
Subject: Re: Mandatory stops e.g. before a level crossing
Posted by _____ on Wed, 14 Feb 2018 09:38:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Christian,

I agree with your summary with the exception of one big attention:

- > If the mandatory stop is not physically visible by a panel/sign, please model it as an OCP:
- > `<ocp><propOperational>@operationalType="stoppingPoint"`

This is clearly not the original intention of an `<ocp>` nor of "stoppingPoint". It could lead to several further problems and misunderstandings. So, I would best call it a "work-around".

An `<ocp>` is originally intended as a container for "timetable measuring places", e. g. stations and all other "aggregated" infrastructure places which are usually shown in timetables. On the contrary, a non-physical mandatory stop will not necessarily be shown in timetables. In such cases, there will be no passing/stopping times and highly probably no "register" and all that. So why using an `<ocp>` then at all? A non-physical mandatory stop with no timetable relevance is purely a rule, and as long as we have no `<railML><rules>` (and no demand for such a modelling), it should not be modelled in railML.

However, we can agree that if a non-physical mandatory stop is to be shown in timetables, an `<ocp>` is the right solution.

So, I want to ask you not to recommend the usage of "stoppingPoint". In cases where a modelling of non-physical mandatory stops in railML 2.x is unavoidable, it can be acceptable as a work-around but even then, I would recommend not to use "stoppingPoint" but rather a place-holder-only, an "empty" `<ocp>`.

Best regards,
Dirk.
