
Subject: [railML2] Clearer modelling of the signal designation
Posted by [Tobias Bregulla](#) on Sat, 25 Jan 2020 13:50:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good afternoon,

we want to extend our infrastructure export from GPSinfradat by the signal designation (unique identifier of a signal per operating point). In doing so, I noticed a contradiction between the railML rules and the example on the corresponding Wiki page.

According to the wiki entry for the signals (see <https://wiki2.railml.org/index.php?title=IS:signal>), the general rules for @code (machine-readable designation for exchange) and @name (established human-readable designation) also apply there. In the example for the signal, however, the designation is given at @name, which in my opinion is not correct and hinders the data exchange.

For explanation: it is about the designation "20ZS3" attached to this German combination signal (<https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/2e/Ks-Signa I.jpg>), which is also used in site plans and many other documents.

In our opinion, the current wiki example should be described as follows:

```
<track>
  <ocsElements>
    <signals>
      ...
      <signal id="sig2630123" dir="up" pos="18597" type="combined"
function="home" ruleCode="DE:ESO:HV"
code="A1" name="ESig A1"
description="Einfahrsignal des Bf Boppard" xml:lang=de
ocpStationRef="KBOP" absPos="109647">
<geoCoord coord="50.237850 7.576116"
epsgCode="urn:ogc:def:crs:EPSG::4326"/>
      </signal>
      ...
    </signals>
  </ocsElements>
</track>
```

In this example, the designation "ESig A1" could be logically formed (not mandatory, only as a suggestion) from the function function="home" --> entry and type="combined" --> main signal in a project-specific way.

What does the community think about this? Could the example be adapted according to this usage?

Best regards,

--

Tobias Bregulla

Bahnkonzept Dresden/Germany
