

---

Subject: Re: [railML 3.1] border types

Posted by [Thomas Nygreen JBD](#) on Thu, 07 Jun 2018 14:56:25 GMT

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

---

christian.rahmig wrote on Mon, 04 June 2018 15:25

Am 29.05.2018 um 18:45 schrieb Thomas Nygreen:

> 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.

the situation that you describe here, is better being solved with a different implementation: Instead of using border elements, I suggest to define an <OperationalPoint> and to locate this operational point as an area covering all the affected tracks. Further, this <OperationalPoint> can be specified with an attribute <propOperational>@operationalType="shuntingYard". Finally, the interlocking element may reference this operational point.

A shunting yard is something else than what I am trying to describe. What we would like to do is to define areas within stations for different interlocking purposes. So Jörg is correct. Two common uses would be for defining areas that can be released from the interlocking for manual operation (probably fits locallyControlledArea in railML 2.x, except that it requires tracks to be split at the borders) or areas that are electrically separated in the signalling system, such that one can be shut down for maintenance without shutting down the whole station. It is too long since I looked at the railML 3 specs to remember if there are other groupings that work better.

christian.rahmig wrote on Mon, 04 June 2018 15:25

So, to conclude: I think that grouping of borders is not the best solution here. Borders shall be used where there is an explicit point (e.g. on the track) where e.g. the ownership changes (without knowing where else it will change too).

I agree that grouping borders is not the best solution. It might be that my mind is too occupied at the moment with solving our needs using the elements that are already in railML 2.x.

Best regards,  
Thomas Nygreen

---