

# 3.3 Conformance Events

## Events – TNext



<b>Section:</b> <i>[e.g.: Section 1.2 IMS]</i>	2.4 (1) (b)
<b>Title:</b> <i>[Title of Event]</i>	TN-NC011: Uplands Station
<b>Location in Proposal:</b> <i>[section, page #]</i>	NOR-S3UL-44DK-2002, NOR-S3UL-44DK-2003, NOR-S3UL-44DK-3001, NOR-S3UL-44DK-6002, NOR-S3UL-44DK-9002, NOR-S3UL-44DK-9003
<b>Classification:</b> <i>[Non-Conformant, Unobservable, Exceedances...]</i>	Non-Conformant ( <i>please see Note from the BESC on following page</i> )
<b>Description:</b> <i>[insert description as required]</i>	<p>Proponent has provided a Station with a single passenger platform. Schedule 15-2, Part 1, Clause 2.7(a)(v)K requires Uplands Station to be a two track station with either a centre loading with a platform between the set of tracks and side loading with platforms being outside of the set of tracks.</p> <p>A platform on one side of one set of tracks does not meet this definition and does not fulfill the requirement.</p>
<b>Scope Modification Description</b> <i>[in the case of a Non-Conformance, what is the scope required to accomplish Conformance]</i>	Proponent will need to redesign the Station including a second passenger train platform, an additional fare control “enclosure”, and additional vertical circulation to serve the platform; or redesign the Station to function with a centre platform.



# 3.3 Conformance Events

Events – TNext

## NOTE from the BESC:

At the request of the BESC, the non-conformance notation for Uplands Station (TN-NC011) was reviewed by the Technical Advisors (TA) and the Legal Subject Matter Expert (Legal SME).

**The TAs** indicated that assuming the performance requirements of the System are achieved with one side Platform and the two-Track configuration, the Uplands Station platform configuration fulfills the requirement of the PSOS.

As per the PSOS, Platform means that portion of the Station where Trains and or buses stop to load and unload Passengers. There are two basic types of O-Train Platform configurations: centre loading which has the Platform located between each set of Tracks, and side loading, which has the Platforms located on the outside of each set of Tracks. Assuming that this platform configuration fulfills the requirement to be located outside the set of tracks, it should be deemed Conformant with Comments.

**The Legal SME** noted that the interpretation of the Technical Conformance Team is the most reasonable one, and supported by the definition of “Platform” in Section 15-1. It remains that the requirement for two revenue tracks at Uplands stations is not clearly and unambiguously stated. Given the TA’s conclusion that the Proposal can potentially be viewed as complying with this ambiguity, the Legal SME proposes that the issue be deemed to be “Conformance with comments”.

The comments should specify that:

*The Proposal is being marked as conformant because the PSOS does not specifically include a requirement that Uplands station include two revenue tracks. The solution, however, does not meet the indications that side platforms should be provided for “each set of tracks”.*

As a result, the **BESC** adopts the views from the TA and the Legal SME and therefore believes the appropriate designation for this matter should be “Conformant with Comments”.



# 3.3 Conformance Events

## Events – TNext



<b>Section:</b> <i>[e.g.: Section 1.2 IMS]</i>	2.1 (1) (i) (ii)
<b>Title:</b> <i>[Title of Event]</i>	TN-CwC003: Siding Locations
<b>Location in Proposal:</b> <i>[section, page #]</i>	Mainline Drawing Submission
<b>Classification:</b> <i>[Non-Conformant, Unobservable, Exceedances...]</i>	Conformant with Comments
<b>Description:</b> <i>[insert description as required]</i>	<p>The siding lengths, locations and turnout locations for all three Proponents were reviewed by the SME and in response to n002 and n012, the SME identified the main differences noting which sidings were shorter and longer than the PSOS requirement.</p> <p>The PSOS requirements were written based on the reference design (Reference Concept Design) rather than the performance of the System. The length and location of the sidings should have been left to the Proponents based on their design.</p> <p>The approach to leave the location and length of sidings to Proponent teams would be the preferred approach and only judge conformance on the outputs of the operational modelling. If there are any “requirements” that the SME’s are aware of and are not met (e.g. the location of the turnout at 29+820) with the submissions, they should be clarified during FPN. Therefore, this event should be classified as Conformant with Comments.</p>
<b>Scope Modification Description</b> <i>[in the case of a Non-Conformance, what is the scope required to accomplish Conformance]</i>	

# 3.3 Conformance Events

## Events – TLink



<b>Section:</b> <i>[e.g.: Section 1.2 IMS]</i>	2.1 (1) (i) (ii)
<b>Title:</b> <i>[Title of Event]</i>	TL-CwC001: Siding Locations
<b>Location in Proposal:</b> <i>[section, page #]</i>	Mainline Drawing Submission
<b>Classification:</b> <i>[Non-Conformant, Unobservable, Exceedances...]</i>	Conformant with Comments
<b>Description:</b> <i>[insert description as required]</i>	<p>The siding lengths, locations and turnout locations for all three Proponents were reviewed by the SME and in response to n002 and n012, the SME identified the main differences noting which sidings were shorter and longer than the PSOS requirement.</p> <p>The PSOS requirements were written based on the reference design (Reference Concept Design) rather than the performance of the System. The length and location of the sidings should have been left to the Proponents based on their design.</p> <p>The approach to leave the location and length of sidings to Proponent teams would be the preferred approach and only judge conformance on the outputs of the operational modelling. If there are any “requirements” that the SME’s are aware of and are not met (e.g. the location of the turnout at 29+820) with the submissions, they should be clarified during FPN. Therefore, this event should be classified as Conformant with Comments.</p>
<b>Scope Modification Description</b> <i>[in the case of a Non-Conformance, what is the scope required to accomplish Conformance]</i>	

# 3.3 Conformance Events

Events – TEA



<b>Section:</b> <i>[e.g.: Section 1.2 IMS]</i>	2.1 (1) (i) (ii)
<b>Title:</b> <i>[Title of Event]</i>	TE-CwC001: Siding Locations
<b>Location in Proposal:</b> <i>[section, page #]</i>	Mainline Drawing Submission
<b>Classification:</b> <i>[Non-Conformant, Unobservable, Exceedances...]</i>	Conformant with Comments
<b>Description:</b> <i>[insert description as required]</i>	<p>The siding lengths, locations and turnout locations for all three Proponents were reviewed by the SME and in response to n002 and n012, the SME identified the main differences noting which sidings were shorter and longer than the PSOS requirement.</p> <p>The PSOS requirements were written based on the reference design (Reference Concept Design) rather than the performance of the System. The length and location of the sidings should have been left to the Proponents based on their design.</p> <p>The approach to leave the location and length of sidings to Proponent teams would be the preferred approach and only judge conformance on the outputs of the operational modelling. If there are any “requirements” that the SME’s are aware of and are not met (e.g. the location of the turnout at 29+820) with the submissions, they should be clarified during FPN. Therefore, this event should be classified as Conformant with Comments.</p>
<b>Scope Modification Description</b> <i>[in the case of a Non-Conformance, what is the scope required to accomplish Conformance]</i>	