational instructions are reserved for European instructions.  If numbered, the national instructions defined by the individual infrastructure managers shall start from 21 onwards.</i></p> <p><i>The following harmonised operational instructions - European Instructions - are available:  [list of available European Instructions with their title]</i></p> <p><i>The use of the European Instructions is mandatory:  - for ETCS, in accordance with the rules of the Appendix A, and  - in all cases stated in this TSI.</i></p> <p><i>In all other cases, the use of the European Instructions is recommended.</i></p> <p><i>If an operational instruction related to a class B system requires more information than the European Instructions, a national instruction may be used instead. In such a case, the infrastructure manager may define these requirements in its national instructions. These national instructions shall contain at least the same content as that for a European Instruction.</i></p>	NWC	<p>The current wording under App. C2.1 is sufficiently clear already. Further improvements can be elaborated in the next revision cycle, under the coordination of the competent OPE WP.</p>	EIM

162	15	Appendix C2 (p 56) / Section 3	P	EIM OPE	<p>In the TSI OPE draft 2022, the following rule has been added in section 3 of App. C2:  <i>"In case of verbal communication of a European instruction, the signaller shall only read out the first and second identifier figure of every field. Where a third identifier figure also exists, its field qualifier will be read out instead."</i></p> <p>In real time communication when issuing a European Instruction, this rule will create confusion because the third identifier will be present on the forms that the signaller and driver will use, in example when communicating a Km for field 1.12.1 on EI 1:  - with the following verbal expression "Field one-point-one-two kilometer ...";  - instead of the complete verbal expression "Field one-point-one-two-point-one kilometer ...".</p> <p>Although the common aspiration to harmonise communications when issuing an operational instructions, this new rule regarding <u>only</u> the third identifier on the European Instructions, will not ensure harmonised communications, as MS and IM will still have the opportunity to fix non-harmonised rules for all communications that are not yet harmonised by means of App. C when issuing an operational instruction.</p> <p>Given these arguments, we propose to completely delete this new rule in the section 3 of App. C2, in order to allow each MS and IM (taking into account the possible communication errors given different operational languages on a network) to apply its own communication rules, awaiting the <u>full</u> harmonisation of communications when issuing operational instructions.</p>	A		EIM
163	16	Appendix C2 (p 56) / Section 6	P	EIM OPE	<p>Given that there may be multiple different speed limits in a track section that need to be issued by means of a European Instruction and in order to avoid the issuing of multiple European Instructions, we suggest the following additon in section 6 of App. C2, as indicated in blue:  <i>"No tick box, field or option for input in a field shall be added.  The infrastructure manager may add more than one field "x.41 Do not exceed the speed of ..." on its European instructions if necessary."</i></p>	R	<p>Having more than one field with the same field identifier and number is not acceptable for the transmission of the EI, either vocal or digital.  If more than one speed limits need to apply in a track section, an equal number of EIs will need to be issued.</p>	EIM
164	17	Appendix C.2 (p 56) / Section 6	M	EIM OPE	<p>In the TSI OPE draft 2022, the following rule has been added in section 6 of App. C2:  <i>"The infrastructure manager and the railway undertaking may add guidance on how to fill in and read the forms of the European instructions, under the condition that this guidance is not part of the communication procedure."</i></p> <p>Given that this provision also applies to national instructions, we suggest to transfer this provision to section 2 of App. C2 in order to extend its field of application to all operational instructions, with the following amended wording as indicated in red and blue:  <i>"The infrastructure manager and the railway undertaking may add guidance on how to fill in and read the forms of the <del>European</del> operational instructions, under the condition that this guidance is not part of the communication procedure."</i></p>	R	<p>It is not the purpose of App. C2.2 to further detail the modalities governing the filling in and reading of non-harmonised national operational instructions. Such modalities can depend on the transmission medium used and are normally covered by the SMS of IMs and RUs. Signallers and drivers are expected to be trained on how to apply them.</p>	EIM
