

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21	Document: prEN 17237:2022	Project: WI
------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ Table (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
TL				ge	“Steadiness of production” is not the correct English term	Use “consistency of production” instead	
TL				te/ge	Terms “minimum distance between anchor sleeves” and “minimum distance between anchor sleeves having no superposition” are misleading	Use “minimum distance between the anchor sleeves from which superposition is avoided” for both terms instead, but not for the key of figure 3	
TL				te/ed/ge	“FPC result” not clear. “FPC test result” is meant, not single measurements.	“FPC test result” instead of “FPC result”.	
TL				ge/ed	Inconsistent expression	“supplementary mounting aid plate anchor” instead of “supplementary plate anchor”	
TL		3.1.1.1; 3.1.3.1 to 3.1.3.8	whole clause; figures	te	The term "design ETICS" is not used in the document. Figure 1 introduces even more terms that are also not used anywhere else. The whole clause is confusing and not needed.	Delete 3.1.1.1; Delete the box and all asterisks in every figure and amend key	
TL		3.1.1.8	key figure 2	te	Wrong key	Replace key with 1 Middle area 2 Edge/corner area 3 Joint area 4 Middle area position examples 5 Edge/corner position examples 6 Joint position examples 7 Panel borders r_{min} Distance defining the middle area c Distance c determined according to EN 16382:2016	
TL		3.1.3.4	caption of figure 11	ed	“with” is missing before “spiral anchors”	Correct	
TL		3.1.4.2		te/ed	The term "variant" rarely occurs is not necessary for understanding the document. It rather confuses.	Delete clause 3.1.4.2 and every appearance of the term “variant” in the standard	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21

Document: prEN 17237:2022

Project: WI

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
TL		4	all "EXAMPLE S"	ed/te	Units missing	Add units to numbers	
TL		4.6.1.3.3	1 st paragraph	te	Term "5%-quantile" not clear	Explain term in clause 3 by "A 5%-quantile for the confidence level of 75 %, $F_{5\%}$, is calculated using the mean value F_{mean} and the variation coefficient v of the measurements and the $k_{95/75}$ -factor according to ISO 12491:1997, Table 6, and means that 5% of the measurements will have a 75% probability of being below $F_{5\%}$ and 95% above. $F_{5\%} = F_{\text{mean}} \times (1 - k_{95/75} \times v)$ "	
FR		4.7.2.3.		te	<i>"4.7.2.3 The performance of pull-through resistance, $\sigma_{k,anchors}$, related to the ETIC kit, shall be expressed with the value, for the relevant combination of parameters related to some of its components (see 4.7.2.2), shall be expressed with the indication of the value (see 4.7.2.1). When chosen to indicate in addition also one or more results related to the properties of this ETIC kit (see 4.7.2.1 a) to e)), this shall be done respecting the following scheme: [a b c d e]: EXAMPLE 7,55 kPa [8,05 7,60 4,55 120 250]"</i> I think the performance expression in kPa requires to indicate the number of anchors.	<i>"4.7.2.3 The performance of pull-through resistance, $\sigma_{k,anchors}$, related to the ETIC kit, shall be expressed with the value, for the relevant combination of parameters related to some of its components (see 4.7.2.2), shall be expressed with the indication of the value (see 4.7.2.1). When chosen to indicate in addition also one or more results related to the properties of this ETIC kit (see 4.7.2.1 a) to e)), this shall be done respecting the following scheme: [na:nec:nj a b c d e]: EXAMPLE 3,40 kPa [4:0:4 0,64 0,29 0,21 120 250] Note: na, nec, nj see section 5.8.1"</i>	
TL		4.7.3.2	g)	te	Optional plate anchors are possible but not considered in the code	Change "g) [VI or VII all all - -]" to "g) [VI or VII all all all all]"	
FR		4.7.3.3		te	<i>"The performance of pull-off tensile resistance, $\sigma_{k,block,t}$, related to the ETIC kit and for the relevant combination of parameters related to some of its components (see 4.7.3.2), shall be expressed with the indication of the value (see 4.7.3.1). EXAMPLE 7,55 kPa"</i>	<i>"The performance of pull-off tensile resistance, $\sigma_{k,block,t}$, related to the ETIC kit and for the relevant combination of parameters related to some of its components (see 4.7.3.2), shall be expressed with the indication of the value (see 4.7.3.1), the relevant number of anchors per unit area, distance c and r_{min} [na:nec:nj c rmin]."</i>	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21	Document: prEN 17237:2022	Project: WI
------------------	---------------------------	-------------

