

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
RS-UK	96	1		ge	There is a risk that the document with its Appendices becomes a textbook, but with only some aspects described in detail. For example there is much detailed information regarding the bearing capacity and settlement of spread foundations but no detailed pile settlement methodology, yet the detailed description of assessing downdrag requires pile settlements to be determined. There is a further risk that designers may not choose to follow the methodologies described which would render the presenting, checking and verifying the chosen detailed methods a questionable use of resource.		Accepted		Work in progress
RS-UK	1	02		ge	There seems to be a general misunderstanding of the Observational Method throughout the document	Align the description of this method and its applicability to the defined use of the Method	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Need detail
RS-UK	2	02		te	Throughout the document there are many instances of REQ containint 'non-exhaustive lists'. These cannot (by definition) be REQ as a REQ needs to be unambiguous and controlled by the standard, not by the reader.	Consider and modify - if 'non-exhaustive lists' need to remain, these clauses can only be RCM.	Accepted		
JB-UK	5	3.1.4.01 - xx		ge	no definition of micropiles	define in accordance with execution code bsen 14199:2015 "Micropiles are structural members to transfer actions to the ground and can contain bearing elements to transfer directly or indirectly loads and or to limit deformations".. And are less than 300mm diameter (1.1 and 1.2)	Accepted		Will add
JB-UK	1	3.1.4.3		ge	Definition of displacement pile unclear	removal of "except" as displacement piles commonly used for this purpose	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	ISO 6707-1 definition
JB-UK	2	3.1.4.5 and 3.1.4.6		te	definition requires clarity	Specify if force transition is SLS or ULS. I.e. for friction pile is the SLS the primary force supported.	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	ISO 6707-1 definition. But will consider
RS-UK	3	3.1.4.9		te	Usually referred to as a Ground Model in my experience	consider changing to Ground Model method	Accepted		
JB-UK	3	3.1.4.21		te	Load not Eurocode term	Action would be a more suitable term	Partly Accepted		Will review the definition. But remember that Clause 6 and all the testing codes refer to load tests, not action tests
JB-UK	4	3.1.4.36		te	UK common practice to take total deflection over a number or series of predetermined blows	permanent piles settlement after a single blow or multiple blows during driving or dynamic impact test.	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	But is not the definition normalised to one blow?
RS-UK	79	06		ge	Is the piling section test aligned with the ICE SPERW	confirm/amend	Accepted		
JB-UK	6	6.1 (2)		ed	remove minipiles as not defined in execution code or current document		Partly Accepted		PT4 will discuss whether to keep both but include a definition
JB-UK	7	6.1 (3)		ge	too vague,	Piled rafts and rigid inclusion operate in the same design space and primarily are defined by deflection. However they can be separated. A rigid inclusion has to have a load transfer platform present and so cannot be intrinsically linked into the superstructure. Piles rafts are always linked through the reinforcement. Suggest use this as guide to applicability of clause 10 (LT P) or 4 and 5 (linked)	Not Accepted		

Contents of commenting template

1st author

MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
JB-UK	8	6.1 (5)		ge	too vague,	Piled rafts and rigid inclusion operate in the same design space and primarily are defined by deflection. However they can be separated. A rigid inclusion has to have a load transfer platform present and so cannot be intrinsically linked into the superstructure. Piles rafts are always linked through the reinforcement. Suggest use this has guide to applicability of clause 10 (LT P) or 4 and 5 (linked)	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	This is in direct opposition to advice given by the ASIRI Project report and by published papers [such as 'Serviceability and safety in the design of rigid inclusions and combined pile-raft foundations' by Cecilia Bohn]. These suggest that there are differences in design methodology necessary depending on whether the rigid inclusions are required to increase bearing capacity, or just to reduce settlements. Design as piles to Clause 6 for the first case. Design as ground improvement to Clause 10 for the second.
TS-UK	1	6.1	(5) and (6)	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	9	6.1 (6)		ge	too vague,	Piled rafts and rigid inclusion operate in the same design space and primarily are defined by deflection. However they can be separated. A rigid inclusion has to have a load transfer platform present and so cannot be intrinsically linked into the superstructure. Piles rafts are always linked through the reinforcement. Suggest use this has guide to applicability of clause 10 (LT P) or 4 and 5 (linked)	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	This is in direct opposition to advice given by the ASIRI Project report and by published papers [such as 'Serviceability and safety in the design of rigid inclusions and combined pile-raft foundations' by Cecilia Bohn]. These suggest that there are differences in design methodology necessary depending on whether the rigid inclusions are required to increase bearing capacity, or just to reduce settlements. Design as piles to Clause 6 for the first case. Design as ground improvement to Clause 10 for the second.