165	18	Appendix C2 (p 57) / Section 6	M	EIM OPE	<p>The former European Instructions of the TSI OPE 2019 are still present in the TSI OPE draft 2022 for public consultation (p 57 to 65), without any indication of their deletion due to the introduction of the Enhanced European Instructions.</p>	NWC	<p>The former EIs have been deleted in the OPE TSI draft. This is shown in track-change mode, like all other changes to the document. The EIs being embedded pdf documents, however, their deletion appears as a single horizontal red line over the entire EI form.</p>	EIM
166	19	Appendix C2 (p 66-74) / Section 6 / European Instructions	P	EIM OPE	<p>The translations of the former European Instructions of the TSI OPE 2019 were often not consistent with the wording of the original English European Instructions (i.e. the Dutch and French translations). In order to ensure a correct translation of the Enhanced European Instructions in the final TSI OPE 2022, including the use of the correct terminologie in their content, we would like to have the opportunity to review the draft of the translations of these instructions before their publication.</p>	NWC	<p>ERA does not manage the translations of any TSI.  There is also no legal basis for intervening and/or coordinating any such translations.  Linguistic issues should be addressed to the translation services of the Commission and should be coordinated by the sector and authorities at national level, before the final TSI text is published, to prevent inconsistencies.</p>	EIM

167	20	Appendix D1 (p 77) / Note N° 3	P	EIM OPE	<p>In the draft TSI OPE 2022 for public consultation (as well as in the current TSI OPE 2019), the following obligation is mentioned for the IM in Note N° 3 of App. D1:</p> <p>"3. With a view to avoid duplication of testing, in relation to parameters "Traffic loads and load carrying capacity of infrastructure" and "Train detection systems", the infrastructure managers shall provide through RINF the list of vehicle types or vehicles compatible with the route for which they have already verified route compatibility, where such information is available."</p> <p>Given the ultimate responsibility of RU for route compatibility checks (RCC), given the unsuitability of RINF to provide this information to RU instead of providing a list to RU and given the difficulties for IM to provide this up-to-date information that could undermine the ultimate responsibility for RCC by RU, we propose to amend this rule for IM as follows and indicated in red and blue:</p> <p>"3. With a view to avoid duplication of testing, in relation to parameters 'Traffic loads and load carrying capacity of infrastructure' and 'Train detection systems', the infrastructure managers shall may provide through RINF the a list of vehicle types or vehicles compatible with the route for which they have already verified route compatibility, where such information is available."</p>			EIM
168	21	Appendix D1 (p 77) / 2nd row of table Last column	U	EIM OPE	<p>Is the following exemption for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland still in force for the TSI OPE 2022:</p> <p>"For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland networks, the static compatibility checks for vehicles shall be performed according to relevant national rules in accordance with 4.2.7.4 (4) of Commission Regulation (EU) No 1299/2014. "?</p>	NWC	Reference to UK will be removed however reference to Northern Ireland will remain owing to specific provisions of the EU-UK withdrawal agreement, in order to safeguard cross-border operations between Ireland and Northern Ireland.	EIM
169	22	Appendix D3 (p 93) / Note N° 3	P	EIM OPE	<p>In the TSI OPE draft 2022, the following is stated in App. D3 - Note N° 3:</p> <p>"3. Item 7 lists the minimum set of ETCS National Values required to be made available to the railway undertakings. Infrastructure managers shall also provide upon request to a railway undertaking the complete set of National Values, e.g. to serve as default values for ERTMS/ETCS on-board units operating locally."</p> <p>Given that the exact number for the national values in the table is 1.5, we suggest to replace "Item 7" by "Number 1.5" in Note N° 3.</p>	A	"7" referred to a former numbering of this list. Error corrected to "1.5"	EIM
170	1	7.2.2.2 7.2.2.3	M	UTP	As UK has been deleted in the title of the specific cases, corresponding references should also be deleted in the accompanying text.	A		UTP
171	2	Appendix B, C1, C2	G	UTP	In the final version submitted to RISC, please ensure that the title and text are not separated by page breaks.	NWC	Page breaks are only inserted between consecutive Appendices.	UTP
172	3	Appendix A 4.2 Table 2 line 'ETCS stop marker'	M	UTP	<p>It is the train which has to be stopped (by the driver), and not the driver who has to stop. <u>Proposal</u>:</p> <p>ETCS stop marker</p> <p>Harmonised trackside ETCS marker board defined in [2] used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify a potential EOA and,</li> <li>• indicate the location where a driver has to stop <b>the train</b> , if running without an MA</li> </ul>	A		UTP