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					I think the performance expression requires to indicate the number of anchors.	<i>EXAMPLE 7,55 kPa [4:8:4 ! 50 ! 110]"</i> <i>12,25 kPa [8:8:8 ! 50 ! 110]"</i>	
TL		4.7.4.2	i)	te	Optional plate anchors are possible but not considered in the code	Change "i) [VI, VII or VIII all all -]" to read "i) [VI or VII all all all]" and "j) [VIII all all -]"	
FR		4.7.4.3		te	<i>"4.7.4.3 The performance of pull-off tensile-shear resistance, $\sigma_{k,block,ts}$, and the applied shear stress T_{ts}, related to the ETIC kit and for the relevant combination of parameters related to some of its components (see 4.7.4.2), shall be expressed with the indication of the value (see 4.7.4.1):</i> <i>EXAMPLE 7,55 kPa/1,25 kPa"</i> I think the performance expression requires to indicate the number of anchors.	<i>"4.7.4.3 The performance of pull-off tensile-shear resistance, $\sigma_{k,block,ts}$, and the applied shear stress T_{ts}, related to the ETIC kit and for the relevant combination of parameters related to some of its components (see 4.7.4.2), shall be expressed with the indication of the value (see 4.7.4.1) and the relevant number of anchors per unit area, distance c and r_{min} [$n_a:n_{ec}:n_j ! c ! r_{min}$].</i> <i>EXAMPLE 7,55 kPa/1,25 kPa [4:8:4 !50!110]"</i> <i>12,25 kPa/1,25 kPa [8:8:8 !50!110]"</i>	
FR		4.9.3.1	1	te	<i>"...the resulted value in K/W, convergently rounded to 0,001 K/W, reported."</i> The rounding rule is redundant to the rule given in Annex D.2.2. The rule given in D.2.2 is compliant to the State of the Art. See also comment for clause 5.10.2.2!	Erase the rounding rule in clause 4.9.3.1	
TL		5.1.2		te	For components used for test specimen(s) reference values are known. What about the component properties of untested components?	After "... is already assessed." add: "In other words, for components for which there are no reference values, the same validity sector derived from the reference value(s) of the tested component applies. The values of the untested component are taken from the factory production control (FPC). See 6 and Annex H"	
TL		5.1.2	2 nd sentence	te/ed	explanation of ">= than tested" not clear	"the specification or component property shall be greater than or equal to the specification or component property of the test specimen already	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21