TS-UK	2	6.1	(7)	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	10	6.1 (7)		ed	yes but reference c.2.2	use c2.2 and remove from appendix	Accepted		
JB-UK	11	6.1	(7) table 6,1	ed	Replace with table C.2.2	use c2.2 and remove from appendix	Not Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	This was the first attempt. Opposition resulted in creation of C2.2 in the Annex
EA-UK	1	6.1	(7) Table 6.1		It is not clear what a "high replacement" and "low replacement" pile is. Just saying piles that involve rhe removal of spoil is not enough.	Provide typical examples like "CFA piles", "bored pile"	Partly Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	The contents and examples will be discussed by PT4 and TG3 and then revised
RS-UK	75	6.1	(7) Table 6.1	te	Needs considerable thought and expansion - e.g. rotary displacement piles, drilled or bored totally replace the hole volume so high replacement, etc.	Reconsider and considerably the table contents	Partly Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	The contents and examples will be discussed by PT4 and TG3 and then revised
JB-UK	15	6.2 (3)	line 4	ed	revise "Local experience" as geology can change significantly over short distances	replace with "geological conditions"	Not Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.1(3). The term 'ground' covers fill, soil and rock. It is agreed that geology or ground conditions can change significantly over short distances. 'Local experience' refers to piling in known, uniform and consistent ground
JB-UK	13	6.2 (3)		te	contradiction of lower bound limit of GC(C)2 and note 26 which implies a lower structure value	allow reduction in GCC if appropriate for piled application	Partly Accepted		Presume sub-clause is 6.2.1(3). This is already there as (3) is a <RCM>. This is a choice to be made by the designer. But the point is that piles are rarely required if the Geotechnical Category is GC2
JB-UK	12	6.2 (3)		ed	use correct acronym	GCC2	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.1(3). GCC2 is the Geotechnical Complexity Class [see EN 1997-1 Table 4.1. The Geotechnical Category GC2 is a combination of GCC [Table 4.1] and CC [Table 4.2] as detailed in Table 4.3
JB-UK	14	6.2 (3)	line 4	ed	revise wording to better reflect UK common practice	replace "and " with "or"	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.1(3). 'And' is correct. It is not an either/or choice, but both have to be satisfied
JB-UK	16	6.2 (4)	line 1	ed	common to UK piling and insurance cover that the design can only consider reasonably foreseen conditions in that design	replace with "All reasonably foreseen future design situations including future known transient...."	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.1(4). 'And' is correct. It is not an either/or choice, but both have to be satisfied
RS-UK	76	6.2.2		te	Include adjacent works	Include adjacent works	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Please provide more detail about where any reference to adjacent structures should be included

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
JB-UK	17	6.2.2.1 (2)		ge	Reference or specify minimum requirements. reference to 6.2.6	reference to formula 6.1 and 6.2	Partly Accepted		Will consider a forward reference
JB-UK	18	6.2.2.2 (2)		ed	duplicate of 6.2.1 (2)	remove	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	6.2.2.2(2) refers to pile imperfections and tolerances; 6.2.1(2) refers to design situations. They are different
RS-UK	77	6.2.2.3 (1)		te	'larger' than what?	delete 'larger'	Partly Accepted		This will be discussed by PT4
JB-UK	19	6.2.2.3 (4)		te	not common UK practice to place reliance on fill for design purposes as not consistent or reliable. The point is valid when considering installation issues, but surely that should be included in relevant execution codes and not here; remove	remove	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Not relying on fill, just taking account of possible densification
JB-UK	21	6.2.2.3 (5)		ge	Pile spacing can also be influenced by ground conditions e.g. where piles are founded in rock, piles can be spaced at close centres and pile interaction (with regards to pile settlement) may not be considered. Agreed, should also be reflected in Table 6.2	Amend to exclude end bearing and sockets into rock	Partly Accepted		Minor amendment to include ground conditions. (5) is <RCM> and designer can take account of ground conditions
JB-UK	20	6.2.2.(5)		ed	need to define that end bearing or shaft friction relates to SLS	either cover in definition or specify SLS	Partly Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.2.3(5). Will discuss with PT4 and TG3
JB-UK	22	6.2.2 (6)		ed	covered in displacement execution code so can be removed	remove	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.2.3(6). Pile spacings are a design choice, not execution, so this needs to be in the design code
JB-UK	23	6.2.2 (7)		te	in restricted access piling there are conditions where this cannot be avoided	add comment that where this spacing is reduced to less than Smin the design should take into account the reduction in capacity of potential stress bulb overlap	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Presume sub-clause is 6.2.2.3(7). Agreed. But this is <RCM> and your comment is already covered by 6.2.2.3(1) or (2) or (3) which is <REQ>
