
Subject: Re: [railML2] Enhancing the <lock> element
Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Thu, 25 Feb 2021 07:57:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Norwegian railway sector appreciates the suggestion for introduction of generic descriptions of a locks properties. We have no objections to the suggested implementation in railML2. We suggest the coordinators double check if the suggested attributes in the previous and in this posting are also contained in [railML3].

We would like to suggest further adding two important attributes of the lock: its type and a reference to what it locks.

With the above suggested attributes, we now have a generic internationally clearly understandable general type description. But we have an UC to unambiguous designate a national type to a national rule. Here we suggest to use the attribute @ruleCode in railML2.5. An example for the rule code would be the Norwegian rule book for locks:

https://orv.banenor.no/orv/doku.php?id=Brukerveiledninger:personale_som_skal_betjene_signalanlegg:kontroll%C3%A5ser_og_saml%C3%A5ser#lasetyper
Listing and describing the different types and their operational rules for the Norwegian lock types.

For railML3 I leave it to the coordinators to describe the type with either: @ruleCode, @kind, @type, @system or <designator>.

Reference to what the lock actually locks can be done either from the lock or to the lock. In railML2.4nor extensions we have the attribute @lockRef on the element <switch>, <crossing> and the <derailer>. But you could also have a subelement <takesControlOf> with an @ref attribute like in railML3. What does the community prefer?