Document: **prEN 17237:2022**

Project: WI

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
						used to assess a particular characteristic of an ETIC kit." instead of "the value shall ... already assessed"	
TL		5.1.2	Note 2	ed	"determined" is the wrong term	Replace with "assessed"	
TL		5.1.3	1st paragraph	te	Several batches of components can be used. Clarify	Add a note: "One or more batches of a component can be used for the assessment of an ETIC kit by testing. One can use different batches for different characteristics, but also for one characteristic. Each batch of a component generates reference values for certain component properties, depending on the assessed characteristic of the ETIC kit, detailed in Annex E.	
FR		5.10.2.2	1	te	The expression " <i>convergently rounded to 0,001 W/K</i> " is redundant to the rounding rule given in Annex D.2.2. The rule given in D.2.2 is compliant to the State of the Art. See also comment for clause 4.9.3.1!	Erase the rounding rule in clause 5.10.2.2!	
FR		5.10.3.2			The expression " <i>convergently rounded to 0,001 W/K</i> " deviates for the rules given for plate anchors in Annex D.2.2!	I propose to apply the same rounding rules as for plate anchors.	
FR		5.10.4.2	1	te	The expression " <i>convergently rounded to 0,001 W/K</i> " deviates for the rules given for plate anchors in Annex D.2.2!	I propose to apply the same rounding rules as for plate anchors.	
TL		5.2.1.2.1	1 st paragraph, 2 nd sentence	te	Wrong reference.	„EN 13238:2010" instead of „EN 13823:2020"	
TL		5.2.1.2.1	5 th paragraph	te/ed	The term "variant" rarely occurs and is not necessary for understanding the document. It rather confuses.	Delete "Two variants shall be considered regarding base and finishing coats (two test specimen design)."	
TL		5.2.1.2.1	6 th paragraph	te/ed	Clarification	Add after "... four test specimen" "(2x2)"	
TL		5.2.1.2.1	list	te/ed	The term "variant" rarely occurs and is not necessary for understanding the document. It	"ETIC kits with" instead of "The variants";	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21	Document: prEN 17237:2022	Project: WI
------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					rather confuses.	add “an”, “a” and “, and/or” accordingly: “a) an adhesive ... > 15 %, and or”; “b) a thermal ... WF , and or”; “c) a standard substrate ...”; Delete “combined or not, “	
TL		5.2.1.3.1	3 rd paragraph	te/ed	The term "variant" rarely occurs and is not necessary for understanding the document. It rather confuses.	Delete 1 st sentence.	
		5.2.2.6.1	1 st paragraph	te	Clarification	Add “, which consist only of thermal insulation, “ between “specimens” and “shall”	
TL		5.3.2.2	keys	te	Accuracy of the variables is missing	Add “, rounded to 0,01 kg/m ² ” to W (two times) Add “, rounded to 0,0001 m ² ” to A (two times) Add “, rounded to 0,0001 kg” to m (four times)	
TL		5.3.4.1	1 st paragraph	te	Is EN ISO 29767:2019, method A, the common test method for MW in Europe (short term)? Or is it rather EN 12087:2011 (long term)?	Clarify. Even two different methods can be possible, if the comparison is not mixed up, e.g. by adding “or according to EN 12087:2011” after “method A, “ in 1 st paragraph	
		5.3.4.1	2 nd paragraph	ed	“or the material”	“of the material”	
TL		5.7.2.2.2.2	1 st paragraph	ed		“compression behaviour” instead of “compressive behaviour”	
FR		5.8.1, 5.8.2, 5.8.3 and Annex E table E.4		te	I still have doubts, whether the “validity of FPC results – approved, if a FPC results falls in the range” will gain acceptance at insulation manufacturers. I am concerned because any “Fixing strength” test (clause 5.8) in an insulation with a strength greater than “lower limit of FPC”/0.8 (for MiWo boards) would require a change to the lower limit values of FPC.	Re-consider the normalization of test results in 5.8.1, 5.8.2 and 5.8.3. See Annex I of this document for an example.	
TL		5.8.1.3.2.3;		ed	“middle area position” not consequently used	Change “middle area anchor setting position” to	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
		5.8.1.4.2.3				"middle area position" (four times)	
FR		5.8.1.3.4.2 5.8.1.4.4.2 5.8.2.4.5 5.8.3.4.5 G.3		ed	"The range for an anchor setting position to consider is middle area position > edge/corner position > joint position."	The range order for an anchor setting position to consider is middle area position > edge/corner position > joint position.	
FR		5.8.1.4.4.1	2	te	"...tensile strength of the layer where the anchor is sitting in \geq than tested and a thickness \geq than tested." is not correct because the thickness does not matter but the position of the spiral matters. The DIAP-rule for the position of the spiral is already laid out in 5.8.1.4.4.2	"...tensile strength of the layer where the anchor is sitting in \geq than tested and a thickness \geq than tested. "	
