
Subject: Identical signal representation [de:Gruppenausfahrssignal]

Posted by [pierre.simon](#) on Wed, 04 Jul 2012 16:54:59 GMT

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

Hello, I'm Pierre Simon and I work for Infrabel which is responsible of the railway infrastructure in Belgium. We are developing a software for helping in the installation of the ETCS1 on the belgian railway. That's why we are now joining the railML community.

The first subject is : The representation of the identical signal

Usually, identical signals are installed at the exit of a grill (de:GleisHarfe). They are visible for the driver if the train is in the grill or even if it is on the main track.

We suggest to duplicate this signal for all the tracks where the driver will see the signal and add an attribute ('identicalSignal') to refer signals between each other. (Apparently this kind of signal is at least used in Belgium, Germany and Czech Republic).

[de: Fuer Gruppenausfahrssignale wird ein Attribut benoetigt, das die einzelnen Signale miteinander verlinkt.]

--

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

Subject: Re: Identical signal representation [de:Gruppenausfahrssignal]

Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Wed, 04 Jul 2012 18:33:36 GMT

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

Hello Pierre,

> Hello, I'm Pierre Simon and I work for Infrabel which is responsible of
> the railway infrastructure in Belgium. We are developing a software for
> helping in the installation of the ETCS1 on the belgian railway. That's
> why we are now joining the railML community.

welcome to the railML infrastructure forum. It would be interesting to hear more about your application of the railML schema at the next railML meeting in Zurich, Switzerland, on November 14.

> The first subject is : The representation of the identical signal
>
> Usually, identical signals are installed at the exit of a grill
> (de:GleisHarfe). They are visible for the driver if the train is in the
> grill or even if it is on the main track.
> We suggest to duplicate this signal for all the tracks where the driver
> will see the signal and add an attribute ('identicalSignal') to refer

- > signals between each other. (Apparently this kind of signal is at least
- > used in Belgium, Germany and Czech Republic).

If we have a look at the real (installed) infrastructure, only one signal (common signal) exists whereas the "signal duplicates" can be classified as virtual signals: They repeat the common signal's information, but cannot be found in the real infrastructure. So, one option would be to allow for such virtual signals and define an attribute "virtual" of type boolean. As you proposed, another attribute "identicalSignal" or "signalRef" may be used to refer to an existing signal.

But since there are quite a few objections regarding virtual infrastructure objects I would like to ask the other users: What do you think about virtual signals?

Regards

Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator

Subject: Re: Identical signal representation [de:Gruppenausfahrssignal]

Posted by on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 11:35:09 GMT

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

Hello Pierre and Christian,

>> Usually, identical signals are installed at the exit of a grill
>> (de:GleisHarfe). They are visible for the driver if the train is in the
>> grill or even if it is on the main track.
>> We suggest to duplicate this signal for all the tracks where the driver
>> will see the signal and add an attribute ('identicalSignal') to refer
>> signals between each other. (Apparently this kind of signal is at least
>> used in Belgium, Germany and Czech Republic).

> But since there are quite a few objections regarding virtual
> infrastructure objects I would like to ask the other users: What do you
> think about virtual signals?

I agree with Pierre that an additional information is necessary in the tracks for which a "group starter" [Gruppenausfahrssignal] is valid. At another infrastructure model we also had such "group starter stopping place" [Gruppenausfahrhalteplatz] elements.

At least they tell a train entering the track where to stop (they are not allowed to proceed until the main signal fouling the points). Additionally, they tell a train which is ready to depart from the train

that the "group starter" is valid and, again, that it is not allowed to proceed until the "group starter" is cleared for that train.

So, we do need a virtual element there but I would not call it 'identicalSignal'. I would also not call it "group starter stopping place" [Gruppenausfahrhalteplatz] in RailML which sounds a little bit too special. But from my opinion, it is more a kind of stopping place than an additional signal.

In some cases and some countries, there are marker boards at these places (H-Tafeln in Germany, Fahrtstellungsmelder 559 in Switzerland, marker boards in UK). In these cases, one could say that we wouldn't need the virtual "group starter stopping place" because it follows from the real existing marker board which should be an element elsewhere in the RailML file. In my opinion, it should be left to the writing program to add the virtual element at the same place (meter) of the real marker - just to describe the function.

If we have a possibility to describe a stopping place ("H-Tafel") in RailML - which we should have - we could use that and add a property "virtual". This fits to the discussion on <stopPosts> earlier that year.

So, my suggestion is:

- to define a <stopPost> as optional virtual,
- to allow an optional cross-reference from a <stopPost> to a main signal.

Best regards,
Dirk.

Subject: Re: Identical signal representation [de:Gruppenausfahrsignal]
Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Wed, 24 Oct 2012 14:23:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Dirk, Pierre and other railML users,

- > So, my suggestion is:
- > - to define a <stopPost> as optional virtual,
 - > - to allow an optional cross-reference from a <stopPost> to a main
 - > signal.

indeed, this suggestion seems to be the best solution for the task of modelling "group starter stopping places". Thank you, Dirk. Therefore, I added a comment to the trac ticket [1] about the stop posts, which will be implemented with railML 2.2.

[1] <https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/167>

Regards

--

Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator
