

---

Subject: Re: railML 2.3 infrastructure extension proposal operational properties of an OCP

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2018 09:43:49 GMT

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

---

Dear all,

let me summarize the current proposal for changing the operational OCP type as formulated in Trac ticket #327 [1]:

\* Mark value "blockPost" as DEPRECATED

\* Adding new value "siding"

Further, I want to direct your focus on the new wiki page [2] about different types of OCPs. Although the examples describe the situation in Germany, they provide a very good insight in specific modelling of different types of OCPs. Thank you very much, Dirk and Mr. Leberl, for this contribution!

My question to all of you:

Looking at the explanations in [2], do you still agree with current proposal of Trac ticket #327 to be implemented with railML 2.4 or would you like to change it?

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/327>

[2] [https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=Dev:Types\\_of\\_ocps](https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=Dev:Types_of_ocps)

As usual I am looking forward to receiving your comments...

Best regards

Christian

Am 02.01.2017 um 17:29 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

> Dear Torben,

>

> Am 20.12.2016 um 18:27 schrieb Torben Brand:

>> [...]

>> propOperational

>> In Norway trains are by default only allowed to enter a

>> station one by one, due to safety reasons. If a station is

>> equipped/designed with simultaneous entry features

>> (NO:samtidig innkjør) trains may enter simultaneously. This

>> is necessary to know for the capacity planner, timetable

>> planner and train driver. The element <propOperational> is extended

>> with the new

>> attribute @NO:samtidigInnkjør [datatype: enumeration]. The

>> attribute has 4 Norwegian preset values and the values

>> "partial" and "none". The precise values of the value

>> "partial" needs to be defined in another system/model.

>

> The reasons for having the attribute seem clear to me. Can you tell us

> what are the four Norwegian preset values for this parameter? Further,

> instead of "partial", which is rather unspecific, I would prefer having

> more concise values instead. Are there any other railways that make use

> of such an attribute? If yes, I have no objections against creating a

> Trac ticket and implementing this attribute with the next release.

>

>> The attribute @operationalType is extended with the value

>> "siding". In Norway a "siding" is an additional track on the

>> path (section of line between stations). It is not a station

>> according to Norwegian definition as it does not have a

>> main-home signal. Thus the path on the siding needs to be

>> blocked during the operation of entering and leaving the

>> siding. PS. There is a trackType under track with value

>> "sidingTrack" This is described in the Wiki as: "This is a

>> siding"

>

> Yes, railML already allows to specify a track as being a siding track by

> setting <track type="sidingTrack">. However, what is missing is an

> operational representation of the siding as you request it. Therefore,

> your suggestion to add the enumeration value "siding" for the attribute

> @operationalType seems to be valid. Is there anybody among the railML

> community who needs to model sidings outside of stations, too?

>

>> The attribute @operationalType is extended with the value

>> "halt". In Norway we need to separate between a halt within

>> a station and outside the station (on the path). I suggest

>> to use the existing operationalType "stoppingPoint" with

>> halts within the station (As this correlates with the

>> Norwegian name "stoppested"="stoppingplace"). And the new

>> operationalType "halt" for halts on the path.

>

> An operation control point <ocp> is located on a track indirectly via

> the <crossSection> element. The track itself can be classified as a

> station track or a main route track via its attribute @type. Thus, it is

> possible to distinguish between an OCP within a station and an OCP

> outside the station (de: "freie Strecke"). Consequently, it is not

> absolutely necessary to introduce a new enumeration value "halt" for

> <ocp><propOperational>@operationalType. Your example may look like this:

>

> <track id="tr01" type="stationTrack">

> <trackTopology>

> <crossSections>

> <crossSection id="cs01" pos="123.4" ocpRef="op01">

> </crossSection>

> </crossSections>

> </trackTopology>  
> </track>  
> ...  
> <ocp id="op01">  
> <propOperational operationalType="stoppingPoint">  
> </propOperational>  
> </ocp>  
>  
> However, the solution is complex and it requires <track> elements in  
> order to locate the OCP via their <crossSection> elements. Your proposed  
> attribute adaptation would work also without tracks and it would assign  
> the feature directly to the OCP. Therefore, I am open for more opinions  
> on this issue to find a practical solution.  
>  
>> It needs to be defined if a station is remote controlled (by  
>> CTC). Thus we have added the new boolean attribute  
>> @NO:remoteControlled. Later extensions could define which  
>> remote controller (CTC) is controlling the interlocking  
>> controller.  
>  
> Accepted. Instead of a boolean attribute, it might be useful to define  
> an enumeration attribute in order to specify the type of controlling. On  
> the other side, the detailed definition of station control should be  
> done in the <controller> element and therefore your suggested solution  
> with the boolean attribute seems to fit well.  
>  
> 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

---