
Subject: Re: [railML 3.1] border types

Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Sat, 02 Jun 2018 15:21:45 GMT

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

Hi,

if you have something in mind which is temporarily in use and activated/deactivated by an interlocking then it shall be defined in interlocking schema. There we have thought about "RestrictedAreas" especially for:

- Working zones
- local shunting areas
- ETCS shunting areas
- permission zones

Dr.-Ing. Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking scheme coordinator

railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)

Phone Coordinator: +49 351 87759 40; railML.org: +49 351 47582911

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

On 29.05.2018 18:45, Thomas Nygreen wrote:

- > In Norway we discussed just a week or two ago if <border>s
- > were suitable for specifying shunting areas etc. in
- > stations. Would this kind of use be in line with what the
- > element is intended for? Two questions we had was how to
- > group borders together to actually form an area, and how to
- > specify what kind of area it is. The former can be solved by
- > using a common name for all borders of the same area, and
- > the latter by using type="other:...", but creating a way to
- > group borders together by IDREF seems preferable.
- >
- > This is also one of the elements where it is difficult to
- > understand the semantics of the dir attribute. Can a border
- > exist in only one direction?