

*Section ¹	*Section Identifier	Paragraph/ table/ figure/ commentary/ note	*Comment Type ²	*Page No	*Comment Detail	*Proposed Change
Clause	1.4.1.7	1	General	6	This definition is redundant to the one in Clause 1.4.3.8.	Merge the terms defined in Clauses 1.4.1.7 and 1.4.3.8 into a single definition.
Clause	1.4.2.1	1	Editorial	7	Terms relating to HID lighting like “ballast” are likely to be obsolete soon as the phase-out of these technologies is effectively underway.	Consider whether there is utility in keeping terminology related to non-SSL technology, depending on the revision cycle of this document.
Clause	1.4.2.17	1	Technical	8	In the numerator of the equation for K, the term “axb” is ambiguous. It appears to mean “a multiplied by b”.	If the term indicates a multiplication, substitute a multiplication symbol (×) for a literal letter ‘x.’ Alternately, leave the multiplication implied (i.e., “ab” rather than “axb”).
Clause	1.4.3.8	1	General	10	This definition is redundant to the one in Clause 1.4.1.7. It’s also unclear why this definition is included under 1.4.3 (‘Light sources’)	Merge the terms defined in Clauses 1.4.1.7 and 1.4.3.8 into a single definition.
Clause	1.4.4.1	1	Editorial	10	The given definition (“ <i>A term referring to colour quality expressed numerically.</i> ”) is very vague, even with the qualifier about the CIE (x,y) system.	Use a more specific definition of this term, e.g., “ <i>An objective expression of the quality of a colour of light regardless of its luminance.</i> ”
Clause	1.4.4.2	1	Editorial	10	With regard to Note 1, there are no objective (or universally accepted) definitions of the terms “warm” and “cool” with respect to colour temperature. Your values are arbitrary, and people will take issue with them. Even 4000K, which many observers describe as a very ‘harsh’ white, falls well below your ‘cool’ colour appearance cutoff of 5000K.	Any references to ‘warm’ or ‘cool’ in terms of colour appearance should not be attached to any specific range of correlated colour temperature values.
Clause	1.4.7.5	1	Editorial	13	Note 1 indicates that “ <i>for sports lighting, the degree of discomfort glare may be calculated but</i>	Add a reference to support this claim.

¹ Options include: Clause, Title, Table of Contents, Preface, Foreword, Introduction, Appendix, Bibliography or Index.

² Options include: Editorial, General or Technical.

*Section ¹	*Section Identifier	Paragraph/ table/ figure/ commentary/ note	*Comment Type ²	*Page No	*Comment Detail	*Proposed Change
					<i>there is not a method for quantifying disability glare.</i> This claim seems like it needs some kind of reference for the source of that information, as it will come as a surprise to many readers.	
Clause	2.2.2	1	Editorial	15	In this clause it is claimed, without evidence, that <i>“With a higher standard of play the speed of play will generally be faster.”</i> The list of items beneath this statement, labelled (a)-(g), indicate increasingly higher standards of play. This suggests that, a priori, higher light levels are needed as the standard of play increases, regardless of the needs of the individual sport being played. This is a vague and overarching suggestion that should be avoided if the underlying premise is indefensible.	Keep a description of the standards of play, but either provide a technical reference justifying the claim that higher standards require a “higher class of lighting,” or drop this claim altogether.
Clause	2.3	1	Editorial	15	This statement is curious: <i>“It is important, particularly at the more advanced levels of play, that the visual requirements of the spectators, that is, the ability to see the action clearly and comfortably, are met by the lighting installation.”</i> Why? Is it because spectators at events with higher standards of play pay more to watch? It’s unclear why this matters. Does it imply that spectators at events with a lower standard of play can then be disadvantaged because they don’t have access to brighter lighting installations? Is it only a matter of scaling the installation to the physical size of the venue (and, hence, the average distance between observer and play)?	The sentence should be completely worded, or dropped altogether. I don’t the sense in which it is interpreted is what the author means.
Clause	2.5.1	2	Editorial	16	With regard to the statement <i>“In large stadiums and sports halls, the illuminance required is therefore often determined by the visual requirements of the most distant spectators.”</i>	Rethink the wording of this statement, or drop it altogether.

*Section ¹	*Section Identifier	Paragraph/ table/ figure/ commentary/ note	*Comment Type ²	*Page No	*Comment Detail	*Proposed Change
					<i>Providing this level of illuminance usually more than satisfies the participants' needs,</i> it seems that one runs the risk of over-illuminating, which can disadvantage both nearer spectators AND players through more glare from brighter sources.	
Clause	2.5.1	4	Editorial	16	It is here claimed that <i>"the illuminance on the vertical planes will usually be satisfactory if the recommended illuminance on the horizontal plane is provided by equipment of the correct type, positioned according to accepted good practice, and with the light correctly distributed."</i> How do you know this? Or are you just admitting in a roundabout way that you can't adequately constrain vertical illuminances through design? How often is 'usually'? What is the outcome when it's not satisfactory?	Add a technical justification to this claim, or don't make it at all.
Clause	2.5.2	1	Editorial	16	The first sentence of this paragraph seems to rely on the pre-SSL lighting era in which lumen depreciation over product lifetimes was both significant and effectively irreversible. Is this so relevant now as SSL lighting takes over? Just dim initially to some fraction of full power and slowly turns the power up over time to offset losses.	The notion of how illuminance depreciation is handled in this document needs rethinking in light of inevitable trends in the sales of SSL versus non-SSL products in the sports lighting industry. Rather than promoting initial over-lighting of playing fields to account for lumen depreciation, promote adaptive dimming to compensate for losses over product lifetimes.
Clause	2.6	1	Editorial	17	It is claimed, without justification, that <i>"It is usually the ideal for the playing surface to appear uniformly bright when viewed from the relevant directions."</i> Why? Doesn't high uniformity <u>decrease</u> contrast? Doesn't decreased contrast, say, between ball and playing surface, disadvantage both players and spectators? And doesn't it also contradict Clause 2.4, which argues that <i>"usually the brightness contrast</i>	Justify this blanket claim, or drop it. Defer to the next paragraph, which appeals to <i>"minimum uniformity ratios specified for the sport"</i> .