173	4	Appendix A 3.2	P	UTP	<p>The possibility for a driver to leave the cab should not be an ETCS rule, we think it would suit more in App. B2.</p> <p>Anyway, a driver could leave the cab also by request or need from the signaller, not only to use a fixed lineside phone. For example in EI 8, we can request the driver to activate LX manually. Other examples in Italy are when a driver is requested, in some degraded cases, to check the correct position of a switch, or when a driver is requested to check the completeness of their train. Our suggestion is not to exclude other possible cases.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u>:</p> <p>All actions involving the driver assume his physical presence in the driver's cab, unless when required to examine a technical failure of the train at standstill, <del>or</del> obtain signaller's instructions through a fixed lineside phone <b>or when requested by the signaller/non-harmonized rules.</b></p>	A		UTP
174	5	Appendix A 5.1.10	U	UTP	<p>The current text could lead - especially in the translation - to the misinterpretation that a driver without release speed would be allowed to overpass an EoA:</p> <p><u>Proposal</u>:</p> <p>Option 1:</p> <p>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Stop Marker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>indicating the EOA of the current MA without a release speed indication being displayed on the DMI (when in some Member States an EOA may be implemented without any release speed)", or</b></li> <li>• indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</li> <li>• when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative option 2:</p> <p>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Stop Marker:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• indicating the EOA of the current MA, <b>even</b> when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</li> <li>• when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</li> </ul>	R	<p>The proposed addition would only complicate the application of the rule, transferring the responsibility to the driver.</p> <p>The proposed alternative can be misleading when no release speed is provided.</p> <p>The former wording of the rule (App. A ver. 5) was finally retained. It will be up to the driver to decide when exactly to start looking outside in order to identify the SM matching the EoA displayed on his/her DMI. With proper trackside engineering, there should be no ambiguity for the driver on which physical EoA (marked by SM) corresponds to the EoA calculated by the OBU.</p>	UTP

175	6	Appendix A 5.1.11	U	UTP	<p>The current text could lead - especially in the translation - to the misinterpretation that a driver without release speed would be allowed to overpass an EoA:</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> Option 1: <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Location Marker:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>indicating the EOA of the current MA, or</b></li> <li>• <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</i></li> <li>• <i>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternative option 2: <i>The driver shall stop on the approach to an ETCS Location Marker:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>indicating the EOA of the current MA, <b>even</b> when a release speed indication is displayed on the DMI, or</i></li> <li>• <i>when running without an MA unless he has received a specific authorisation by the signaller.</i></li> </ul>	R	<p>The proposed addition would only complicate the application of the rule, transferring the responsibility to the driver.</p> <p>The proposed alternative can be misleading when no release speed is provided.</p> <p>The former wording of the rule (App. A ver. 5) was finally retained. It will be up to the driver to decide when exactly to start looking outside in order to identify the LM matching the EoA displayed on his/her DMI. With proper trackside engineering, there should be no ambiguity for the driver on which physical EoA (marked by LM) corresponds to the EoA calculated by the OBU.</p>	UTP
176	7	Appendix A 6.2.5	G	UTP	<p>Appendix A section 6.2.5 'The traction unit has to move in SL' is not an operational rule. This is part of the handling of rolling stock and should be defined in the rolling stock manual "how to prepare a loco for SL mode".</p> <p>Appendix A section 6.2.5 should be deleted</p>	R	<p>The conditions for an OBU to enter SL mode and the resulting technical effect of this mode are already described in the Generic ETCS Driver's Handbook. The proposed addition to rule 6.2 "Preparing a movement" is meant for the operational context of SL mode, in coherence with the other cases under that rule. A slave engine can become a leading one at any time during a train run (e.g. when a dual trainset is split in an intermediate station to follow two different destinations). The proposed rule serves to make clear when and how a driver is allowed to exit SL mode when the operational need arises.</p>	UTP
