

Dear railML users,

the release of the new version railML 2.2 is approaching...
One big issue of the new schema is the implementation of speed profiles that will be referenced by the <speedChange> elements. Since speed instructions depend on a lot of parameters resulting directly from the train (e.g. braking configuration, load), from the track's geography (e.g. slope) or from operation (e.g. route of the train), the <speedProfile> element includes a lot of attributes. The details can be found in trac ticket [1].

At the end of this trac ticket few open points are listed and I want to put these open points here into the forum and ask for your comments:

1. What to do with the current "trainCategory" attribute in <speedChange>?

Marking as "deprecated" is an easy way, but there are nevertheless international train categories for lines, e.g. "NC_Train" of the ETCS domain. Therefore I suggest to introduce a new attribute "etcsTrainCategory" and mark the other one as deprecated.

2. What to do with the current "status" attribute in <speedChange>?

It is possible to define a state of validity for a speed restriction in the sense of 'planned' or 'active' or ... However, I think, it is better to put this information inside the <speedProfile> instead of the <speedChange>.

3. How to define the "blocking of a track"?

The speed restriction vMax="0" within a <speedChange> does not imply a blocking of a track. In particular, it may be possible to order a train to enter a blocked track with a speed of 25 km/h. Therefore, I suggest to add another attribute "blocked" of type boolean within the <speedProfile>.

4. How to define an "obligational stop" where all or only certain trains have to stop prior going on with the same speed aspect as before?

A maximum speed vMax="0" within a <speedChange> can be interpreted as a mandatory stop. If we want to qualify the information of vMax="0", we need to add another attribute to the <speedChange> element, e.g. "specialPurpose". Its enumeration values like 'mandatoryStop' or 'mandatoryBraking' may cover all cases of obligational stops.

[1] <https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/41>

Regards

--

Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator

Subject: Train category for speed changes/speed profiles (was: last open points for speedProfiles in railML 2.2)

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 10:21:20 GMT

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

Dear railML users,

as written in Christians posting some times ago, the aspect of train categories for speed changes / speed profiles is not satisfactory discussed.

Christian Rahmig <coord@infrastructure.railml.org> writes:

- > the release of the new version railML 2.2 is approaching...
- > One big issue of the new schema is the implementation of speed
- > profiles that will be referenced by the <speedChange> elements. Since
- > speed instructions depend on a lot of parameters resulting directly
- > from the train (e.g. braking configuration, load), from the track's
- > geography (e.g. slope) or from operation (e.g. route of the train),
- > the <speedProfile> element includes a lot of attributes. The details
- > can be found in trac ticket [1].
- >
- > At the end of this trac ticket few open points are listed and I want
- > to put these open points here into the forum and ask for your
- > comments:
- >
- > 1. What to do with the current "trainCategory" attribute in <speedChange>?
- >
- > Marking as "deprecated" is an easy way, but there are nevertheless
- > international train categories for lines, e.g. "NC_Train" of the ETCS
- > domain. Therefore I suggest to introduce a new attribute
- > "etcsTrainCategory" and mark the other one as deprecated.
- >
- > [1] <https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/41>

There was no response here!

We met in Berlin last week and had small discussion at the round table about this issue. But these discussions did also not lead to a clear

change request. I summarized the open points in a new Trac ticket and hope that this thread collects some statements about the wished and needed implementation for the upcoming railML 2.2.

See Trac ticket #225 [2]:

At the railML conference in Berlin (2013-03-06) a bit confusion raised around the train category for speed profiles and speed changes. See also #41 for the speed profile implementations.

Current implementation:

- * Attribute `etcsTrainCategory` in `speedChange` element.
- * no general train category attribute in `speedProfile` element, use other special characterization instead

Questions/requests:

- * general train category attribute for the `speedProfile` element
- * special train category attribute for the `speedProfile` element in order to define "passenger" and "goods" trains
- * special train category attribute for the `speedProfile` element in order to define special vehicle family types, e.g. "Flirt"

Any comments* in short-term appreciated.

[2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/225>

* +1, -1, questions, hints, use cases...

Kind regards...

Susanne

--

Susanne Wunsch

Schema Coordinator: railML.common

Subject: Mandatory braking in front of a steep gradient (was: last open points for speedProfiles in railML 2.2)

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Mon, 11 Mar 2013 15:20:07 GMT

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

Dear railML users,

At the railML conference in Berlin, the issue of this thread was discussed. A summarized Trac ticket text is copied at the end of this

posting.

I found no proper discussion thread about this issue in this forum but the following mentioning.

