

Making the railway system
work better for society.

Document Review – Comment Sheet

Document commented (name/version): Recommendation ERA-REC-122 V2.0

<i>Requestor:</i>	Agencia Estatal de Seguridad Ferroviaria (Spanish NSA)
<i>Deadline for submitting comments:</i>	31st October 2021

	<i>Reviewer 1</i>	<i>Reviewer 2</i>	<i>Reviewer 3</i>	<i>Reviewer 4</i>	<i>Reviewer 5</i>
<i>Date:</i>	28/09/2021				
<i>Name:</i>	Emilia Fernández				
<i>Organisation:</i>	AESF (Spanish NSA)				
<i>Email:</i>	mefmelgoso@seguridadferroviaria.es				

Document History

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Comments</i>
2.0	-	Version for public consultation (TAP TSI)

Conventions:

<i>Type of Comment</i>		<i>Reply by requestor</i>	
<i>G</i>	General	<i>R</i>	Rejected
<i>M</i>	Mistake	<i>A</i>	Accepted
<i>U</i>	Understanding	<i>D</i>	Discussion necessary
<i>P</i>	Proposal	<i>NWC</i>	Noted without need to change

Review Comments <if necessary add extra lines in the table>

<i>N°</i>	<i>Reference (e.g. Art, §)</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Reviewer's Comments, Questions, Proposals</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Proposal for the correction or justification for the rejection</i>
1.	Section 7.1 (c)	P	1	<p><i>The monitoring of the deployment and operation is managed by the TAP Implementation Cooperation Group (ICG) for Retail related implementation</i></p> <p>Is this figure (TAP ICG for Retail related implementation) responsible for the monitoring of the deployment and operation of TAF TSI? In TAF TSI 'document' appears 'TAP and TAP ICG'. Both figures have the same composition.</p> <p>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).</p>		
2.	Section 7.1 (c)	M	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Reporting to the European Commission and to the TAP/TAF Steering Committee Telematics Advisory Committee.</i> 		

<i>N°</i>	<i>Reference (e.g. Art, §)</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Reviewer's Comments, Questions, Proposals</i>	<i>Reply</i>	<i>Proposal for the correction or justification for the rejection</i>
3.	Section 7.1 (c)	U	1	<i>The implementation related to RU/IM communications is monitored by the TAF ICG.</i> We do not understand this sentence within the TAP TSI regulation.		

Note: This table could be changed according to the requestor's needs

Please read carefully the Data Protection Notice below before submitting your comments.

<https://www.era.europa.eu/content/data-protection#meeting1>

I have read the Data Protection Notice and I accept the processing of my personal data accordingly.

I accept that the comments I have submitted can be published on the ERA website along with: my name my e-mail address