
Subject: Re: Line category according to EN 15528
Posted by on Fri, 24 Jul 2015 16:02:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Christian,

> Any comments on this approach ... are welcome.

Well, then please welcome my comments:

During earlier discussions on this "approach" we came to the conclusion better to handle "physical" values behind these rather "political" classes in railML. This means: Rather use "maxAxleLoad" and "maxMeterLoad" or "maxSpecificLoad".

The reasons were:

There are more local (country-specific) line classes than in EN15528 which means that the enumeration from EN will not fulfil many practical demands. How should we classify a German line of CE or CM2..4 when only the EN15528 are allowed? And from the other way 'round: If we allow country-specific classes as CE, how should one compare or convert it with the other values? This would only be possible by "understanding" the physical background (axleload, meterload a.s.o.), therefore we should always name this background.

There are also many examples where the classes do not fit the actual physical values (you could say, from a technical point of view, the line is wrongly classified - but the classification is political... For instance, the German line 6686/6709 is classified D4 but has apparently a load spread of less than 6 tons per meter.). So you cannot decide whether a certain vehicle or train can use the line if you only know the classification but not the actual physical values.

I personally think that this earlier conclusion is still reasonable and therefore would still prefer the physical values such as "maxAxleLoad" and "maxMeterLoad" or "maxSpecificLoad".

Best regards,
Dirk.

Am 01.06.2015 um 11:38 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

> Dear railML community,

>

> with railML 2.3 we also want to implement line categories as defined in

> EN 15528. Therefore we set up the Trac ticket [1] including the following:

>
> The European standard EN 15528 defines line categories depending on the
> maximum allowed meter load and axle load. The following entries are
> possible:
> * A
> * B1
> * B2
> * C2
> * C3
> * C4
> * D2
> * D3
> * D4
> * D4xL
> * E4
> * E5
>
> Any comments on this approach, which has been initially implemented with
> revision 621 (see [2]), are welcome.
>
> [1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/259>
> [2] <https://trac.railml.org/changeset/621/railML>
>
> Best regards
> Christian
>
