
Subject: Re: Obligational stop

Posted by [thomas.kauer](#) on Fri, 15 Mar 2013 14:38:59 GMT

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

Dirk Br  uer wrote:

>
> Dear Susanne,
>
> Am 12.03.2013, 22:57 Uhr, schrieb Susanne Wunsch <coord@common.railml.org>:
>> We want to remove both attributes (mandatoryStop and mandatoryBraking)
>> from the "speedChange" element for the upcoming 2.2 version.
>
> Ah, I understand.
>
>> And indeed both scenarios
>> are some kind of operational-rule-driven.
>
> The "Betriebsbremsung" more than the "mandatory stop".
>
> So I agree to remove "Betriebsbremsung" to somewhere else, may be away
> from <infrastructure> to <rules> or such.
>
> I do not agree concerning "mandatory stops". Their reason is clearly
> infrastructure. In the case of level crossings (the case you always quote)
> the reason is "bad sight" from street to railway line due to an obstacle
> in the triangle between a car, a train, and the level crossing. This
> "obstacle" - possibly a house - is clearly infrastructure - somebody has
> built it there. May be it's not railway property, but rather
> infrastructure in general than rule.
>
> Other examples for "mandatory stops" are at least the same
> "infrastructure-like": RETB stop markers are a kind of starter signal, or
> H-Tafel or Trapeztafel in Germany.
>
> Of course all these also have a touch of rule: The reason for a starter
> signal is a rule (just one train in one section). Despite this, I guess
> you would treat starter signals, H-Tafel, and Trapeztafel as
> infrastructure, too. So you should do the same with mandatory stop marker
> boards.
>
> Another example would be Ra10 / Rangierhalttafel from Germany (limit of
> shunting marker board in English). Is it infrastructure or rule? Some of
> both, of course. There is no physical need to stop there, as there is no
> physical need to stop at any other main signal or marker board.
>
> However, following the rule Christian once said: At least if you can touch
> it, it is infrastructure. You can touch a main signal, a Ra10, as well as
> a "mandatory stop" marker or these "0 km/h" speed signals at German level

> crossings with "bad sight".

>

> Convinced?

>

>> The "mandatoryBraking" attribute, which is the topic of this thread, may

>> be modelled as an operational stop with a reference to its level

>> crossing. But this idea is also not fully checked and far from "ready to

>> implement".

>

> I guess there is a mistake in your writing: You do not mean

> "mandatoryBraking" but "mandatoryStop".

>

> The "mandatoryStop" has another character than an operational stop.

> Operational stops are by far not mandatory - on the contrary. They can be

> skipped (the train is allowed to run through) under certain conditions,

> which are pure of "timetabling" matter.

>

> Currently, you cannot create an operational stop in RailML referencing a

> level crossing - stops can only reference OCPs, and a level crossing is no

> OCP. It would be necessary to additionally create an OCP at the place of

> the level crossing to model the operational stop.

>

> Anyway, with this technology you cannot express that stops are regularly

> necessary forced by the infrastructure manager (or some other authority)

> at this place. I think it should be possible to create infrastructure-only

> RailML file (a RailML file with just infrastructure, no trains). If this

> is given to anybody who wants to create a timetable, it should tell him as

> much as he could see "in nature". It should spare him to go outside and

> look at each sign. If you agree with this, the "mandatory braking" marker

> boards should be infrastructure.

>

> If you do not want to put them as an attribute of <speedChange>, then

> please allow a cross-reference from/to <speedChange> to keep background

> information.

>

> Best regards,

> Dirk.

>

>

Dear Dirk

I agree that if there is a "mandatory braking marker" this should be part of the infrastructure. So it should be treated as a marker (a kind of signal). A lot of speed changes have their origins in a marker or some other kind of signal - a cross-reference would very well fit for that need. If the "mandatory braking" has no marker but is only written somewhere in operational rules you would have to make a difference between "general" rules for all trains and "timetable specific" rules that may only be

applied by some railway companies running there.

But I don't think you need a <speedChange> for a "mandatory braking marker" since the resulting speed is depending on the exact braking rules and train properties, so you normally won't be able to give any concrete speeds at so a <speedChance>.

Best regards,
Thomas

--

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