177	8	Appendix A 6.12	P	UTP	<p>Formatting of the revised text should be adapted so that all bullets corresponding to "If DAS information is available on board:" are correctly displayed below as sub topics.</p> <p><u>Proposed formatting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If DAS information is available on-board:</i></li> <li>- <i>may follow the target advice speed when displayed on the DMI</i></li> <li>- <i>may coast when is displayed</i></li> <li>- <i>may respect the stopping points if indicated</i></li> <li>- <i>may request a stopping point to be skipped if instructed and this option is available on the DMI</i></li> <li>- <i>may operate the doors when invited to do so by relevant DMI indications</i></li> </ul>	NWC	<p>The list is already indented as proposed in the comment, yet it does not appear so in track-change mode (likely a MS Word visualisation issue).</p>	UTP
178	9	Appendix A/6.14	M	UTP	<p>Correction needed. The driver shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in ETCS level 1 without trackside signals, in ETCS level 2 without trackside signals, and in ETCS level 3, when approaching the next ETCS stop marker, inform the signaller, <b>stop at the ETCS stop marker</b> and apply rule.....</li> </ul> <p>Rationales: the driver shall inform the signaller when the train is stopped at the next ETCS stop marker on the french network. When the train is running in SR, the driver must not used the radio. It seems important to clearly state that the driver is explicitly requested to stop before to offer the possibility to overpass without stopping if he has previously received the European Instruction.</p>	R	<p>Mandating a stop at every SM invalidates the possibility offered by the specifications to override while running (e.g. when already in possession of an authorisation to pass this SM). It can therefore not be accepted as a general rule.</p> <p>Any IM wishing to not allow this practice is free to set the relevant national value V_NVALLOWOVTRP to 0, so that a stop is imposed in such situations.</p>	UTP
179	10	Appendix A 6.41.1.a)	P	UTP	<p>Since the movement backwards can be decided by the driver, there are cases in which there are no instructions given by the signaller.</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> [...] <i>the driver shall move the train / shunting movement backwards following any instructions <b>possibly</b> given by the signaller.</i></p>	R	<p>"any" already reflects this potentiality.</p>	UTP
180	11	Appendix A	M		<p>The reference to the 2022 updated version is missing in the cover page of Appendix A in OPE TSI core text. The reference to the previous version 5 issued on 09/04/2019 should be replaced.</p>	NWC	<p>For TSI 2022, App. A will be integrated into the OPE TSI core text, so no need to quote the OPE TSI publication data on the front page of App. A. The version number will however be quoted separately for easier traceability.</p>	UTP
181	12	Appendix A	G		<p>ERA and EC commitment to include the Appendix A in the core text of OPE TSI Annex A shall be enforced.</p> <p>This is in particular important to further ensure that the translation of Appendix A by the EC legal service takes place before publication instead of previous publications managed as directly by ERA for such an independent ERA technical document published on ERA website only.</p>	NWC		UTP

182	13	Appendix A 6.1.2	U	UTP	Manual change of data required for train running number shall be treated by the driver in similar conditions than manual change of data required for the driver identification, i.e. in both cases "while at standstill or, if allowed by national value, while running" <b>Proposal:</b> <i>If a change is required, the driver shall enter/modify and validate:</i> - the train running number <b>while at standstill or, if allowed by national value, while running</b> - [...]	R	For the Train Running Number, the SRS stipulate that it is always allowed to change it while running, i.e. this action is not configurable by means of a national value. As a general principle, no harmonised operational rule shall restrict a flexibility that is offered by the technical specifications. Removing this possibility in Appendix A is therefore not acceptable. Regulating this possibility through a harmonised operational rule would also go against the principle of responsibility split between IM-RU; whether this operation incurs a risk should be up to the RU to assess (and restrict its use accordingly), not the IM.	UTP