JB-UK	24	6.2.2.3 (7)	Table 6.2	te	UK common practice does not acknowledge a relationship between installation method and minimum spacing. Values of "2D and P" seem too low Add exception of rock socketed and rock end bearing piles high displacement piles 5D or 1.5p (friction piles) does not follow current UK common practice BS8004 2015 suggest 3D or P. define P and D as the larger of the two piles where sizes vary Also 8004 suggests minimum group effects do not occur in groups of less than 5 piles where Smin is observed	remove and replace with comment that group effects only occur where there are more than 5 piles in a group (BS8004). spacing should be 3D or P to follow UK common practice, exclude rock designs add "unless the design considers pressure bulb overlap"	Partly Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	I disagree. Driven displacement piles generally need to be installed at wider spacings than bored replacement piles. Ignoring group effects for 5 piles or less was removed from previous draft after objections. We need consensus across Europe, not just UK
TS-UK	3	6.2.2.3	Table 6.2	te	Minimum spacing should be 2 x D	Change Table	Partly Accepted		Will discuss with PT4 and TG3 and possibly revise
JB-UK	25	6.2.2.3		te	Closer spacings should not just be limited to embedded earth retaining structures.	Closer piles spacings may be used when the piles form part of an embedded earth retaining structure or where a suitable assessment of interaction has been carried out.	Partly Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	6.2.2.3(9) is <PER>. 6.2.2.3(1) covers the interaction
JB-UK	26	6.2.3.1 (2) and (3)		te	Whilst the point is valid, the pile designer may only have a rudimentary understanding of the structure and so may not be best placed to act as the decider. Generally this is an interaction between the structural designer and the geotechnical one	can this be also include in EC1992 next revision so the responsibility becomes joint?	Partly Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	(2) is difficult as the pile designer may not have enough information. But this needs to change. The pile designer must discuss with the structural designer. (3) is more in control of the pile designer, so must inform the structural designer
JB-UK	27	6.2.3.2 (1)		te	define the frequency threshold of cyclical and dynamic loadings	guidance required define the frequency threshold of cyclical and dynamic loadings (NGI)	Partly Accepted	#11. PT suggests this compromise:	PT6 will add clauses on cyclic and dynamic loading to EN 1997-1 and EN 1997-3
JB-UK	28	6.2.3.2	note40	te	give guidance on shaft degradation factor for all soil types	give guidance on shaft degradation factor for all soil types (NGI)	Partly Accepted	#11. PT suggests this compromise:	PT6 will add clauses on cyclic and dynamic loading to EN 1997-1 and EN 1997-3
JB-UK	29	6.2.3.2	note41	ed	reference required for axial pile capacity reduction for cyclical loading, as this is not true for both onshore and offshore work	reference required for axial pile capacity reduction for cyclical loading, as this is not true for both onshore and offshore work	Partly Accepted	#11. PT suggests this compromise:	PT6 will add clauses on cyclic and dynamic loading to EN 1997-1 and EN 1997-3

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
JB-UK	30	6.2.3.4.		te	confusion as down drag treated as a factor in ULS. In UK more common to consider down drag with dead load in SLS condition (serviceability analysis)	confusion as down drag treated as a factor in ULS. In UK more common to consider down drag with dead load in SLS condition (serviceability analysis)	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	I am confused. ULS and SLS need to be considered
JB-UK	31	6.2.3.4 (4)		te	coincidental timing of variable vertical loading and down drag is not always predictable, also surely if the two act together this results in the upper bound that needs to be assessed This can only be valid when the variable compression acts at the same time as the down drag, which is not always the case. Also as may act in concert so should be accounted for	remove	Partly Accepted		PT4 and TG3 will discuss. (4) clearly needs to be revised or deleted
JB-UK	32	6.2.3.5	note 49	ed	this section should include for clay heave due to desiccation	Add "including heave due to desiccation"	Accepted		
JB-UK	33	6.2.3.5 (3)		ed	As discussed in 6.2.3.4	remove	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	This relates to ground heave not down drag. Please clarify. We may need to add more to this sub-clause along the lines 'provided the heave displacement is not excessive'
JB-UK	34	6.2.3.6 (1)		ed	for clarity include the structural actions too	Add " as well as the transverse actions applied by the structure"	Accepted		Covered by 6.2.1(2). Will discuss with PT4 and probably add a new sub-clause
JB-UK	35	6.2.4 (1)	line 6	ed	needs reference to definition of "excessive movement"	Add words given in 6.9.2.2 (5) " defined as a downward plunging failure of the pile"	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	In this example it is not necessary for the pile element to fail itself to cause excessive movement that damages the supported structure. PT4 will discuss and consider whether we need a definition of 'excessive movement'
JB-UK	36	6.2.4 (2)		ge	Agreed	agreed	Accepted		
TS-UK	4	6.2.4(2) and (3)		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	37	6.2.4 (3)		te	follow definition set in 6.1 comment. A rigid inclusion has to have a load transfer platform present and so cannot be intrinsically linked into the superstructure. Piles rafts are always linked through the reinforcement. Suggest use this has guide to applicability of clause 10 (LT P) or 4 and 5 (linked)	follow definition set in 6.1 comment. A rigid inclusion has to have a load transfer platform present and so cannot be intrinsically linked into the superstructure. Piles rafts are always linked through the reinforcement. Suggest use this has guide to applicability of clause 10 (LT P) or 4 and 5 (linked)	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	It is not this simple. Piles or rigid inclusions can be used beneath embankments without a LTP [not usual but possible]. Likewise, rigid inclusions can be used beneath spread foundations.
