N°	Reference (e.g. Art, §)	Type	Reviewer	Reviewer's Comments, Questions, Proposals	Reply	Proposal for the correction or justification for the rejection
1	General	M	OTIF (UK)	There are some typographic errors that should be fixed.	A	OTIF (UK) would also be kindly requested to help tracing & fixing errors.
2	General	G	OTIF (UK)	TAF TSI would now appear to place a requirement to always send a receipt confirmation message. This is valid in planning processes but does not work when applied to the operation or train preparation.	R	WP confirmed that the operational scope is indeed plannnig. The messsage placed in the planning chapter, the TSI sequences given in TD do not suggest otherwise. Additionally the Sector Handbook further advises on the correct application. No need for TSI update with this respec was identified by the
3	Section 7	M	NCP Spain	This TSI concerns the subsystem telematics applications for freight/~~passenger.~~	D	There is no mistake - both parts of the subsystem telematics applications are concerned by this TSI since several basic parameters of the current TAP TSI have been moved to this one. Consequently they apply to the passenger RU/IM communication. (see also 19)
4	Section 7.1 (c)	P	AESF (Spanish NSA)	The monitoring of the deployment and operation is managed by the ERA TAF and TAP Implementation Cooperation Group (ICG). Is this figure (TAF & TAP ICG) responsible for the monitoring of the deployment and operation of TAP TSI? In TAP TSI 'document' appears 'TAP ICG for Retail related implementation'. Both figures have the same composition. In case they are the same we propose to harmonise the denomination in both TSIs (TAF & TAP). Same comment in public consultation to TAF TSI (#2).	A	Response through the answer to the sector comment no. 20.
5	Section 7.2.2 (1)	M	AESF (Spanish NSA)	…of Regulation (EU) 2016/796, or via the ~~TAF TSI Steering Committee~~ Telematics Advisory Committee.	A	Replacement of Stering Commitee by the The Telematics Advisory Commitee did not aim at removing the corresponding body submitter role in the Change Management Process.
6	Implementation 4	U	ANSFISA (NSA IT as NCP IT)	"Each Member State shall ensure that a National Allocation Entity is appointed to be responsible for allocating unique location codes for each reference database and notifying all involved reference databases (e.g. Central Reference Database (CRD), Retail Reference Database (RRD)) of the update." Therefore, there are at least two NAEs, one for CRD (e.g., Primary Location Codes), one for RRD (e.g., Retail Location Codes). Are there other NAEs? It could be useful to identify and define in Appendix II different NAEs with different names (e.g., NAE for CRD, NAE for RRD).	R	Current text ("a National Allocation Entity is appointed…") is not perceived by the WP as preventing the MS decision to appoint appropriate body or bodies according to specific need. However, Agency will elaborate after consultation with its legal department if it would be useful replacing by "… one or more National Allocation Entities" and propose accordingly in the Recommendation.
7	Appendix III, point (6)	U	ANSFISA (NSA IT as NCP IT)	"Work with the Member State to ensure that **a n** National Allocation Entity is appointed". How do many NAEs have to be appointed? Only one? This sentence is not consistent with "Implementation 4".	A	Current text is not perceived by the WP as preventing the MS decision to appoint more than one NAE. However, Agency will elaborate if it would be useful that adding "… one or more National Allocation Entities" and propose accordingly in the Recommendation.
8	Appendix II	P	ANSFISA (NSA IT as NCP IT)	The term "National Allocation Entity (NAE)" is missing: since NAE is defined in the draft TAP TSI, it should be useful to add a definition of each NAE (see also comment n°1).	A	
9	New appendix	P	ANSFISA (NSA IT as NCP IT)	It could be useful to create a new appendix for NAE (like appendix III for NCP). This appendix should clarify some aspects related to NAE, for example: • How do many NAEs exist? • The tasks to be undertaken by each NAE. • If there are some restrictions about the identification of a NAE.	A	See TAP item 26.
10	4.3.5	M	JSG-CSG by EIM	In line "TrainRunningInformation", the reference to TAF TSI should be completed as follow: 4.2.5.3 Train running information and Train Delay Cause message Also, all references (numbering and title) to TAP TSI should be reviewed and aligned	A	Also TAP no. 19
11	1.1, 1.2	P	JSG	These sections (Abbreviations and Reference documents) are not present in TAP TSI and are not useful. Proposal to delete chapters 1.1 and 1.2 in order to align with TAP TSI.	A	
12	2.3	P	JSG	Article 'Overview of the subsystem description' is proposed to be deleted as it does not exist in the TAP TSI and there is no added value. Processes are specified in more detail in chapter 4 of the TSI. Proposal to delete chapter 2.3.	R	Chapter covers TAF specific aspects such as the RU/LRU minimum capabilities which are beyond what is detailed in the chapter 4.
