
Subject: [railML3] Mandatory <Location> for <genericArea>?
Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Tue, 10 Oct 2023 08:51:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear railML community,

Do I read this right that a <location> is mandatory for <genericArea>?
<https://wiki3.railml.org/wiki/IS:genericArea>

In the norwegian railway sector we need project areas. They work great in railML2.4nor explained in chapter 4.9 here:

https://www.jernbanedirektoratet.no/globalassets/documenter/railml/20230330_railml2.4norisdocumentation_v1.6.pdf

We use bounding elements using <isLimitedBy> references pointing to functional infrastructure elements (<border>s).

The same mechanisms exist in railML3.2 and we would like to use them!

But we do not have any information on circles or polygones as is the required choice under <location>!

Also we have no requirement for them!

Se example for a project area in Advanced Example in Railoscope here:

<https://railoscope.com/tickets/Fyh1WAZliOQbgVmY?modelId=64d2293fb1421a4b8096c580&selectId=163-22>

Subject: Re: [railML3] Mandatory <Location> for <genericArea>?
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Wed, 18 Oct 2023 12:41:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello Torben,

thanks for pointing on this topic. I checked the related development issue [1] and the forum posts [2]. After all, I cannot find any reason or argumentation, why the child element <location> should be mandatory and I am quite sure that this is a bug of our implementation of the <genericArea> element in railML 3.2. I suggest to change this to optional (like for the other child elements) with railML 3.3.

If someone from the community has any objection, please let me know until end of Octobre 2023.

Thank you very much and best regards
Christian

[1] <https://development.railml.org/railml/version3/-/issues/479>

[2] https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=830&goto=2832&#msg_2832

Subject: Re: [railML3] Mandatory <Location> for <genericArea>?

Posted by [Georg Boasson](#) on Tue, 31 Oct 2023 13:38:17 GMT

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

Bane NOR will be using <genericArea> in our railML3.2 exchange of data in Q1 2024 and will therefore very much appreciate a service fix deployment of railML3.2. The fix should use <isLimitedBy> as borders instead of circles or polygons.

Subject: Re: [railML3] Mandatory <Location> for <genericArea>?

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 14 Nov 2023 07:06:22 GMT

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

Dear Georg,

thank you for your feedback. We understood that this topic is very important for Bane NOR and their projects and therefore, the ticket will be prioritized for railML 3.3 implementation. As for railML 3.2, we will document a work-around based on zero entries in the railML3 wiki.

Best regards

Christian

Subject: Re: [railML3] Mandatory <Location> for <genericArea>?

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 08 Dec 2023 09:56:55 GMT

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

Dear all,

the zero-entries based work-around for generic areas without a circular or polygon location in railML 3.2 shall look like this:

```
<genericArea id="...">
  <location>
    <circle radius="0">
      <centerPoint>
        <pos>0 0</pos>
      </centerPoint>
    </circle>
  </location>
</genericArea>
```

You can find this work-around code snippets also on the wiki page of genericArea [3]. Further, the newly created Git issue #522 [4] puts the fixing on the agenda for railML 3.3.

[3] <https://wiki3.railml.org/wiki/IS:genericArea>

[4] <https://development.railml.org/railml/version3/-/issues/522>

Best regards

Christian