TS-UK	5	6.2.6		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	38	6.2.6		ge	Not consistent with Table E1 1997-2 Annex E.	6.2.6 should be adopted in preference	Accepted		PT4 [and PT5] were asked to provide specific advice regarding ground investigation related to the various types of geotechnical structure. EN 1997-2 probably needs to be updated. I understand that PT6 will review and update for consistency across all parts of EN 1997
JB-UK	43	6.2.7 (1)		ed	Addition of reference to relevant standards , such as 14689 and 14688	include reference to current best practice	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Do you mean 6.2.6(1)? 6.2.6(1) references EN 1997-2 which refers to these other codes
EA-UK	#REF!	6.2.6 (2) <RCM> Note 52			Re-Word. Dynamic probing can provide valuable information to determine the ground model, but are unlikely to provide reliable measurements sufficient for CALCULATING PILE RESITANCE pile design.		Partly Accepted		PT4 will discuss
JB-UK	39	6.2.6 (2)		ge	Good to clarify what constitutes a 'investigation profile'. This terminology not used in 1997-2?	6.2.6 should be adopted in preference	Partly Accepted		Perhaps include a definition either in EN 1997-2, or in Clause 3

Contents of commenting template

1st author

MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
JB-UK	40	6.2.6	note52		for 90% of uk house foundations and smaller projects the spt/cpt/pmt profile is all that is produced should be amended to reflect this	remove "but are unlikely to provide reliable measurements sufficient for pile designs"	Partly Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	Dynamic probing is much too crude and prone to rod friction and operator error to provide any reliable ground strength or stiffness. We'll discuss with PT4 and may delete last half of the final sentence
JB-UK	44	6.2.7 (4)		ed	addition of coefficient of volume change (Cv)	addition of coefficient of volume change (Cv)	Partly Accepted		Presume you mean 6.2.6(4). How do you use this to design a pile? Is not Cv less important for this sub-clause. And it is included already in 6.2.6(3)
JB-UK	45	6.2.7 (7)		ed	beneficial effect on relative density increase due to installation are difficult to predict and not include or accepted in UK practice	remove	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Presume you mean 6.2.6(7). Just because it is difficult does not mean you should not be permitted to include. This is <PER>. I disagree that UK practice is to ignore
JB-UK	41	6.2.6 (9)		ed	Addition of description of soil type (granular/cohesive/ made ground) as frequently omitted	add " description of material type (granular, cohesive, made ground)	Partly Accepted		You mean soil description and grain size [fine or coarse]. Not always possible with say CPT or PMT
JB-UK	42	6.2.6.(9)		ed	Addition of reference to relevant standards , such as 14689 and 14688 also 1997-2	include reference to current best practice	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	That is covered by 6.2.6(1) reference to EN 1997-2
JB-UK	46	6.3.2 (2)		ed	vast majority of steel tubular piles installed in UK are second life tube. Acceptability acknowledged and included in SPERWALL	Add that second life tube is acceptable provided that it can be demonstrated as acceptable	Partly Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Provided the steel meets one or more of the specified codes, it is acceptable. Please provide more information
TS-UK	6	6.3.4(3) and (4)		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	48	6.3.4(3) and (4)		te	could be taken as contradictory	change (3) to durability due to aggressive ground conditions should be assessed in compliance with appropriate standards a minimum appropriate value cmin, dur shall be 10mm for precast piles, 25mm for cast in place piles	Partly Accepted		PT4 will discuss. Problem is that there are no appropriate standards defining this
JB-UK	47	6.3.4		ed	Include reference to reference to 12794	add precast piles should comply with EN12794	Partly Accepted		Does this actually have any specification for concrete?
