
Subject: Re: New reflected thoughts towards railML 2.3 infrastructure extension proposal line sections

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 20 Nov 2017 15:05:51 GMT

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

Dear Torben,

Am 14.07.2017 um 09:44 schrieb Torben Brand:

- > [...]
- > To model the open section (or other line sections/segment) I
- > suggest to keep the proposed element <lineSection>. I suggest to change
- > the suggested <lineSection>@type:"path"
- > to "openSection, as this seems to be a better term (but I
- > am, as always, open for other suggestions. Also, I will
- > receive guidance for English terms from Network Rail
- > resources in August). Alternative if no common ground can
- > be found for defining "open section" we suggest to use the
- > national value: "NO:linjen".

did you already get guidance for English terms from Network Rail? I am curious to hear/read whether they prefer "openSection" or "path".

- >
- > An alternative is to make a new
- > <ocp/propOperational>@type:"openSection". But I would prefer
- > the line section choice as an open section is not an ocp and
- > the an open section "ocp" could contain multiple other ocps.
- > What does the forum think?

I agree. An operational point is an operational point and the railway line/track in between can be defined as line section.

Best regards

Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator

railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)

Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911

Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany www.railml.org