Christian Rahmig <coord@infrastructure.railml.org> writes:

- > 4. How to define an "obligational stop" where all or only certain
- > trains have to stop prior going on with the same speed aspect as
- > before?
- >
- > A maximum speed vMax="0" within a <speedChange> can be interpreted
- > as a mandatory stop. If we want to qualify the information of
- > vMax="0", we need to add another attribute to the <speedChange>
- > element, e.g. "specialPurpose". Its enumeration values like
- > mandatoryStop' or 'mandatoryBraking' may cover all cases of
- > obligational stops.
- >
- > [1] <https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/41>

I summarized the opinions from the conference in Trac ticket #227 [2]:

During the last railML conference (2013-03-06) in Berlin the discussion came to this aspect of the current speedChange implementation:

If a goods train driver has not used its train brakes during a specified time (e.g. last hour) it should do an "operational braking" - not until standstill, but to check, if the brakes work properly.

This operation is indicated at the drivers timetable.

It seems, that the scenario is a very special German one, that is covered by the German operational rules. Brake tests are done very differently across other countries. It is not a general infrastructure specific issue, but more an operational one.

Therefore the implementation of "mandatoryBraking" in the element "speedChange" should be removed.

railML partners should use an "any"-Attribute as a short-term solution.

For re-inventing this feature it should be modeled in another way. There were no further proposals.

Any comments* appreciated.

Kind regards...

Susanne

[2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/227>

* +1, -1, hints, questions...

--

Susanne Wunsch

Schema Coordinator: railML.common

Subject: Re: Train category for speed changes/speed profiles (was: last open points for speedProfiles in railML 2.2)

Posted by _____ on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 19:20:21 GMT

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

Dear Susanne,

> Questions/requests:

>

> * general train category attribute for the speedProfile element

Not from my side - see arguments on such an attribute at "Stop posts for different train types". Infrastructure has to be independent from operators. Please always try to describe the physical background / reason.

> * special train category attribute for the speedProfile element in

> order to define "passenger" and "goods" trains

Not from my side. Please always try to describe the physical background / reason.

> * special train category attribute for the speedProfile element in

> order to define special vehicle family types, e.g. "Flirt"

"Flirt" is not a train category in this meaning, rather a vehicle family. Please do not mix the terms. The best would be to describe the physical background / reason. There must be a physical reason why a "Flirt" is allowed to go quicker or slower there. From a neutral, general point of view: This speeds should be allowed also for all other vehicles with the same physical attributes but with different names than "Flirt". (The speeds should not depend on the name of the vehicles...)

If there is a need for a less neutral way: A "vehicleRef" (enumerable) would be acceptable.

Best regards,

Dirk.

Subject: Re: Train category for speed changes/speed profiles (was: last openpoints for speedProfiles in railML 2.2)

Posted by [thomas.kauer](#) on Fri, 15 Mar 2013 15:45:25 GMT

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

Dirk BrÄuer wrote:

>
> Dear Susanne,
>
>> Questions/requests:
>>
>> * general train category attribute for the speedProfile element
>
> Not from my side - see arguments on such an attribute at "Stop posts for
> different train types". Infrastructure has to be independent from
> operators. Please always try to describe the physical background / reason.
>
>> * special train category attribute for the speedProfile element in
>> order to define "passenger" and "goods" trains
>
> Not from my side. Please always try to describe the physical background /
> reason.
>
>> * special train category attribute for the speedProfile element in
>> order to define special vehicle family types, e.g. "Flirt"
>
> "Flirt" is not a train category in this meaning, rather a vehicle family.
> Please do not mix the terms. The best would be to describe the physical
> background / reason. There must be a physical reason why a "Flirt" is
> allowed to go quicker or slower there. From a neutral, general point of
> view: This speeds should be allowed also for all other vehicles with the
> same physical attributes but with different names than "Flirt". (The
> speeds should not depend on the name of the vehicles...)
>
> If there is a need for a less neutral way: A "vehicleRef" (enumerable)
> would be acceptable.
>
> Best regards,
> Dirk.
>
>
Dear Dirk

there is certainly a physical reason, but that's not all: You need also the permission (for example from the EBA or the BAV). So that at the end only some construction types like Flirt may be allowed to get faster).