RS-UK	78	6.3.4.(4)		te	Is this a construction vertical deviation or a setting out deviation of the pile head?	confirm	Partly Accepted		Neither. It is a variation in the flatness of the interface between the pile concrete and the ground. A driven cast insitu, auger bored, CFA bored or drilled pile will result in an uneven interface between the cast concrete and ground, defined as deviation by EN 1992-1-1
JB-UK	49	6.3.6	note 57	te	addition of comment on design life	add "in the case of temporary structures untreated piles maybe used when the anticipated durability exceeds the design life specified	Accepted		
JB-UK	50	6.4 (1)		ed	addition of "reasonably foreseen"	addition reads ..."that apply in the ground at installation and reasonably foreseen during the service life of the pile."	Partly Accepted		If something is an unknown, how can it be designed for. PT4 to discuss
RS-UK	80	6.4 (1)		te	Can the groundwater level throughout the service life of the pile be known?	Can/should this be a REQ	Partly Accepted		If something is an unknown, how can it be designed for. PT4 to discuss
RS-UK	81	6.5.1		te	Can the Observational Method be used for pile design?	clarify	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Refer to EN 1997-1
JB-UK	51	6.5.1. (4)		te	method flexibility	add comment that the situation should be assessed geotechnically using acceptable methods	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Not clear what you mean here
JB-UK	52	6.5.1 (6)		ge	Can examples / methods to determine be included?	require references	Partly Accepted		Possibly. Can you provide an example please?
JB-UK	53	6.5.1.(9)		te	no standard cyclical test available	guidance required	Partly Accepted		But this goes beyond EN 1997-3. If cyclic, dynamic or impact loading is significant, then advanced analysis or testing should be carried out
JB-UK	54	6.5.2 (2)		ed	add reference to ISO 22477, parts 1 , 4 and 10	include reference to ISO 22477, parts 1 , 4 and 10	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	This is the way PT4 have been asked to refer to execution codes

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
JB-UK	55	6.5.2 (4)	Table 6.3	ge	This table makes not allowance for previous experience on a specific site or locality/ground conditions Define or reference 6.9.2 and 6.9.3	Define or reference 6.9.2 and 6.9.3 Add a caveat that 'where load tests are available on the site or in the locality it may be suitable to reduce the testing numbers'.	Partly Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	If you have test data on the site, include, but in the locality can only be experience and cannot be used as site specific validation. PT4 are looking to TG3 for guidance on minimum quantities to include in this table. Please provide guidance. 6.9 is already referenced in 6.5.2(2)
JB-UK	56	6.5.2 (4)	Table 6.3	te	Define volumes by area as per table 6.7.	Define volumes by area as per table 6.7.	Partly Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	If you can supply some recommendations, PT4 will consider
JB-UK	57	6.5.2 (4)	Table 6.3			Note should reflect 6.9.2.4 (3)	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	It is not clear what note
TS-UK	7	6.5.2 (4)	Table 6.3	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
TS-UK	8	6.5.2(6)		te	This is required	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	59	6.5.3.1 ((4)		ed	aspirational in last part of sentence , as infers static testing sole method of validation of data. Also load testing data not often public ally available	remove "shall have been proved by documented load testing of comparable foundations" and replace "with peer reviewed publications or case histories".	Partly Accepted	#11. PT suggests this compromise:	Cannot change from <REQ> or 'shall'.but could add 'peer reviewed publications'
JB-UK	60	6.5.3.1 (7)		te	not common in UK practice	change to PER (?) or remove	Partly Accepted	#5. Comment on material that is unchanged from current Eurocode	Please refer to EN 1997-1:2004 sub-clause 7.6.2.1(2). PT4 will discuss and possible make <PER>
JB-UK	61	6.5.3.1 (9)		ge	definition required , what is "not significant" magnitude for down drag. Remove reference to low weight fill and section above ground	remove "the pile doe not extend ..."	Partly Accepted	#5. Comment on material that is unchanged from current Eurocode	Please refer to EN 1997-1:2004 sub-clause 7.6.2.1(2). PT4 will discuss and possible make <PER>
JB-UK	62	6.5.3.1 (13)		ge	Should this be accommodated through application of partial factors on soil resistance? The reference to reducing skin friction to 80% for tension is a clear change from current practice. This will produce conservative designs in some cases. There is no evidence that such an approach is appropriate in all cases.	remove	Partly Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	Partial resistance factors do not make any allowance for this. Model factors may be better. French proposal included in Table 6.9
RS-UK	82	6.5.3.2 (2)		te	Is reference to the contnent of Note 60 sufficient to satisfy the REQ?	clarify	Partly Accepted		Probably not
JB-UK	63	6.5.3.2 (2)		ed	aspirational in last part of sentence , as infers static testing sole method of validation of data. Also load testing data not often publicly available	remove "shall have been proved by documented load testing of comparable foundations" and replace with "peer reviewed publications or case histories".	Partly Accepted	#11. PT suggests this compromise:	Cannot change from <REQ> or 'shall'.but could add 'peer reviewed publications'