FR		5.8.2.1	1	ed	"A one or a two-specimen design, differing in the number per unit area and/or anchor setting positions, is possible."	Better to understand: A one or a two-specimen design, differing in the number of anchors per unit area and/or anchor setting positions, is possible.	
FR		5.8.2.1	2 3 4 NOTE	te/ed	"A nearly non-polar foil between substrate and thermal insulation is mandatory." That is not necessary for this test. It is only necessary for the tests in clause 5.8.3 Pull-off tensile-shear resistance	Erase the sentences requiring a non-polar foil in paragraph 2, 3 and 4 and erase the NOTE!	
FR		5.8.2.3 and many other sections			The expression "...convergently rounded to 3 significant digits" needs a definition	Insert a definition in prEN17237 and provide 2 or 3 examples!	
TL		5.8.2.4.3		te	The base coat does not influence the test result	Replace "the tested" with "any"	
FR		5.8.2.4.3	1	te	"A test result is valid for the tested base coat in any thickness." It does not comply to State of the Art	Erase the complete clause or edit: "A test result is valid for all the tested base coat in any thickness."	
FR		5.8.2.4.4	1	te	"For a reinforcement of the material glass fibre mesh, a test result is valid for any glass fibre	Erase the complete paragraph or edit:	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					<p>mesh with a tensile strength after conditioning in aggressive medium according to EN 13496:2013 \geq than tested, a mesh size \leq than tested and the optional use of additional reinforcement layer(s) of the same material.”</p> <p>I am not aware that it does comply to State of the Art. Double-check with Dr. Oberhaus!</p>	<p>“For a reinforcement of the material glass fibre mesh, a test result is valid for any glass fibre mesh with a tensile strength after conditioning in aggressive medium according to EN 13496:2013 \geq than tested, a mesh size \leq than tested and the optional use of additional reinforcement layer(s) of the same material.”</p>	
FR		5.8.3.4.2	2	te	<p>“A test result of fixing method III to VIII is valid for any thermal insulation of the same material and type as tested, a tensile strength \geq than tested and a shear strength \geq than tested.”</p> <p>I feel there is a statement about insulation thickness missing.</p>	<p>“A test result of fixing method III to VIII is valid for any thermal insulation of the same material and type as tested, a tensile strength \geq than tested, and a shear strength \geq than tested and thickness \leq than tested.””</p>	
TL		5.8.3.4.3		te	The base coat does not influence the test result	Replace “the tested” with “any”	
FR		5.8.3.4.3	1	te	<p>“A test result is valid for the tested base coat in any thickness.”</p> <p>It does not comply to State of the Art</p>	<p>Erase the complete clause or edit:</p> <p>“A test result is valid for all the tested base coat in any thickness.”</p>	
FR		5.8.3.4.4	1	te	<p>“For a reinforcement of the material glass fibre mesh, a test result is valid for any glass fibre mesh with a tensile strength after conditioning in aggressive medium according to EN 13496:2013 \geq than tested, a mesh size \leq than tested and the optional use of additional reinforcement layer(s) of the same material.”</p> <p>I am not aware that it does comply to State of the Art. Double-check with Dr. Oberhaus!</p>	<p>Erase the complete paragraph or edit:</p> <p>“For a reinforcement of the material glass fibre mesh, a test result is valid for any glass fibre mesh with a tensile strength after conditioning in aggressive medium according to EN 13496:2013 \geq than tested, a mesh size \leq than tested and the optional use of additional reinforcement layer(s) of the same material.”</p>	
FR		5.8.3.4.5	1 and 2	te	<p>“For plate anchors having a plate diameter $d_P \leq 60$ mm, a test result is valid for plate anchors in any length with a characteristic plate stiffness $k_P \geq$ than tested, a plate diameter $d_P \geq$ than tested and a characteristic load resistance $FP \geq$ than tested.”</p> <p>This DIAP rule does not apply to Fixture Method</p>	<p>Amend and add:</p> <p>“For fixing method (III) with For plate anchors having a plate diameter $d_P \leq 60$ mm, a test result is valid for plate anchors in any length with a characteristic plate stiffness $k_P \geq$ than tested, a plate diameter $d_P \geq$ than tested and a characteristic load resistance $FP \geq$ than tested.”</p>	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21