183	14	Appendix A 6.22	U	UTP	Current text: "the driver shall switch off the main power switch, taking into account the position of the pantographs" The first symbol mentioned in 6.22 shows an announcement signal ("stands at half braking distance before switch-off signal") and informs the driver that he must switch off his traction unit <u>after</u> this section taken into account the position of the pantographs. The current wording is subject to possible misinterpretations and should be corrected.	NWC	Comment not clear. The announcement icon and marker board in this rule indicate the approach to a section that shall be passed with the main switch off. To do this in a safe way, the driver shall operate the switch before the train's pantographs reach the concerned section. This course of actions is already reflected in the current wording.	UTP
184	15	Appendix A	M	UTP	For coherence with CCS TSI, the reference to level R needs to be added in Appendix A. It could be mentioned that in the 2022 version of the OPE TSI, the reference to level R will not be analysed and references to level 2 and level 3 separately are still mentioned in Appendix A.	A	Appendix A reflects the new level R as of draft version 5.10.	UTP
185	16	Appendix A 4.2 Table 3	M	UTP	Missing reference to RMR and ATO need to be added. It could be clarified that RMR corresponds to FRMCS and/or GSM-R. It could be also be clarified that the RMR/FRMCS is not used nor analysed in the 2022 version of the OPE TSI. The RMR/GSM-R as a radio communication is the only one considered in the 2022 version of the OPE TSI.	NWC	ATO was added to Table 3. RMR/FRMCS will not be added since there are no references to either of these in this OPE TSI (system version 3.0 will not be covered in this revision of OPE TSI). The term "RMR" is not added either since there is no need to make the distinction between GSM-R and FRMCS in this OPE TSI edition.	UTP
186	17	Appendix A 4.2 Table 3	U	UTP	Missing reference to SL need to be added.	A		UTP
187	18	Core OPE TSI / 4.2.2.1.3.2	G	UTP	In the OPE TSI version for consultation, this paragraph has not been updated according to the regulation 2021/2238 (on 15th dec. 2021). In this regulation, the latest dates, when the acceptance of plates will be mandatory in 4 countries (FR, BE, ES, PO), have been postponed taking into account the difficulties of implementation (eg 1/01/2026 for BE. and FR.).	A	The final OPE TSI draft will be updated to properly reflect the obsolescence of these clauses.	UTP
188	19	Appendix A/6.58	U	UTP	The Train Integrity may be given by an external device, not necessarily a TIMS. Shall we mention TIMS failure or be more open on a failure in the acquisition of the Train Integrity?	NWC	TIMS is a generic term describing a system external to the ETCS OBU, able to provide the train integrity confirmation to the ETCS OBU. So, by "TIMS failure" we understand any failure of any such system.	UTP
189	20	Appendix A/6.58	P	UTP	Proposal for LEVEL 3 : "When the train preparer / driver of a train scheduled to run or running in an ETCS level 3 area becomes aware that the TIMS is <b>in failure not operational</b> , he shall apply App. B rule 15."	A	Wording retained: "TIMS has failed"	UTP

190	21	Core OPE TSI - Appendix C2 - EI 1	UTP	<p>Due to the application case of EI1 in class B, we propose to add one tick box, eg "x.24 : and shall run on-sight towards the next block signal, or in ERTMS until a new MA has been received".</p> <p>This is due to the absence of requirement to "run on sight" by default in the rule 11 of the appendix B.</p> <p>An alternative is a national rule at MS level, requiring to run on sight by default when passing a stop signal.</p> <p>Please notice that in MS where this field is not used, it may be deleted on the form used in this MS.</p>	NWC	<p>The proposed addition is not appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Under ETCS (the primary field of application of EI 1) on-sight driving shall always apply once the EoA is passed given the mode (SR or SH); the signaller will only tick box x.25 in order to exempt the driver from this restriction if the signaller can ascertain that it is safe for the driver to proceed in that way. Whenever a new MA is received, supervised operation will be activated and EI 1 is no longer effective.</li> <li>- If EI 1 is used for Class B operation, then on-sight driving is indeed not explicitly instructed therein. However, having an extra tick-box for that purpose in EI 1 would complicate its use for ETCS operation, where this option is assumed to apply by default. An operational solution would be to provide the on-sight instruction through the additional instruction field. This would also be in line with the provision of App. B2 rule 11 for passing a signal with stop aspect "When giving authorisation, the signaller shall give the driver any instructions concerning the movement."</li> </ul> <p>The proposed alternative of a national rule mandating on-sight driving whenever an EoA is passed by means of EI 1 in Class B is another possibility. In that case, if the signaller can exceptionally exempt the driver from running on sight, the signaller can tick box x.25.</p> <p>It is noted that under ETCS, the modalities for passing a stop signal are already covered in rule 6.39 and the use of EI 1 is fully prescribed. App. A rule 6.39 and App. B2 rule 11 are also fully consistent with each-other.</p> <p>These can be clarified also in the Application Guide</p>	UTP
