Subject: [railML2] Clearer modelling of the signal designation Posted by Tobias Bregulla on Sat, 25 Jan 2020 13:50:13 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Good afternoon,

we want to extend our infrastructure export from GPSinfradat by the signal designation (unique identifier of a signal per operating point). In doing so, I noticed a contradiction between the railML rules and the example on the corresponding Wiki page.

According to the wiki entry for the signals (see https://wiki2.railml.org/index.php?title=IS:signal), the general rules for @code (machine-readable designation for exchange) and @name (established human-readable designation) also apply there. In the example for the signal, however, the designation is given at @name, which in my opinion is not correct and hinders the data exchange.

For explanation: it is about the designation "20ZS3" attached to this German combination signal (https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/2e/Ks-Signa I.jpg), which is also used in site plans and many other documents.

In our opinion, the current wiki example should be described as follows:

In this example, the designation "ESig A1" could be logically formed (not mandatory, only as a suggestion) from the function function="home" --> entry and type="combined" --> main signal in a project-specific way.

What does the community think about this? Could the example be adapted according to this usage?

Best regards,

--

Tobias Bregulla Bahnkonzept Dresden/Germany