Dear Philip, Mico and all "lurkers",

I can possibly clarify some issues raised by Philip. This concerns the current situation in railML, their current usage and the background behind former development; I do want to value the current situation as being sufficient or not.

> 2. there are some ambiguities with regard to the attributes
> - an activity might be 'ordered' by the RU for a commercial stop

To explain the intention behind the current situation: The term "ordered" in the attribute /operationalStopOrdered/ refers to the contractual relationship between IM and TOC.

The term "commercial" of the attribute of the same title in railML traditionally refers to the contractual relationship between TOC and end-customer, not to the contractual relationship between IM and TOC.

> - onOff is not clearly defined to be relevant to customers/goods only

May be "not clearly defined", but the intention behind is of course: Only for commercial stops. Does not make sense for traditional operational stops (which are not ordered). Theoretical, having an operational stop for crew change, one could differ between on/off/both but so far, there was never a practical demand for that and it is very far-fetched just to raise or reduce the number of crew-members and fix this in a timetable.

The intention behind onOff was clearly: Passenger information.

I want to add concerning stopOnRequest: Intended for passenger usage only; makes no sense for "goods only" activities. The real background is to tell the passenger whether he has to signal his wish for a stop immediately before. For freight, a customer cannot signal a wish to stop "immediately before" (by hand or button). At least, he would have to phone or communicate in a more specialised way a special time period before.

 From an operational view (concerning relationship between TOC and IM and inside TOC and IM), "goods only" activities are always "on request", so by default they can be omitted if there is no demand. The former "Bedarfszug" has been made obsolete therefore.

> 3. in general I suspect that more than one 'activity' can be
> supplied for a stop - how shall 'conflicting' attributes be

> treated in such a case?

Concerning this, it is documented:
"It is not intended to write different stop types at the same station.
Concerning the usualities of railway operation: If there are reasons for
both a traffic stop and an operational stop, a traffic stop shall be
declared. If an operational stop becomes necessary by IM as well as by
TOC, it will be declared as an operational stop by TOC (ordered
operational stop)."

I agree that if we will define an enumeration of additional stop
informations (activities), this should be repeatable (several activities
at one stop).

Best regards,
Dirk.