191	1	4.2.2.9	ASSOCIAZIONE AUGUSTO CASTRUCCI APS – Ancora IN MARCIA	<p>Driver vigilance</p> <p>A means of on-board monitoring of driver vigilance is necessary.</p> <p>This shall, <b>which must meet the ergonomic requirements set out in the directive of the Council Directive of 12 June 1989 concerning the introduction of measures aimed at promoting the improvement of the safety and health of workers at work (89/391 / EEC), as implemented by each member state, intervene</b></p> <p>to bring te train to a stand if the driver does not react within a certain time; the time range is specified in the rolling stock TSIs.</p> <hr/> <p>The driver's "vigilance" is a behavioral element which is not defined in this TSI. Consequently, supervisory monitoring is a function that maintains large margins of uncertainty.</p> <p>The control system currently envisaged as a requirement of this TSI, using mechanically operated interfaces is primitive and obsolete, and contrary to the most elementary principles of ergonomics.</p> <p>In the railway sector, the most modern digital technologies, communication, detection and control, have been profitably inserted in all the elements of the system, with very advanced peaks in the on-board, ground and traffic management systems.</p> <p>On the contrary, for the driver's control function there has been no technological innovation, but a device with a primitive operating philosophy, identical from the early years of the last century, is still used: sound - gesture, sound - gesture, sound - gesture, etc.</p> <p>The electronic and digital processing of the signal coming from the on-board interfaces (pedals, push buttons, tactile buttons, etc.), has not in fact changed the archaic conception of the system without respect for the health and dignity of the driver.</p> <p>Furthermore, according to all the human psychophysiology studies present in the literature, the cyclic repetition of movements and gestures can induce or favor a hypnotic state.</p> <p>The forced execution of instantaneous actions and simple movements of the limbs in response to a sound stimulus, with gestures repeated indefinitely over time, for the entire duration of the work also implies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- distraction from driving;</li> <li>- alienation from the operational context;</li> <li>- frustration resulting from the obsolescence of the device used..</li> </ul>	R	<p>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.</p>	

132	1	4.2.2.9		<p>Driver vigilance A means of on-board monitoring of driver vigilance is necessary. This shall, <b>which must meet the ergonomic requirements set out in the directive of the Council Directive of 12 June 1989 concerning the introduction of measures aimed at promoting the improvement of the safety and health of workers at work (89/391 / EEC), as implemented by each member state, intervene</b> to bring te train to a stand if the driver does not react within a certain time; the time range is specified in the rolling stock TSIs.</p> <p>The driver's "vigilance" is a behavioral element which is not defined in this TSI. Consequently, supervisory monitoring is a function that maintains large margins of uncertainty.</p> <p>The control system currently envisaged as a requirement of this TSI, using mechanically operated interfaces is primitive and obsolete, and contrary to the most elementary principles of ergonomics.</p> <p>In the railway sector, the most modern digital technologies, communication, detection and control, have been profitably inserted in all the elements of the system, with very advanced peaks in the on-board, ground and traffic management systems.</p> <p>On the contrary, for the driver's control function there has been no technological innovation, but a device with a primitive operating philosophy, identical from the early years of the last century, is still used: sound - gesture, sound - gesture, sound - gesture, etc.</p> <p>The electronic and digital processing of the signal coming from the on-board interfaces (pedals, push buttons, tactile buttons, etc.), has not in fact changed the archaic conception of the system without respect for the health and dignity of the driver.</p> <p>Furthermore, according to all the human psychophysiology studies present in the literature, the cyclic repetition of movements and gestures can induce or favor a hypnotic state.</p> <p>The forced execution of instantaneous actions and simple movements of the limbs in response to a sound stimulus, with gestures repeated indefinitely over time, for the entire duration of the work also implies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- distraction from driving;</li> <li>- alienation from the operational context;</li> <li>- frustration resulting from the obsolescence of the device used..</li> </ul>	R	<p>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.</p>	
