

---

Subject: Re: train protection systems

Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Mon, 09 Feb 2015 09:24:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Joerg,  
dear everyone,

Am 07.01.2015 um 08:45 schrieb Joerg von Lingen:

- > Hi all,
- >
- > w.r.t. the harmonisation of and semantic rules for the train protection systems
- > I found one rule which cannot be formally proofed:
- > The values of "trainProtectionMedium" and "trainProtectionMonitoring" shall be
- > consistent with "type" in <nationalSystem>.
- >
- > As this seems to be a fixed 1:1 relation I would propose to extend the
- > accompanied file TrainProtectionSystems.xml by this information to allow a
- > formal check.

that's indeed a good idea. If I understood you correctly, you propose to extend the current structure in TrainProtectionSystems.xml to something like this:

```
<trainProtectionSystems ...>  
  <trainProtectionSystemsAtTrack>  
    <name />  
    <validFor />  
    <medium />  
    <monitoring />  
  </trainProtectionSystemsAtTrack>  
  <trainProtectionSystemsOnVehicle>  
    <!-- [...] -->  
  </trainProtectionSystemsOnVehicle>  
</trainProtectionSystems>
```

<medium> defines the physical medium of the train protection system and shall provide a value of the current enumeration tTrainProtectionMedium (cable, inductive, radio, mechanical, optical...).

<monitoring> defines the coverage of a train protection system and refers to the values of the enumeration tTrainProtectionMonitoring (intermittent, continuous).

Any comments on this proposal are very welcome...

Best regards

--

Christian Rahmig  
railML.infrastructure coordinator

---