Document: prEN 17237:2022

Project: WI

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					(V). Actually, it applies to Fixing method (III) only.	<i>For fixing method (V) with plate anchors a test result is valid only for the tested anchor.</i>	
FR		5.8.3.4.5	5 and 6	te	<p><i>“For plate anchors countersunk, a test result is valid for a distance of plate to substrate faced side of thermal insulation \geq than tested.</i></p> <p><i>For plate anchors countersunk, a test result is valid for a distance of the setting tool cuts to substrate faced side of thermal insulation \geq than tested.”</i></p> <p>This DIAP rule does not apply to Fixture Method (V). Actually, it applies to Fixing method (III) only.</p>	<p>Amend and add:</p> <p><i>“For fixing method (III) with For plate anchors countersunk, a test result is valid for a distance of plate to substrate faced side of thermal insulation \geq than tested.</i></p> <p><i>“For fixing method (III) with For plate anchors countersunk, a test result is valid for a distance of the setting tool cuts to substrate faced side of thermal insulation \geq than tested.”</i></p> <p><i>For fixing method (V) with plate anchors countersunk a test result is valid only for the tested anchor.</i></p>	
FR		5.8.4.4		te	A DiAp rule for the alpha factor would be favourable.	<i>A test result with 28 days exposure is also valid for 7 days exposure.</i>	
TL		6.3.1.5.4		te/ed	“Established indirect testing” is a type of indirect testing	Make 6.3.1.5.4 a subclause of 6.3.1.5.3	
TL		6.3.1.5.4		te/ed	“Established indirect testing” is an unfamiliar term	Use “Indirect testing with component properties” instead	
TL		6.3.1.5.4	1 st paragraph	te	This indirect test has been proven in practice for more than 2 decades. Make clear why the method is useful.	Replace the last sentence with "Indirect testing with component properties is an already proven method that has been used in practice for more than two decades. Its correlation with the recommended method ensures that the appropriate characteristic is as declared. The method is described in detail below."	
TL		A		te/ed	Term “limit” is used with a different meaning to e. g. annex H	Clarify the meaning, e. g. by using another expression instead.	
TL		A	Table A.1	ed	Two different expressions for the fixing methods appear in the table	Use "Fastening method I and II" etc. for all indications	

¹ MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21	Document: prEN 17237:2022	Project: WI
------------------	---------------------------	-------------

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
TL		A5.1	a)	te	Term not in line with EN 13496:2022	“no additional conditioning” instead of “no conditioning”	
TL		A5.1	last paragraph	te	Terms not in line with EN 13496:2022	First sentence: “For the conditioning in alkaline solution, the conditioning C according to EN 13496:2022 is considered to be the reference method.” Second sentence: “The conditioning B according to EN 13496:2022 is considered to be the alternative method.”	
FR		D.2.2	4	te	“...is the point thermal transmittance of a mechanical fixing device in W/K, rounded up to 0,001 W/K if $\chi \geq 0,0005$ W/K, rounded to 0 W/K otherwise;” “rounded up” was translated in the German prEN17237 with “...auf 0.001 W/K gerundet...”	Make clearer in English language: “...is the point thermal transmittance of a mechanical fixing device in W/K, rounded upwards to 0,001 W/K if $\chi \geq 0,0005$ W/K, rounded to 0 W/K otherwise;”	
TL		D.2.2	Key for “n”	ed	Typing error	Delete last letter	
FR		E table E.5, table E.6 and E.7		te	<i>f</i> It is accepted that the determined reference value is declared to be the nominal value.” This seems to express the opposite of what was intended to be expressed.	<i>f</i> It is accepted that the nominal value is declared to be the reference value. determined reference value is declared to be the nominal value. ”	
TL		E	E.1/10/15	ed/te	Term not according test standard	“Bulk density of fresh mortar” instead of “Fresh mortar gross density” (3 times)	
TL		E	E.11 title	ed	Space missing	“base coats”	
TL		E	E.12/13	ed	Wrong term	“production month” instead of “month of production”	
TL		E	E.16	te	Wrong test method. Shall be the same as for ready to use base coat and adhesive	„EN 1015-6:1998+A1:2006“	
TL		E	E.2/11/16	ed/te	Term not according test standard	“Bulk density of fresh mortar” instead of “Gross density” (3 times)	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21

