

Template for comments and secretariat observations

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Date: 9.07.2013 | Document: working draft ISO CD 2394 2013_04_15 |
|-----------------|---|

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| MB ¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Actions taken and possible comments by the Revision Committee |
| CZ | Cl. 8 | | tech | Inconsistent notation is used. | Notation should be adjusted to Clause 3, e.g. p_i , p_{ft} . | Symbols updated/changed: p_i , p_{ft} and $E \rightarrow S$ (for load effect) |
| CZ | Cl. 8.4 | Tab. 8.1 | tech | Table 8.1 does not seem to cover Serviceability and Conditional Limit States (moreover it should be harmonized with Tab. 4.1), see current ISO 2394. | Table 8.1 should cover Serviceability and Conditional Limit States. It should be harmonized with Tab. 4.1, see current ISO 2394. | ?? Table 8.1 is moved to annex G - to be discussed in connection with changes in annex G |
| CZ | Cl. 8.4 | 1 st sentence | tech | | The target failure probabilities, i.e. p_{ft} should be chosen taking into account the consequence and the nature of failure. | OK – text changes |
| CZ | Cl. 8.4 | Note | tech | | Note: Tentative target reliabilities related to one year reference period and ultimate limit states can be found in Annex G. Serviceability limit states should be included, also in Annex G. | ?? to be discussed in connection with changes in annex G |
| CZ | Cl. 9 | | tech | All the symbols should be harmonized with Clause 3. | Notation should be adjusted to Clause 3. | Symbols updated/changed: p_i , p_{ft} and $E \rightarrow S$ (for load effect) |
| CZ | Cl. 9.1 | 2 nd colon | Tech | | Nuclear facilities should be deleted. | OK – to be discussed |
| CZ | Cl. 9.3 | 1 st par. | Tech | | Design equations shall be formulated according to the principles given in Clause 5 and Clause 6, taking basis in the modelling of structural performance in terms of limit state functions and the Bayesian probabilistic modelling of uncertainties. The symbolic form of design equations is given in Equation (9.1), which for all relevant failure modes of the structures shall facilitate that values of structural parameters dimensions , such as cross-sectional properties z , may be determined uniquely and such that these are conforming with given requirements to risk and reliability (see also Clause 8.4). If $G(z)$ is needed, then what is that (G also denotes permanent | OK |

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. FR for France; comments from the CMC editing unit are identified by ***)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Date: 9.07.2013 | Document: working draft ISO CD 2394 2013_04_15 |
|-----------------|---|

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| MB ¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of comment ² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Actions taken and possible comments by the Revision Committee |
| | | | | | load)? | |
| CZ | 9.3.1 | 1 st par. | tech | | A permanent action has often a unique characteristic value. When the action refers to the self-weight of the structure, the value G_k should be obtained from the specified values of geometrical quantities and the mean unit weight mass of the material. However, in some cases it may be necessary preferable to define two values, one upper and one lower characteristic value of a permanent action. | OK |
| CZ | 9.3.2 | 3 rd sentence of 1 st par. | tech | Material properties to be used in non-linear analyses may be based on design values, characteristic values, or mean values provided a consistent safety concept is used, that sufficient provide the target reliability level is achieved to be obtained. - Not clear, why actual volume or part? | Clarify. | Text is reformulated |
| CZ | 9.4.2.1 | Exp. (9.6) | tech | Accidental and seismic actions, and combination rules are missing. | Recommendations for combination of actions for ultimate and serviceability limit states are completely missing??? | Clause 9.3.1 contains a general sentence on combination of actions – as in ISO 2394:1998. It is not considered necessary to write more detailed rules. |
| CZ | 9.4.2.2 | Exp. (9.9), exp. (9.10), (9.11) | tech | In model 1 the partial factor γ_m depends on the uncertainty of the strength parameter(s) and γ_θ depends on the uncertainty of the resistance model, incl. bias: symbols ??? b included in γ_θ ??? see also (9.6) | Delete bias b . | The description of the three models are updated and rearranged |
| CZ | 9.4.2 | Last paragraph | tech | The calibration shall be undertaken by choosing the partial factors and load combination values such that when the semi-probabilistic safety format is applied on a portfolio what is that ? never used in that sense, it is better use just “set of structures” | The calibration shall be undertaken by choosing the partial factors and load combination values such that when the semi-probabilistic safety format is applied on a set of structures /class of structures, the difference between the achieved probability of failure and the maximum acceptable probability of | OK – text updated |

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. FR for France; comments from the CMC editing unit are identified by ***)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Date: 9.07.2013 | Document: working draft ISO CD 2394 2013_04_15 |
|-----------------|---|

| 1 | 2 | (3) | 4 | 5 | (6) | (7) |
|-----------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| MB ¹ | Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1) | Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1) | Type of com- ment ² | Comment (justification for change) by the MB | Proposed change by the MB | Actions taken and possible comments by the Revision Committee |
| | | | | | failure is minimized over the entire set of structures . | |
| CZ | Cl.9.5 | | tech | The term cumulative damage is not defined . | Clarify or define “cumulative damage”. | OK – text updated |
| CZ | Cl.9.5 | Exp. (9.13) | tech | $R_d(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{a}, n)$ is the resistance at the end of the life time, based on the original state and all load effects during the life time. Design values for \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{a} may be based on life time reliability target. What that means??? | Clarify or describe in more detail. | OK – text updated |

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. FR for France; comments from the CMC editing unit are identified by ***)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.