13	3.3	M	JSG	The reference to chapter 4.2.9, 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 should be incremented to 4.2.10, 4.2.11 and 4.2.12.	A	
14	4.2.2.2	P	JSG	Add a footnote to quote the title of the eFTI Regulation (EU) 2020/1056.	A	

#	Section	Type	By	Comment	Status	Response
15	4.2.7.1	P	JSG	*The database on "trip plan" is no longer in TAF TSI core text. Proposal to delete the mention. The wagon or Intermodal unit related information exchange and updating are essentially supported by storage of* ~~*'trip plans'*~~ *and 'wagon movements' (Chapter 4.2.10.2: Other Databases).*	A	The trip plans are insided the Consignment Order Message (ConsignmentOrderMessage/COMS/COM/Wagons/WagonNumberFreight; ConsignmentOrderMessage/COMS/COM/AcceptancePoint; ConsignmentOrderMessage/COMS/COM/DeliveryPoint; ConsignmentOrderMessage/COMS/COM/Routing/RouteSection). *The wagon or Intermodal unit related information exchange and updating are essentially supported by storage of 'trip plans' and 'wagon movements' (Chapters: 4.2.2.1 Customer Consignment Note; 4.2.2.2. Consignment order message and 4.2.8 Wagon Movement ~~4.10.2: Other Databases~~).*
16	4.2.7.1	M	JSG	*The reference to chapter 4.2.6 and 4.2.7 should be incremented to 4.2.7 and 4.2.8.*	A	
17	4.2.8.4 4.2.8.5	M	JSG	*The reference to chapter 4.2.4 should be incremented to 4.2.5.*	A	
18	4.5	M	JSG	*The reference to chapter 4.2.10.3 should be incremented to 4.2.11.53*	A	
19	7.1	P	JSG	*Delete the mention to passengers in the first sentence to align with the wording in TAP :* *This TSI concerns the subsystem telematics applications for freight* ~~*/passenger.*~~ *To be alligned with the scope of the TSI ch. 2.1*	R	There is no mistake - both parts of the subsystem telematics applications are concerned by this TSI since several basic parameters of the current TAP TSI have been moved to this one. Consequently they apply to the passenger RU/IM communication. (See also comment 3.) For the sake of the renewed scope of the TAF (alligned with the purpose of the CR 325) current phrase it is accurate as it applies to both parts of the subsystem. The WP acknowledged the ERA explanations, still however asking that ERA to consult legal department and reflect feedback in the Recommendation.
20	7.1(c)	P	JSG	*Section 7.1(c) of the TAF TSI should be aligned with TAP being focussed on RU/IM communication for TAF and TAP TSIs only.* *(c) Deployment and operation monitoring process* *The monitoring of the deployment and operation* ~~*harmonized throughout Europe*~~ *is managed by the* ~~*ERA*~~ *TAF* ~~*and TAP*~~ *Implementation Cooperation Group (ICG) for RU/IM related implementation.* ~~*The ICG, e*~~ *Established and managed by the Agency ERA, the TAF ICG is composed of:* *–the Agency;* *–the National Contact Points (see Annex VII);* *–the Representatives Bodies;* *– other organisations designated by the Agency and having relevant technical and organizational experience.* *The ICG is made responsible for:* *– assessing the progress of implementation and operation, analysing the deviations from the Master Plan and proposing improvement actions;* *– assisting the NCPs to follow-up the TAF and TAP TSI implementation and operation at national level;* *– approving the reports about the TAF and TAP TSI implementation and operation* ~~*further used by the Agency who reports to the European Commission, and to the Telematics Advisory Committee.*~~ *– reporting via the Agency* ~~*who reports*~~ *to the European Commission, and to the Telematics Advisory Committees.* *– Discuss and agree with NCPs any need for additional supporting actions from ERA Member States or NCPs from the annual TAF TSI or TAP TSI implementation reportings.* *The implementation related to Retail is monitored by the TAP ICG.*	R	(c) Deployment and operation monitoring process The monitoring of the deployment and operation ~~harmonized throughout Europe~~ is managed by the ~~ERA~~ TAF and TAP Implementation Cooperation Groups (ICG) ~~for RU/IM related implementation.~~ TAF ICG and TAP ICG shall cooperate to establish the reporting process of common basic parameters. ~~The ICG, e~~ Established and managed by the Agency ~~ERA~~, the TAF ICG is composed of: –the Agency; –the National Contact Points (see Annex VII); –the Representatives Bodies; – other organisations designated by the Agency and having relevant technical and organizational experience. The ICG is made responsible for: – assessing the progress of implementation and operation, analysing the deviations from the Master Plan and proposing improvement actions; –assisting the NCPs to follow-up the TAF and TAP TSI implementation and operation at national level; – approving the reports about the TAF and TAP TSI implementation and operation ~~further used by the Agency who reports to the European Commission, and to the Telematics Advisory Committee.~~ – reporting via the Agency who reports to the European Commission, and to the Telematics Advisory Committees. – Discuss and agree with NCPs any need for additional supporting actions from ERA, Member States or NCPs from the annual TAF TSI or TAP TSI implementation reportings. ~~The implementation related to Retail is monitored by the TAP ICG.~~ ERA was given task to harmonize "Agency", "Agency ERA", "ERA" terms throughout the text.
