
Subject: Re: [railML3|alpha] Missing track conditions
Posted by [Martin Karlsson](#) on Tue, 08 Nov 2016 14:19:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks for your reply. I will consider to enter a use case when time permits. Just a couple of short comments for now:

About electrification, I think after reading your comment that it is best left as it is. It is fully flexible also outside the ERA list. When it does match a list entry, it can easily be translated.

I agree that data should not be modelled twice. In my opinion, data should be decoupled from the function(s) using it, i.e. there should ideally be no ETCS specific objects. A non stopping area is an operational restriction of interest, regardless if it is realised through an ETCS message, a sign post or a written instruction to the driver.