Document: prEN 17237:2022

Project: WI

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
TL		E	Table E.1 ff.	te	FPC minimum frequency of organic content and flame retardant is not consistent. Sometimes "Once per production month" and sometimes "once per change of recipe". As the test requires a test specimen and the recipe, "once per production month is more meaningful	Use "Once per production month" in all cases	
TL		E	Table E.10, last row	ed	Space missing in "Eachindividual"	Correct	
TL		E	Table E.12	te/ed	Time period unit not in line with test standard	"24h" instead of "1d"	
TL		E	Table E.12	te/ed	Wrong term for conditioning	"conditioning" instead of "ageing" (two times)	
TL		E	Table E.12 row "Ash content"	te	The temperature range deviates from test standard	"620±20" instead of "625±25"	
TL		E	Table E.14; table E.17	ed	Organic content in separated rows	Amend organic content rows according to the existing pattern. See table E.10	
		E	Table E.4		Superscript "a" in rows "Organic content" and "Pull through" is meaningless	Delete	
		E	Table E.4		Superscript "a" in rows "Shear strength", "Compression behaviour", "Water vapour permeability", "Air flow resistance", Width tolerance", Thickness tolerance", "Squareness" and "Flatness" is missing	Add	
		E	Table E.4	te	water absorption used in 5.3.4.1, but missing in table E.4	Add 3 rows "Water absorption EN ISO 29767:2019 Once per production month ... FPC mean value ± 30% ... 0 to every reference value + 0,3 kg/m ² 5.3 for MW, ICB, WF", "Water absorption EN ISO 29767:2019 Once per production month ... FPC mean value ± 15% ... 0 to every reference value + 0,2 kg/m ² 5.3 for PU, PF, CG" and "Water absorption EN ISO 16535:2019 Once	

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21

Document: prEN 17237:2022

Project: WI

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
						per production month ... FPC mean value ± 15% ... 0 to every reference value + 0,2 kg/m ² 5.3 for EPS, XPS” according to the existing pattern	
TL		E	Table E.4	te	The range of the reference value of water vapour diffusion starts with zero. Seems to be wrong	Replace “0” with “-30%”	
TL		E	table E.4, row “Organic content”	te	The organic content is calculated, based on a recipe. A range for the steadiness of production is therefore not meaningful	Change to “---”	
TL		E	Tables E.1 and E.2	te	The entry for the component property organic content is not complete.	Insert another row after the existing row for organic content, similar to Table E.10, with the entries “... from each reference value - 0.2% (absolute) to infinity” in the second last column and “5.7” in the last column.	
TL		E/F	E.1/10/15 Table F.1 Notes	ed/te	Term not according test standard	“particle size distribution” instead of “particle size grading” (6 times)	
TL		G		ed	wrong term “foam block”	Replace wrong term with “pull off” (four times)	
FR		G.2 and G.3	1	te, ed	“For test specimens fixed with plate anchors, the pull-off resistance of ETIC kits with another number of plate anchors per unit area than tested shall be calculated by the following algorithm.”	In G.2 and G.3: “For test specimens fixed with plate anchors <i>or spiral anchors</i> , the pull-off resistance of ETIC kits with <i>another different</i> number of plate anchors per unit area than tested shall be calculated by the following algorithm.”	
FR		G.2 and G.3	2	te	“If the middle area position is not determined according to 5.8.1.3.2.3, the minimum distance to the border r_{min} is calculated by $r_{min} = (t_1 + d_p / 2)$ ” This is in favour of those who saved money for the pull-through tests. It neglects that r_{min} could be bigger. Section 5.8.1.3.2.3 “Minimum distance	In G.2 and G.3: “If the middle area position is not determined according to 5.8.1.3.2.3, the minimum distance to the border r_{min} is calculated by $r_{min} = (t_1 + d_p / 2)$ ” A middle area position is any position with a	

1 MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ Table (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					<i>between anchor sleeves</i> " gives provision on d_{min} to be the smaller value of $(2 \times r_{tl}; 2 \times t_l + d_P)$. It is reasonable to assume that $r_{min} = d_{min}/2$ as given in section 5.8.1.3.2.3	minimum distance to edge $\geq r_{min}$.	
TL		G.4		te	Optional plate anchors are possible but not considered. Three possibilities exist: 1) The test specimen for the foam block test does contain not only profiles and rails but also plate anchors or 2) The test specimen for the foam block test does not contain plate anchors. The test result is combined with plate anchor test results by calculation or 3) Plate anchors are used as supplementary mounting aid plate anchors only.	Amend document after clarification, e.g. by a new clause in Annex G between clauses 4 and 5 "ETIC kit showing profiles and rails and plate anchors".	
TL		H			The calculation of the FPC mean value is not fully described. Clarify	The mean value from several measurements is often a test result. When calculating this "test mean value", any outlier shall be discarded. The Student distribution shall be taken into account for the calculation of the error of a test mean value. Since the error can vary from test result to test result, the weighted arithmetic mean shall be calculated as the FPC mean value	
TL		H.1		te	General information missing.	Add a new paragraph "Clause 6.3.1.5.3.1 describes a specific indirect test based on the properties of the components. The test results from factory production control shall correspond to the reference values from the assessment of performance. Different situations and their	

¹ MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21	Document: prEN 17237:2022	Project: WI
------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
						valuation are explained in the following.” at the beginning	
TL		H.1.2	1 st paragraph	te	The different batches of a component used for the assessment can come from different production lines	Delete “, produced in one production line,”	
TL		H.1.2	2 nd paragraph	te	Content of paragraph is wrong. A validity sector always belongs to one component	Delete paragraph	

FR = Falk Rosenkranz, Member CEN/TC88/WG18

TL = Thomas Lohmann, Convenor CEN/TC88/WG18

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2022-03-21	Document: prEN 17237:2022	Project: WI
------------------	----------------------------------	-------------

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/Figure/Table/ Table (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	----------	-----------------	---------------------------------

Annex I

I would like to express my concern about all the provisions for FPC but these for anchors. Considering the example of shear strength in table E.4. I wonder whether it is clear to the industry and production responsible persons that the +/-20%-range for shear strength referring to the reference value, will be narrowed over time. Whenever a new anchor concept is qualified by the “pull-off tensile shear resistance test” there is a chance that actual relative FPC range becomes smaller.

					prEN17237 table E.4		actual FPC range			
					actual shear strength [kPa]	FPC 20% [kPa]	FPC +20% [kPa]	actual FPC min [kPa]	actual FPC max [kPa]	actual relative FPC range [+/- %]
01.01.2024	HILTI	spiral anchor	Pull-off resistance	tensile-shear	18.8	15.04	22.56	15.04	22.56	20%
01.02.2024	Fischer	spiral anchor	Pull-off resistance	tensile-shear	16.9	13.52	20.28	15.04	20.28	15%
01.03.2024	EJOT	countersunk anchor	Pull-off resistance	tensile-shear	19.7	15.76	23.64	15.76	20.28	13%
01.04.2024	Fischer	countersunk anchor	Pull-off resistance	tensile-shear	17.2	13.76	20.64	15.76	20.28	13%

1 **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

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