21	Appendix II - Glos	G	JSG	*The Glossary should be checked vis-à-vis the output of CR 382.* *Hereafter some proposals on the Glossary, not exhaustive.*	NWC	Also TAF no. 64

22	Appendix II - Glossary	P	JSG	*Competent authority:* *Add reference to article 3(3) of the eFTI Regulation (EU) 2020/1056 which refers to the origin of the definition.*	A	
23	Appendix II - Glossary	P	JSG	*Regulatory information:* *Add reference to article 3(1) of Regulation (EU) 2020/1056 which refers to the origin of the definition.*	A	
24	Appendix II - Glossary	P	JSG	*Definition of NAE is missing. Include the definition in TAF and TAP as proposed by the sector Reference Files TEG, a little bit different than the definition in TAP recommendation.* *The National Allocation Entity (NAE) ensures the uniqueness of location codes within a country.*	A	See also comment 8. Agreed to update the TAF glossary, for the updated text see TAP no. 27
25	Appendix II - Glossary	P	JSG	Update the definition of Primary Location Code *Primary Location Codes (PLCs) identify locations on a railway network. ~~The Infrastructure Manager owning the railway network manages the PLCs.~~ These are normally important locations, where trains start, end, stop, run through or change line.* **A Primary location is identified by a single and unique Primary Location Code.**	A	See updated TAP proposal - no. 66.
26	Appendix II - Glossary	P	JSG	Add a definition of Subsidiary Location Code as it is quoted in the core text. **A Subsidiary Location must be linked to, and be part of a single Primary Location. It may specify in a more detailed way a point, attributes or an usage of Primary location. A Subsidiary Location is identified by a unique Subsidiary Location Code.**	A	See updated TAP proposal - no. 67.
27	7.1(b)	P	JSG/CSG	The date of implementation for stakeholders without individual master plan is fixed by ERA to 07/06/2023, corresponding to the application date of rail Passenger Rights Regulation (EU) 2021/782. The logic of this date is understood concerning rail PRR requirements but : • Rail PRR mentions already this date. Thus, repeating it for rail PRR requirements described in TAP TSI brings no added value as the rail PRR is mandatory in any case. • It applies also to RU/IM BPs non linked to rail PRR, some of them involving IMs, e.g. BP 4.2.16 (Path request and path allocation) or BP 4.2.17.1 (Train ready). Such decision was taken by the TAF Revision WP. In addition, during the TAP Revision WP (01.06.2021) it was NOT agreed/decided that the individual master plan will be published by ERA The paragraph in TAF TSI and TAP TSI must be aligned by using the TAF TSI wording ensuring consistency of requirements for RU/IM communication described in TAF TSI, but also referenced in TAP TSI. If text should be changed in TAP TSI compared to TAF TSI text, request for a joint TAF & TAP WP meeting dedicated to the revision of the TSI text related to 'Development of the system'. Also, "master plan" should be replaced by "TAF/TAP implementation reporting as described in 7.1(c)". Today, the implementation reporting is the tool for stakeholders to update their masterplan, also fostering the participation to the reporting, the implementation reporting could be used by stakeholders to create their master plan for those with any. Revised text should be as follow: *7.1(b) Development of the system* *All railway stakeholders concerned shall deploy the system following their individual* ~~*master plan*~~ **TAF/TAP implementation reporting as described in 7.1(c)** ~~*or, if no*~~	A	7.1(b) Development of the system All railway stakeholders concerned shall deploy the system following the Master Plan published at the public website of the Agency agreed in conjunction with additional comment to the 7.1c adding to the list of tasks of the ICG: The ICG is made responsible for: (...) - establishing and updating the Master Plan published at the public website of the Agency