*Section ¹	*Section Identifier	Paragraph/ table/ figure/ commentary/ note	*Comment Type ²	*Page No	*Comment Detail	*Proposed Change
					<i>between the object and background matters most”?</i>	
Clause	2.6	1	Technical	18	Where do the data come from that were used to generate Figure 2.1? Also, the inset figure seems to suggest that only backscattering or retroreflection of incident light is considered. How does this graph look if the observer were on the other side of the direction of the angle of incidence of the light?	Clarify the source of the data used in the figure. All data used should come from cited sources; otherwise, explain how the data were obtained.
Clause	2.7	1	Editorial	18	The first sentence claims, without evidence, that “ <i>Generally, the full volume of the field of play should be illuminated evenly to create equal playing conditions for all players and to create a consistent level of visibility.</i> ” Again, how does this square with the description in Clause 2.4 of the importance of contrast in establishing adequate visibility? Does high uniformity not work explicitly against your claim?	Justify this blanket claim, or drop it.
Clause	2.7	1	Editorial	19	In Figure 2.2, the examples shown suggest that the space above the overhead luminaires is dark/unlit. But is it really? The presumption of an “acceptable” degree of illumination coverage really hinges on that notion. The example in (b) certainly implies subjecting the player to much more direct glare – how is that “acceptable”? Is a ball overhead easier to see in the glare of an overhead luminaire versus being lost in presumed darkness between them?	Rethink the presentation of this figure, especially in light of discussion later in the section (“The need to limit glare may conflict with other requirements;” “ <i>Appropriate means of controlling glare are included in the requirements for lighting the various sports given in AS 2560.2. These may include one or more of the following: (b) The mounting of luminaires at or above a specified height.</i> ”
Clause	2.8	1	General	19	In regard to “ <i>mitigating stroboscopic effects,</i> ” refer here to the text in Clause 3.1.5.	Refer the reader here to the discussion in Clause 3.1.5.

*Section ¹	*Section Identifier	Paragraph/ table/ figure/ commentary/ note	*Comment Type ²	*Page No	*Comment Detail	*Proposed Change
Clause	2.9.2	1	Technical	20	In the paragraph and the table that follows it, the term “reflectance factor” is not defined. Where does this come from? How does it relate to the term defined in Clause 1.4.6.2? (i.e., is it just ρ ? And is this just another way of saying ‘wavelength-independent albedo’?)	Clarify the meaning of “reflectance factor”. If it’s the same as “reflectance” as defined in Clause 1.4.6.2, then just call it “reflectance”.
Clause	2.10.3	3	Technical	21	It is claimed, without evidence, that “ <i>Generally, provision of about five percent of the installed light source luminous flux should prove adequate for this purpose.</i> ” What is the source for this estimate?	Add a technical justification to this claim, or don’t make it at all.
Clause	2.10.4	1	Editorial	22	The section on “control of obtrusive light” is weak and light on details. If this is to be discussed at all, it should be comprehensive. For example, a prohibition of light trespass should, at a minimum, be added to the narrative.	Add more detail to this section, or drop it and refer the reader to AS 4282.
Clause	3.1.1	1	Editorial	23	It’s unclear why luminous efficacy “ <i>should be considered in the selection of light sources for a sports lighting installation.</i> ” Efficacy has nothing to do with sports.	Drop luminous efficacy as a specific consideration in the selection criteria for sports lighting and adhere only to the factors that involve sports.
Clause	3.1.3	3	General	23	After listing “ <i>five properties</i> ” (a through e), the first sentence of the third paragraph refers to “ <i>the above four properties</i> ”.	Replace “four” with “five”.
Clause	3.1.4.2	1	Technical	27	The first paragraph states that “ <i>colour is important to most sports,</i> ” which directly contradicts the statement in Clause 2.4 that “ <i>Colour contrast is important in some sports, but usually the brightness contrast between the object and background matters most.</i> ” So which is it?	Modify the opening of this sentence to the effect of “While brightness contrast between the object and background usually matters most for visibility, colour rendition may be the dominant concern for some sports.”

*Section ¹	*Section Identifier	Paragraph/ table/ figure/ commentary/ note	*Comment Type ²	*Page No	*Comment Detail	*Proposed Change
Clause	4.4	1	Technical	31	In Figure 4.1, there are several elements that are not properly described in either the caption or the main body of the text. What is the shaded area from 6000 burning hours toward higher values? Why are three traces plotted (and what determines their spread toward higher burning hours)? And what is the source for the data, given that the figure is characterized as “typical”?	Clarify the contents and source of the data in the figure.
Clause	4.4	1	Technical	32	What is the source of the data for this figure? Without citing your sources, a reader has no reasonable way of determining whether your claims are reliable.	Cite a source.