JB-UK	64	6.5.4.1			reference ISO22477-1	reference ISO 22477-1	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	Refer to 6.9. This is the way PT4 have been asked to refer to execution codes
JB-UK	66	6.5.4.1 (5)	Table 6.4	te	This table makes not allowance for previous experience on a specific site or locality/ground conditions	this should only be relevant for DLT when correlated to static design or load testing, not to be used on its own as unreliable.	Not Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	I am sympathetic, but there are a lot of countries that think dynamic impact tests are reliable and accurate
JB-UK	65	6.5.4.1 (5)	Table 6.4	te		number of test seem high for Uk practice values should be 50% of current levels.	Partly Accepted		Please make a suggestion for the percentages. TG3 have been asked to provide guidance on the minimum quantity of load tests for design by testing
TS-UK	9	6.5.4.1(5)	Table 6.4	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	67	6.5.4.1 (6)		te	guidance required	guidance on reduction values for combination of test s should be stated(NGI)	Partly Accepted		PT4 and TG3 to discuss
JB-UK	68	6.5.4.1 (10)		ed	aspirational in last part of sentence , as infers static testing sole method of validation of data. Also load testing data not often publicly available	remove "shall have been proved by documented load testing of comparable foundations" and replace with "peer reviewed publications or case histories". Adopt item (11)	Partly Accepted	#11. PT suggests this compromise:	Cannot change from <REQ> or 'shall'.but could add 'peer reviewed publications'
JB-UK	69	6.5.4.1 (11)		te	Why are steel cased piles drilled to form rock sockets in competent rock excluded? The installation process gives no feedback on performance.	remove	Not Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	Do you mean included? The important part of this condition is the term 'competent rock'. But we need to include a definition in Clause 3

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
EA-UK	70	6.5.4.1 (12)			Clause (12) regarding pile set-up reads better compared to the suggested alternative in (13) and (14)		Accepted		Reads better, but is the content better?
JB-UK	70	6.5.4.2.		te	include reference to ISO22477-1	include reference to ISO22477-1	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	Refer to 6.9. This is the way PT4 have been asked to refer to execution codes
JB-UK	71	6.5.4.3		te	include reference to ISO22477-4	include reference to ISO22477-4	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	Refer to 6.9. This is the way PT4 have been asked to refer to execution codes
JB-UK	72	6.5.4.4		te	include reference to ISO22477-10	include reference to ISO22477-10	Not Accepted	#6. Comment on aspects of drafting style	Refer to 6.9. This is the way PT4 have been asked to refer to execution codes
JB-UK	73	6.5.4.5(1) also notes 66 and 67		ed	superfluous as referenced elsewhere including 6.5.4.1 and 6.5.4.1 (9))	remove	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	Refers to wave equation analysis
JB-UK	75	6.5.4.5 (3)		ed	add frequency	addition reads "frequency and validation of ... "	Partly Accepted		Please provide more information about what you mean here
JB-UK	74	6.5.4.5 (3)		ge	need to add flexibility if results align with geotechnics, other information may now be publicly available	add geotechnical design and appropriate and relevant peer reviewed publications	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	(3) which relates to site specific validation of the design
JB-UK	76	6.5.4.6(1)		ge		Good and clear statement.	Accepted		
JB-UK	77	6.5.4.6 (2)			repeat of 6.5.4.5 and 6.5.4.1	remove	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	This refers to calibration of pile driving formulae
JB-UK	78	6.5.4.6 (4)		ge	need to add flexibility if results align with geotechnics, other information may now be publicly available	add geotechnical design and appropriate and relevant peer reviewed publications	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	(4) which relates to site specific validation of the design
JB-UK	79	6.5.4.6 (4)		ed	add frequency	addition reads "frequency and validation of ... "	Partly Accepted		Please provide more information about what you mean here
JB-UK	80	6.5.5 (2)		ed	addition of "reasonably foreseen"	"take account of the systematic and random variations that could be reasonably foreseen in the ground."	Partly Accepted		If it is unknown, it cannot be foreseen
RS-UK	83	6.5.6		te	Is this true to the spirit of the Observational Method or is it just comparing the results of installed piles, with test piles and spotting anomalies? How will the process described in the note lead to efficiencies implicit in the Observational Method?	clarify	Partly Accepted		Not sure what else to say. Can you provide more detail about where you need some clarification
JB-UK	81	6.5.6(2)		te	change from RCM to REQ	alter to REQ	Accepted		
EA-UK	1	6.5.7.1 (3)			The heading refers to "single" piles, so "pile group" is not required in this tatement unless the heading is changed to "Design of laterally loaded piles".		Partly Accepted		PT4 will review where to move this
JB-UK	82	6.5.7.2 (2)		te	use alternative draft (4)	delete (3) and include (4)	Partly Accepted	#5. Comment on material that is unchanged from current Eurocode	This is a modification of sub-clauses from the existing EN 1997-1:2004. PT4 to discuss
JB-UK	84	6.5.8.2 (10)	Note 74	te	requires clarity	This note is too open ended and provides no recommendations about the approach to be taken	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Read a text book. EN 1997-3 says what no how
