
Subject: Re: railML 3.2 railway signal modeling

Posted by [Milan Wölke](#) on Wed, 05 Apr 2023 15:57:04 GMT

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

Hello Thomas,

If I understood you correctly, you're saying that railML 3 doesn't allow for a clear distinction between a main signal and a distant signal, and that it's intended to be that way. I disagree with this viewpoint. The infrastructure schema should accurately describe the railway infrastructure, without including the logic of interlocking. Since a main signal and a distant signal are visibly different, their physical differences should be modeled in the infrastructure schema. The meaning of these differences can then be described in the interlocking schema. Do you agree with this approach of separating infrastructure and interlocking schemas?

Best regards,
Milan
