

---

Subject: Re: Obligational stop

Posted by [thomas.kauer](#) on Fri, 15 Mar 2013 14:38:59 GMT

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

---

Dirk Br  uer wrote:

>  
> Dear Susanne,  
>  
> Am 12.03.2013, 22:57 Uhr, schrieb Susanne Wunsch <coord@common.railml.org>:  
>> We want to remove both attributes (mandatoryStop and mandatoryBraking)  
>> from the "speedChange" element for the upcoming 2.2 version.  
>  
> Ah, I understand.  
>  
>> And indeed both scenarios  
>> are some kind of operational-rule-driven.  
>  
> The "Betriebsbremsung" more than the "mandatory stop".  
>  
> So I agree to remove "Betriebsbremsung" to somewhere else, may be away  
> from <infrastructure> to <rules> or such.  
>  
> I do not agree concerning "mandatory stops". Their reason is clearly  
> infrastructure. In the case of level crossings (the case you always quote)  
> the reason is "bad sight" from street to railway line due to an obstacle  
> in the triangle between a car, a train, and the level crossing. This  
> "obstacle" - possibly a house - is clearly infrastructure - somebody has  
> built it there. May be it's not railway property, but rather  
> infrastructure in general than rule.  
>  
> Other examples for "mandatory stops" are at least the same  
> "infrastructure-like": RETB stop markers are a kind of starter signal, or  
> H-Tafel or Trapeztafel in Germany.  
>  
> Of course all these also have a touch of rule: The reason for a starter  
> signal is a rule (just one train in one section). Despite this, I guess  
> you would treat starter signals, H-Tafel, and Trapeztafel as  
> infrastructure, too. So you should do the same with mandatory stop marker  
> boards.  
>  
> Another example would be Ra10 / Rangierhalttafel from Germany (limit of  
> shunting marker board in English). Is it infrastructure or rule? Some of  
> both, of course. There is no physical need to stop there, as there is no  
> physical need to stop at any other main signal or marker board.  
>  
> However, following the rule Christian once said: At least if you can touch  
> it, it is infrastructure. You can touch a main signal, a Ra10, as well as  
> a "mandatory stop" marker or these "0 km/h" speed signals at German level

> crossings with "bad sight".  
>  
> Convinced?  
>  
>> The "mandatoryBraking" attribute, which is the topic of this thread, may  
>> be modelled as an operational stop with a reference to its level  
>> crossing. But this idea is also not fully checked and far from "ready to  
>> implement".  
>  
> I guess there is a mistake in your writing: You do not mean  
> "mandatoryBraking" but "mandatoryStop".  
>  
> The "mandatoryStop" has another character than an operational stop.  
> Operational stops are by far not mandatory - on the contrary. They can be  
> skipped (the train is allowed to run through) under certain conditions,  
> which are pure of "timetabling" matter.  
>  
> Currently, you cannot create an operational stop in RailML referencing a  
> level crossing - stops can only reference OCPs, and a level crossing is no  
> OCP. It would be necessary to additionally create an OCP at the place of  
> the level crossing to model the operational stop.  
>  
> Anyway, with this technology you cannot express that stops are regularly  
> necessary forced by the infrastructure manager (or some other authority)  
> at this place. I think it should be possible to create infrastructure-only  
> RaiLML file (a RailML file with just infrastructure, no trains). If this  
> is given to anybody who wants to create a timetable, it should tell him as  
> much as he could see "in nature". It should spare him to go outside and  
> look at each sign. If you agree with this, the "mandatory braking" marker  
> boards should be infrastructure.  
>  
> If you do not want to put them as an attribute of <speedChange>, then  
> please allow a cross-reference from/to <speedChange> to keep background  
> information.  
>  
> Best regards,  
> Dirk.  
>  
>  
Dear Dirk

I agree that if there is a "mandatory braking marker" this should be part of the infrastructure. So it should be treated as a marker (a kind of signal). A lot of speed changes have their origins in a marker or some other kind of signal - a cross-reference would very well fit for that need. If the "mandatory braking" has no marker but is only written somewhere in operational rules you would have to make a difference between "general" rules for all trains and "timetable specific" rules that may only be

applied by some railway companies running there.  
But I don't think you need a <speedChange> for a "mandatory braking marker" since the resulting speed is depending on the exact braking rules and train properties, so you normally won't be able to give any concrete speeds at so a <speedChance>.

Best regards,  
Thomas

--

----- posted via PHP Headliner -----

---