JB-UK	85	6.5.8.3		te	When in rock consideration should also be given to potential cone pullout resistance.	For piles in rock check cone pull-out resistance	Partly Accepted		PT4 will consider all comments and come to a consensus view
JB-UK	86	6.5.10.1 (4)		te	remove "where appropriate"	remove "where appropriate"	Accepted		
JB-UK	87	6.5.10.3	note 77	te	remove as not relevant	remove	Partly Accepted		Will consider with Note 74
JB-UK	89	6.6.1	formulae 6.8	te	should the formulae reflect that the sum of the correlation factors is what is required here	include sum function in formulae	Partly Accepted		Not the sum. The product

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
JB-UK	88	6.6.1 (2)	note 80	ed	typo should refer to 6.8 not 6.7	replace with 6.8	Accepted		Typo
JB-UK	90	6.6.2 (1)		te	need to include for occasions when testing not done	default value required	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	This is already included as 'no validation testing'
TS-UK	10	6.6.2(3)	Table 6.5	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	91	6.6.2 (3)	table 6.5	ge	How does this compare to current practice.	A range of sample calculations for various pile types and testing regimes will be required to allow comparison the new approach and the existing approach. Accept, but values need review	Partly Accepted		It is near enough the same for UK practice. TG3 and PT4 will discuss and prepare some example calculations to cover other countries that carry out design by calculation
JB-UK	92	6.6.2 (6)	table 6.6	te	SPT included in error as cant be used as validation against something they contribute to	remove reference to SPT in table	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	You are misunderstanding. These are correlation factors for using SPT as the primary design verification
JB-UK	95	6.6.2 (6)	table 6.8	te	correlation factors should be at least 30% higher	correlation factors should be at least 30% higher	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Values based on TG3 recommendations
JB-UK	93	6.6.2 (6)	table 6.7	te	revise as if control tests and static test are combined on site the combined factor is worse than none at all	accepted but values require review include additional values for < 1	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Please provide more explanation to your comment as I do not understand. Correlation factors in Table 6.5 are not used together with those in Table 6.7. Values based on TG3 recommendations
JB-UK	94	6.6.2 (6)	table 6.8	ed	to be consistent with 6.7 should be area based table	to be consistent with 6.7 should be area based table	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Yes. Values based on TG3 recommendations. PT4 will discuss with TG3 and see if consistency is desirable or possible
JB-UK	97	6.6.3		te	need to include for occasions when testing not done	Accepted , but default value requires review	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Testing does not generally alter model factors for calculation [Table 9]. Testing is necessary for model factors given either in Table 6.10 or 6.11
TS-UK	11	6.6.3(5)	Table 6.9	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	96	6.6.3 (5)	table 6.9	ge	Geotechnical ground model method does not appear to be defined? How does this compare to current practice.	accepted, but values require review. , sensitivity analysis required to ensure benefits of combinations not weighted	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	See note. Ground model requires an additional 1.1 factor
JB-UK	98	6.6.3 (5)	table 6.10	te	closed form values should be higher. Other soil types not covered, guidance required	closed form values should be higher. Other soil types not covered, guidance required	Not Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	These values have been provided by the Nordic Group. TG3 will consider and possible suggest revisions. If you think values are too low, please provide suggestions and justification so thet TG3 and PT4 can review
JB-UK	99	6.6.3 (5)	table 6.10 and 11	te	wave equation and signal matching are the same process,	resolve/consolidate values and take highest values	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Not correct
JB-UK	100	6.6.3 (5)	table 6.11	te	values too low	should be increase by at least 40% unless correlated with static test data	Not Accepted	#9. Comment does not represent consensus national positions or is contradictory	These values have been provided by the Nordic Group. TG3 will consider and possible suggest revisions. If you think values are not correct, please provide suggestions and justification so thet TG3 and PT4 can review
JB-UK	101	6.6.4 (1)		ge	confusing when compared to 8.9.4	clarify with respect to 8.9.4	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	You have lost me here. 8.9.4 is acceptance tests for grouted anchors. Is this what you mean? Please clarify
JB-UK	102	6.6.4 (2)	table 6.12	te	high and low replacement DC1 and 3 values should be separated from others as they seem low. How does this compare to current practice.	add to NGI (see table 6.9)accept in principle, but requires further parameter review	Partly Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	These need to be taken together with the proposed correlation and model factors, and the appropriate factors on actions. PT4 will provide some comparative calculations to demonstrate how the overall design relates to current approaches
TS-UK	12	6.6.4(2)	Table 6.12	te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	108	6.6.6			include reference to en 12794	include reference to en 12794	Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	Not sure this is correct sub-clause reference.
