
Subject: Re: [railml3] Signal types and functions
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 11 Feb 2019 14:51:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Thomas,
dear all,

Am 08.02.2019 um 20:38 schrieb Thomas Nygreen:

- > [...] The remaining values for <signalIS>@type are
- > "foulingPoint": a fouling point that marks the begin of an
- > intersection of different tracks' loading gauges"departure":
- > A signal indicating that a passenger train is ready to leave
- > the station."snowplow": a snowplow signal"stop": In general,
- > this sign marks a position on a track, where a train needs
- > to stop. In most cases it indicates the position where a
- > passenger train should stop at a platform (stopPost). On
- > branch lines with simplified operational rules, this signal
- > may also be used to mark a position where a train has to
- > stop to wait for a permission to proceed. Made redundant by
- > <isStopPost>."levelCrossing": a level crossing signal Made
- > redundant by <isLevelCrossingSignal>."electricity": A
- > sign/board for electric locomotives indicating when and
- > where the pantograph or other collector needs to be lowered.
- > Made redundant by <isCatenarySignal>."radio": A sign/board
- > providing instructions on train radio usage."speed": a speed
- > sign/board Made redundant by <isSpeedSignal>.

You are right, there is some kind of redundancy. The idea was to provide the information on two levels:

- high level (only one word): using attribute <signalIS>@type
- detailed level: using child element <signalIS><is*Signal>

Depending on the requirements resulting from the use case, the information about the signal shall be modelled either in one way or the other.

- > The remaining values for <signalIS>@type seem quite
- > arbitrary and oddly specific while still missing information
- > necessary for a meaningful interpretation. My best
- > suggestion is to replace the attribute with a structured
- > variant of the 2.x @ruleCode (<designator>?), and create
- > further isXXX where necessary.

Yes, <signalIS>@type is far away from being complete. But the list can be extended due to the "otherEnumerationValue" extension. Apart from this, a @ruleCode may be a good solution that can be integrated into the <designator> element.

> [...] Furthermore, <signalS>@virtual was moved to a new
> enumeration value in <signalS>/<signalConstruction>@type
> (with values "virtual", "semaphore" and "light"), but there
> is also still a <signalL>@isVirtual attribute. So one of
> these is probably still redundant.

As Jörg already wrote: we used two different definition of "virtual".
Therefore, we decided to remove the IS based "virtual" (a signal is not
physically present outside at the track) and put it into the
<signalConstruction> child element.

> Additionally, <signalS>@switchable is also related to
> <signalConstruction>@type as it is "set TRUE if the signal
> is able to show several signal aspects, set FALSE if the
> signal is a static panel that always shows the same signal
> aspect" (my emphasis). To me it seems even more logical to
> include "board" than "virtual" in the list, and consequently
> remove @switchable.

"board" can be considered as a new value for
<signalS><signalConstruction>@type. It will be defined as a
"non-switchable semaphore signal". The enumeration value "semaphore"
would be used for switchable semaphore signals. Are there any examples
for non-switchable virtual signals?

Any feedback is highly appreciated...

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
