

---

Subject: New reflected thoughts towards railML 2.3 infrastructure extension  
proposal line sections

Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Fri, 14 Jul 2017 07:44:03 GMT

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

---

As previously mentioned, the use case for line sections is to segment the line and to group the tracks. The grouping of tracks is an essential feature, as else the `<track/trackTopology/borders>` can be used. The element shall be optional. The segmentation is free to be defined as the individual model requires. The Norwegian model requires (use case: network statement, the Norwegian line book, the Norwegian asset management database structure) a segmentation into the open section (open track, line-side, NO:"linjen", DE:"freihe Strecke" univocal English term to be defined) and the station (according to Norwegian definition).

I agree with Dirk that "station" is not well enough defined in railML nor generic international (in RTM). So it's better to segment according to ocp. As there is already the possibility to reference tracks under an ocp in the sub element `<ocp/propEquipment/trackRef>` I suggest to use this. As there also is an ocp of `propOperationaltype:"station"` the result is the same. But the model is probably more consistent.

To model the open section (or other line sections/segment) I suggest to keep the proposed element `<lineSection>`.

I suggest to change the suggested `<lineSection>@type:"path"` to "openSection", as this seems to be a better term (but I am, as always, open for other suggestions. Also, I will receive guidance for English terms from Network Rail resources in August). Alternative if no common ground can be found for defining "open section" we suggest to use the national value: "NO:linjen".

An alternative is to make a new `<ocp/propOperational>@type:"openSection"`. But I would prefer the line section choice as an open section is not an ocp and the an open section "ocp" could contain multiple other ocps. What does the forum think?

---