JB-UK	103	6.6.6.					Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	No comment here
TS-UK	13	6.6.6	Supplement	te	Pile group text is OK	No change	Accepted		Numbering is messed up [should be 6.6.6]. Supplement 6.6.5 Pile groups. PT4 will discuss and probably include this text in sub-clause 6.6.5
JB-UK	104	6.6.7					Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	No comment here

Contents of commenting template						1st author			
MB (1)	Line number	Clause (2)	Paragraph (3)	Type (4)	Comment (5)	Proposed change (6)	Option	Reason For NOT accept	Drafters Comment
TS-UK	14	6.6.7	Supplement	te	Pile raft text is OK	No change	Accepted		Numbering is messed up [should be 6.6.7]. Supplement 6.6.6 Piled rafts. PT4 will discuss and probably include this text in sub-clause 6.6.5
JB-UK	105	6.7.2 (4)		ge	Partial factor of 1.2 should be noted as a minimum as per BS 8004:2015.	Partial factor of 1.2 should be noted as a minimum as per BS 8004:2015.	Partly Accepted		Cannot refer to national standards
TS-UK	15	6.7.2(4)		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	106	6.7.3					Not Accepted	#3. Comment is not specific.	No comment here
TS-UK	16	6.7.3		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
TS-UK	17	6.7.4		te	This is agreed	No change	Partly Accepted		
JB-UK	109	6.8.3		ge	suggest relaxation of these requirements if contractor has a recognised and independently audited quality system	suggest relaxation of these requirements if contractor has a recognised and independently audited quality system	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	These sub-clauses still need to be adhered to
JB-UK	110	6.8.4		ge	suggest relaxation of these requirements if contractor has a recognised and independently audited quality system	suggest relaxation of these requirements if contractor has a recognised and independently audited quality system	Not Accepted	#10. PT does not agree due to:	These sub-clauses still need to be adhered to
TS-UK	18	6.9.2		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
TS-UK	19	6.9.2.2(6)		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
JB-UK	111	6.9.2.2(6)		te	10% to 20% is a very broad range	industry varies in opinion, some prefer 10%, no support for 20%, settlement rate preferred by others	Partly Accepted		The best definition is approaching an asymptote. But for compression testing in fine grained soils, the failure curve is likely to be brittle [sudden] and 10% may be appropriate. For piles end bearing on coarse grained soils, the failure curve will be ductile and 20% will be more appropriate
JB-UK	112	6.9.2.2(6)	drafting note	te	settlement rate preferred as better indication of approaching failure a function of diameter is arbitrary		Partly Accepted		Not sure creep rate is better for brittle [sudden] failure curves as there will be quite low creep until close to failure
JB-UK	113	6.9.2.2(7)		te	may lead to hazardous operation, suggest use of agreed settlement operation as alternative	may lead to hazardous operation, suggest use of agreed settlement operation as alternative	Partly Accepted		Agree that test must be carried out safely
JB-UK	114	6.9.2.4 (2)		te	no mention of closed form solutions, should this then be removed from previous tables?	remove reference to closed form solutions	Partly Accepted		We are dealing with investigation tests here. Closed form solutions are probably acceptable for control testing
JB-UK	107	6.9.4 (2)		ge	Should relevance of sonic logging also be commented on here? Agreed also include reference to minimum diameter applicable	need to reference minimum diameter applicable relevance of additional information such as ground investigation and rig instrumentation should also be include in assesment of results.	Accepted		Do you mean 6.9.4.3. Probably we should add
TS-UK	20	6.9.4.2		te	This is agreed	No change	Accepted		
TS-UK	21	6.9.4.3		te	Preformed is a better term than precast	Change precast to preformed	Accepted		
JB-UK	115	6.9.4.3 (1)		te	all jointing mechanisms result in false positive anomalies (ciria144) also design sets will not be achieved if broken	remove reference to precast	Partly Accepted		Will add a note about joints
JB-UK	116	6.9.4.5		te	mitigated in precast piles by en12794	mitigated in precast piles by en12794	Partly Accepted		Can add a note