
Subject: railML 2.3 infrastructure extension for capacity planning and network statement usecases

Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Tue, 20 Dec 2016 17:21:47 GMT

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

Dear railML infrastructure forum,

As the railML3 implementation takes a bit longer, Jernbaneverket has looked into fulfilling the absolute requirements of its capacity planning and network statement use case with railML2.3 extensions. The study has shown that the use case can be fulfilled within the frame of "any" element extensions and further "other" attribute definitions that may become part of the emerging railML3 schema. All extension requirements are based on these use cases.

The following existing 7 elements in railML2.3 were extended:

- controller
- trackGroups
- propOperational
- ocsElements
- switch/crossing
- signal
- tunnel

I will post separate postings for the 7 items here in the forum.

All extensions are part of the "NO" namespace that will be defined in a xsd later.

All extended elements or extended attributes to an existing element have been implemented with the namespace prefix "NO:". The prefix can of course later be removed when the extended object would be included in the standard.

All belonging attributes to an extended element have no prefix.

All extended values to existing attributes have been implemented with the prefix "other:".

Extended elements, attributes and values that seem universal have been implemented in English language.

Extended elements, attributes and values that seem Norwegian specific have been implemented in Norwegian language. Values that seem Norwegian specific also have the prefix:"NO:", to clearly mark than as a national parameter.

Kind regards

Torben Brand, Jernbaneverket (from 1.1.2017 Jernbanedirektoratet the Norwegian railway directorate - <http://jernbanedirektoratet.no/en/about-us/>)

Subject: Re: railML 2.3 infrastructure extension for capacity planning and network statement usecases

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2017 16:28:54 GMT

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

Dear Torben,
dear railML community,

Am 20.12.2016 um 18:21 schrieb Torben Brand:

- > Dear railML infrastructure forum,
- > As the railML3 implementation takes a bit longer,

- > Jernbaneverket has looked into fulfilling the absolute
- > requirements of its capacity planning and network statement
- > use case with railML2.3 extensions. The study has shown that
- > the use case can be fulfilled within the frame of "any"
- > element extensions and further "other" attribute definitions
- > that may become part of the emerging railML3 schema. All
- > extension requirements are based on these use cases. The following
- > existing 7 elements in railML2.3 were
- > extended:
- > • controller
- > • trackGroups
- > • propOperational
- > • ocsElements
- > • switch/crossing
- > • signal
- > • tunnel
- > I will post separate postings for the 7 items here in the
- > forum.
- > [...]

Before I am going to answer on your separate postings in detail, please let me thank you for sharing your ideas here in the railML forum with the railML user and developer community. Contributions like yours are very important for the further development of railML, especially for the approaching railML v3.

The proposals are based on railML v2.3. As stated earlier there will be no railML v2.4 with just infrastructure scheme changes. However, if there is a decision to go for a railML v2.4 (pushed by requirements of the timetable schema), how do you want to handle the proposed changes? Do you want to see them implemented in railML v2.4 or better in v3?

Last, but not least: Happy New (Railway) Year to everyone!

Best regards
Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany www.railml.org

Subject: Re: railML 2.3 infrastructure extension for capacity planning and network statement usecases
Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Fri, 24 Feb 2017 13:45:51 GMT

>The proposals are based on railML v2.3. As stated earlier there will be
>no railML v2.4 with just infrastructure scheme changes. However, if
>there is a decision to go for a railML v2.4 (pushed by requirements of
>the timetable schema), how do you want to handle the proposed changes?
>Do you want to see them implemented in railML v2.4 or better in v3?

I suggest to implement the suggested element extensions in both railML 2.4 (if developed) and in railML3. This as they must be part of railML3 as they are part of the capacity planning use case. Both implementations have benefits and disadvantages. railML 2 is available, tested, extensions are relatively simple and the model is relative simple to implement. RailML3 has more functionality, but the model is not developed and tested fully and is more complex. Thus I recommend a parallel approach.

Some of the elements suggested her border towards the interlocking schema. They all derive from the capacity planning use case. And thus they describe, in our perspective, more the interlocking's operational functionality than a technical description. We need to solve as much of this use case as possible as soon as possible. Thus we suggest using the proposed extensions in railML2 infrastructure.
