
Subject: Re: Restricted Areas: limitedBy vs. elements inside
Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2019 11:08:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

we discussed this issue on the today telco. The preference for defining areas like work zone or local operation area or shunting area is to use isLimitedBy only. Thus the trackAssetInArea can be removed as redundant.

However, for permission zones it might be better to name all the elements which are in the "group" (area) of this special permission. With the now direct linking it would be no problem to have the permissionZone not an instance of RestrictedArea and thus having different child elements.

Could you please give me your opinion concerning your practise to define each of the particular areas:

- work zone
- local operation area
- shunting zone
- permission zone

Regards,

Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

Thomas Nygreen wrote on 14.01.2019 13:49:

- > Dear Jörg,
- >
- > I have a strong preference for using only the <isLimitedBy>s
- > to define the area. This is also the current approach of the
- > Norwegian sector in railML2.4nor.
- > <https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=636&start=0&>.
- > The latter is also required (one or more). There can easily
- > be a very large number of assets within an RA, resulting in
- > a large number of such references. Through the topology and
- > positioning systems these assets are easily identifiable
- > without direct references.
- >