Best regards
Thomas

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

Subject: Re: Mandatory braking in front of a steep gradient
Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Sat, 16 Mar 2013 12:11:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Susanne,

Am 11.03.2013 16:20, schrieb Susanne Wunsch:

- > I summarized the opinions from the conference in Trac ticket #227 [2]:
- >
- > During the last railML conference (2013-03-06) in Berlin the
- > discussion came to this aspect of the current speedChange
- > implementation:
- >
- > If a goods train driver has not used its train brakes during a
- > specified time (e.g. last hour) it should do an "operational
- > braking" - not until standstill, but to check, if the brakes work
- > properly.
- >
- > This operation is indicated at the drivers timetable.
- >
- > It seems, that the scenario is a very special German one, that is
- > covered by the German operational rules. Brake tests are done very
- > differently across other countries. It is not a general infrastructure
- > specific issue, but more an operational one.
- >
- > Therefore the implementation of "mandatoryBraking" in the element
- > "speedChange" should be removed.
- >
- > railML partners should use an "any"-Attribute as a short-term solution.
- >
- > For re-inventing this feature it should be modeled in another way.
- > There were no further proposals.

+1

- > [2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/227>

Regards

--
Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator

Subject: Re: Mandatory braking in front of a steep gradient
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Wed, 05 Apr 2017 11:56:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

the following topic about "mandatory braking" is still open. However, it seems like the interest in having a solution available in railML is quite small. So: in case you urgently need a solution for modelling mandatory braking points in railML infrastructure, please comment here. Otherwise, the issue will be closed.

Best regards
Christian

Am 11.03.2013 um 16:20 schrieb Susanne Wunsch:

> Dear railML users,
>
> At the railML conference in Berlin, the issue of this thread was
> discussed. A summarized Trac ticket text is copied at the end of this
> posting.
>
> I found no proper discussion thread about this issue in this forum but
> the following mentioning.
>
> Christian Rahmig <coord@infrastructure.railml.org> writes:
>> 4. How to define an "obligational stop" where all or only certain
>> trains have to stop prior going on with the same speed aspect as
>> before?
>>
>> A maximum speed `vMax="0"` within a `<speedChange>` can be interpreted
>> as a mandatory stop. If we want to qualify the information of
>> `vMax="0"`, we need to add another attribute to the `<speedChange>`
>> element, e.g. "specialPurpose". Its enumeration values like
>> `mandatoryStop` or `mandatoryBraking` may cover all cases of
>> obligational stops.
>>
>> [1] <https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/41>
>
> I summarized the opinions from the conference in Trac ticket #227 [2]:
>
> During the last railML conference (2013-03-06) in Berlin the
> discussion came to this aspect of the current speedChange
> implementation:
>
> If a goods train driver has not used its train brakes during a
> specified time (e.g. last hour) it should do an "operational
> braking" - not until standstill, but to check, if the brakes work
> properly.

>
> This operation is indicated at the drivers timetable.
>
> It seems, that the scenario is a very special German one, that is
> covered by the German operational rules. Brake tests are done very
> differently across other countries. It is not a general infrastructure
> specific issue, but more an operational one.
>
> Therefore the implementation of "mandatoryBraking" in the element
> "speedChange" should be removed.
>
> railML partners should use an "any"-Attribute as a short-term solution.
>
> For re-inventing this feature it should be modeled in another way.
> There were no further proposals.
>
> Any comments* appreciated.
>
> Kind regards...
> Susanne
>
> [2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/227>
> * +1, -1, hints, questions...
>

--
Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany www.railml.org

Subject: Re: Mandatory braking in front of a steep gradient
Posted by on Thu, 18 May 2017 16:48:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Christian,

> Therefore the implementation of "mandatoryBraking" in the element
> "speedChange" should be removed.
>
> railML partners should use an "any"-Attribute as a short-term solution.

I agree with that solution.

Please care (with a lower priority) that there will be a "docking" place
for user-defined (country-specific) virtual track elements as
<any>-elements like "mandatoryBrakingPlace" or "signalViewingPlace" or such.

With best regards,
Dirk.

Subject: Re: Mandatory braking in front of a steep gradient
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 12 Feb 2018 13:42:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Dirk,

thank you for your feedback. In general, there is a "docking place" for user-defined extensions in <trackElements>, which could be used to define <mandatoryBrakingPlace> etc.

Since there has not been a big interest into this topic, I close the ticket #227 [1].

Best regards
Christian Rahmig

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/227>

Am 18.05.2017 um 18:48 schrieb Dirk Bräuer:

> Dear Christian,
>
>> Therefore the implementation of "mandatoryBraking" in the element
>> "speedChange" should be removed.
>>
>> railML partners should use an "any"-Attribute as a short-term solution.
>
> I agree with that solution.
>
> Please care (with a lower priority) that there will be a "docking" place
> for user-defined (country-specific) virtual track elements as
> <any>-elements like "mandatoryBrakingPlace" or "signalViewingPlace" or
> such.
>
> With best regards,
> Dirk.

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany www.railml.org
