

Dear Torben,

thanks for your detailed proposal

Torben Brand wrote on 18.02.2019 11:26:

- > But the generic signal model seems to be very underwhelming.
- > Leaving everything undefined for international
- > interoperability. I would suggest grouping all signal in
- > standard sub elements. These can of course be extended.
- > Based on a quick analysis of the Norwegian signals viewed in
- > a generic manner I would suggest 14 groups of signals. 4 of
- > those are already defined in RC2. I suggest adding the
- > following sub elements (bold are existing). See the
- > following link
- > (<http://cloud.railml.org/index.php/s/4fwsqGFkreMNkeP>) for
- > full value table for the types.

I have added the interlocking view for some of your signals in

<https://cloud.railml.org/index.php/s/xMtAoYGcFsZrjF8>

Please bear in mind that "combined" in the IL sense is related to the aspect which combines several informations in a

single aspect (but maybe realised with more than one lamp). A entry/exit/./main signal with a distant signal on the same post is not combined in that sense. The interlocking would see them as two separate signals.

The various signals used to stop a train in front of an unsecure section would be seen as "barrage" signals having only two possible aspects - stop/clear.

Another case is the "clearance signal"/"Middelkontrollampe" which is always mounted at the main signal post. The interlocking will use it as a "supplementary" aspect together with the main aspect.

- > I also suggest adding the @system attribute. Then the signal
- > sub elements and their types are truly generic. They can
- > then be interchangeable for different types of signalling
- > systems (ATC, CTC, ETCS, Conventional/optical). See example
- > for border.
- >
- > Suggested signal sub elements (groups of signals):
- > • Announcement: Announcement by the train of its
- > presence. Can be with different signals. Usually blowing the
- > whistle (boolean value). Can be defined for one or multiple
- > purpose (boolean: levelCrossing, halt, etc.)

- > • Border: Indicating a level transition. Type start/end.
- > The system attribute defines the type of level transition
- > (ATC,CTC, ETCS, Conventional/optical).
- > • catenary
- > • danger: grouping all types of warning signals:
- > avalanche, wind, frost gate, bridge, etc.
- > • gradient: indicating falling/rising gradient and other
- > info.
- > • Info: general design info. Like arrows, invalid boards,
- > and info panels.
- > • level crossing
- > • main: all route related signals
- > • movement: all signals giving an indication of the
- > movement that are not main or shunting signals (line
- > signals, derailleurs, switch and crossing indicators)
- > • plow: orders for handling the equipment on the train.
- > Here the plow.
- > • Position: mileposts and distance signals (f.i. to level
- > crossings)
- > • Shunting: shunting related signals
- > • Speed
- > • stop post
- >
- > It would be interesting to see how other nations signal
- > models would map to this. This would bring us closer to a
- > unified solution. My suggestion is only a simple attempt on
- > a unified mapping.

Yes, this kind of mapping would be the community input we need.

Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator
