

#	Tender Document / Appendix	Chapter Title	Chapter Paragraph	Page Number	Question	ISR Answer
1	Appendix A - Technical Specification M-05-575	Possession planning - Mobile Access to Possession Planning Preview	3.1.8	45	(Req. ID#487) A mobile-friendly module that ensures real-time communication and updates during the planning phased of a timetable will require a deeper understanding of the features needed by the Customer and the establishment of use cases. Can the Bidder consider this requirement with Severity: "Can" and so, to be discuss later with the customer as a change order?	The requirement is essential for Track Possession operations and therefore cannot be downgraded to a "Can" requirement. Requirement #487 is critical to the Possessions process, as it enables field teams to view and update Possession Plan Previews through a mobile-friendly interface, ensuring real-time communication, coordination, and operational updates during planning and execution activities. Consequently, this requirement must remain classified with Severity: Must and cannot be deferred to a future Change Order.
2	Appendix A - Technical Specification M-05-575	Managing rolling-stock - Storing of gamma-model	2.2.3	43	Although this requirement (#147) makes sense for the operation of the train, from the Bidder perspective a planned timetable is never based on an emergency braking parameter per rolling stock unit but shall be based on a unit specific value which is included into the calculation of the driving dynamic. Can ISR please better explain the requirement in regards to the timetable solution or delete this requirement?	UNISIG 26-3 takes into account the emergency- and service-brake deceleration curves. Per speed interval, the more restrictive speed-distance function forms the basis to derive the supervision curves (permitted curve, indication curve) as a function of time offsets. In running-time computation, the permitted curve describes the outermost envelope to adhere to in case of speed changes and station-entrance at closed exit signal. Depending on the local conditions, the permitted curve is significantly more restrictive than regular assumptions for driving dynamic. In blocking-time computation, the indication curve determines the begin of the blocking time. Thus, as well running times and capacity consumption have a direct dependency on the emergency brake performance of the train. Vice versa, the consideration of emergency brake performance is essential for precise timetabling. For more detail, reference is made to multiple standard literature. Given the high occupation of the Israeli core network, such precise timetabling is necessary to ensure conflict-free scheduling while optimizing the network utilization. Thus, the requirement is not deleted.
3	Appendix A - Technical Specification M-05-575 Appendix A - Technical Specification M-05-575	Running-time and blocking-time calculation - Consideration of INDUSI speed supervision	4.2.1.8	61	Although this requirement (#379) makes sense for the operation of the train, from the Bidder perspective a planned timetable shall be based on the calculated driving dynamic under consideration of the maximum line speed, and trainset/locomotive speed as well as the signalling system and stopping points. This is based on the model condition of the digital twin that the train will be operated accordingly. Can ISR please better explain the requirement in regards to the timetable solution or delete this requirement?	The Israeli I60R supervision functions are strict to mitigate the risk of SPAD related to short safety distances. They require low speeds passing the distant signal in case of closed main signals. In running-time computation this affects the running time while approaching the scheduled standstill. In simulation, it affects further cases in case of occupation conflicts. Given the high occupation of the Israeli core network, the consideration of restrictions due to I60R are necessary to ensure conflict-free scheduling while optimizing the network utilization. Thus, the requirement is not deleted.
4	Agreement	Clause 13.3	13.3	25	we would like to propose a clarification to Clause 13.3 to better reflect the Parties' understanding regarding Contractor's (existing & future) core products and Customer-specific software/modules ("Developments"). As currently drafted, the clause could be interpreted as granting ISR exclusive rights to developments that are created during the performance of the Agreement, even where such developments constitute generic enhancements or reusable components of the Contractor's (existing & future) core products without using ISR's confidential information. Our understanding is that the Agreement covers generally the right of use regarding Contractor's (existing & future) core products. Should the Parties agree on the development of Customer-specific software/modules, such software/modules would be specifically identified and treated accordingly. We therefore propose limiting the exclusivity provisions of Clause 13.3 to Customer-specific software/modules ("Developments") expressly agreed, while clarifying that the Contractor remains free to use, enhance and commercialize its Contractor's (existing & future) core products, including any general-purpose developments, improvements and reusable components. We believe this clarification accurately reflects the intended allocation of intellectual property rights and linked rights of use and provides clarity for both Parties.	Bidders are referred to the Amended Agreement