
Subject: Re: UIC train transport id

Posted by [Joachim Rubröder railML](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 18:47:36 GMT

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

I discussed this question with Andreas at the meeting on 24.04.2012 and he agreed that such a field would be fine but it's a bit too early to decide how to define the field in the proper way. I therefore created an issue #147 for version 2.x

Dirk Br  uer wrote:

- >
- > I'm sorry, there has been again a crossing at the double-track Internet...
- > (It seems that an old "Reichsbahner" like me is not familiar with too much
- > double-track.)
- >
- > I've seen that Andreas has already answered so of the open questions.
- >
- > I had a look into the source which Andreas sent. It seems to be an
- > 'approach' to the problem of train numbers but only from the view of one
- > Infrastructure Company and also more for freight traffic than for
- > passenger traffic.
- >
- > Some of the problems are well-known. So for instance they write:
- >
- > "Uniqueness of the code"
- > "It is the responsibility of the company that creates the code to ensure
- > its uniqueness. Because a code
- > is prefixed with the type and company codes a company only needs to ensure
- > unique in each timetable period."
- >
- > It deals a little bit with the problem of more than one Operator being
- > involved in one train by defining a 'lead operator' (lead RU). Even this
- > is - from my opinion - a little bit blau  ugig because in most cases one
- > Train Operating Company (TOC) does not 'subordinate' under another. At
- > least it is my experience.
- >
- > But what it does not deal with is the problem of one train crossing over
- > the infrastructure of more than one Infrastructure Company - and that is
- > by far not an academic problem! There is no "leading infrastructure
- > company" and it would also be unrealistic. So that means, there may be a
- > 'train' (in general) M  nchen - Z  rich which has a different "UIC train
- > transport id" at DB Netz tracks than it has at SBB tracks. The same
- > applies to a train Hagenow Land - Neustrelitz which crosses three
- > Infrastructure Companies, one double. So this train then has three "UIC
- > train transport ids"? Or four because DB Netz cannot use one double?
- >

> Anyway, we should be very careful here.
>
> - It is now-days hard to imagine that a 'company' like DB Netz follows
> the rules of this document. At least it will take a 'few' years until the
> "big" Infrastructure Companies of our world recognise this "UIC train
> transport ids" and again a 'few' years until they implement it in their
> software...
>
> - If we must implement it now in RailML, it seems to be better to put it
> to the train part because I guess (I'm afraid) that each Infrastructure
> Company uses its own "UIC train transport id".
>
> - It is the philosophy of RailML to put everything which can change into
> a train part and let the train do only the grouping of train parts. We
> should not break this principle.
>
> I would prefer to wait with this "UIC train transport id" and to handle it
> in a wider topic like "compatibility to Pathfinder" where we could assign
> a Diplomarbeit or so.
> But this is only my opinion.
>
> Best regards,
> Dirk.
>
>

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