				<p>Driver vigilance A means of on-board monitoring of driver vigilance is necessary. This shall, <b>which must meet the ergonomic requirements set out in the directive of the Council Directive of 12 June 1989 concerning the introduction of measures aimed at promoting the improvement of the safety and health of workers at work (89/391 / EEC), as implemented by each member state, intervene</b> to bring te train to a stand if the driver does not react within a certain time; the time range is specified in the rolling stock TSIs.</p>			

133	1	4.2.2.9	Trade union organization CUB TRASPORTI (Italy)	<p>The driver's "vigilance" is a behavioral element which is not defined in this TSI. Consequently, supervisory monitoring is a function that maintains large margins of uncertainty.</p> <p>The control system currently envisaged as a requirement of this TSI, using mechanically operated interfaces is primitive and obsolete, and contrary to the most elementary principles of ergonomics.</p> <p>In the railway sector, the most modern digital technologies, communication, detection and control, have been profitably inserted in all the elements of the system, with very advanced peaks in the on-board, ground and traffic management systems.</p> <p>On the contrary, for the driver's control function there has been no technological innovation, but a device with a primitive operating philosophy, identical from the early years of the last century, is still used: sound - gesture, sound - gesture, sound - gesture, etc.</p> <p>The electronic and digital processing of the signal coming from the on-board interfaces (pedals, push buttons, tactile buttons, etc.), has not in fact changed the archaic conception of the system without respect for the health and dignity of the driver.</p> <p>Furthermore, according to all the human psychophysiology studies present in the literature, the cyclic repetition of movements and gestures can induce or favor a hypnotic state.</p> <p>The forced execution of instantaneous actions and simple movements of the limbs in response to a sound stimulus, with gestures repeated indefinitely over time, for the entire duration of the work also implies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- distraction from driving;</li> <li>- alienation from the operational context;</li> <li>- frustration resulting from the obsolescence of the device used..</li> </ul>	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.	
134	1	4.2.2.9	RLS - Rappresentanti dei Lavoratori per la Sicurezza ex D.Lgs. 81-08	<p>Driver vigilance A means of on-board monitoring of driver vigilance is necessary. This shall, <b>which must meet the ergonomic requirements set out in the directive of the Council Directive of 12 June 1989 concerning the introduction of measures aimed at promoting the improvement of the safety and health of workers at work (89/391 / EEC), as implemented by each member state, intervene</b> to bring the train to a stand if the driver does not react within a certain time; the time range is specified in the rolling stock TSIs.</p> <p>The driver's "vigilance" is a behavioral element which is not defined in this TSI. Consequently, supervisory monitoring is a function that maintains large margins of uncertainty.</p> <p>The control system currently envisaged as a requirement of this TSI, using mechanically operated interfaces is primitive and obsolete, and contrary to the most elementary principles of ergonomics.</p> <p>In the railway sector, the most modern digital technologies, communication, detection and control, have been profitably inserted in all the elements of the system, with very advanced peaks in the on-board, ground and traffic management systems.</p> <p>On the contrary, for the driver's control function there has been no technological innovation, but a device with a primitive operating philosophy, identical from the early years of the last century, is still used: sound - gesture, sound - gesture, sound - gesture, etc.</p> <p>The electronic and digital processing of the signal coming from the on-board interfaces (pedals, push buttons, tactile buttons, etc.), has not in fact changed the archaic conception of the system without respect for the health and dignity of the driver.</p> <p>Furthermore, according to all the human psychophysiology studies present in the literature, the cyclic repetition of movements and gestures can induce or favor a hypnotic state.</p> <p>The forced execution of instantaneous actions and simple movements of the limbs in response to a sound stimulus, with gestures repeated indefinitely over time, for the entire duration of the work also implies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- distraction from driving;</li> <li>- alienation from the operational context;</li> <li>- frustration resulting from the obsolescence of the device used..</li> </ul>	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.	