Dear Susanne,

Am 12.03.2013, 22:57 Uhr, schrieb Susanne Wunsch <coord@common.railml.org>:
> We want to remove both attributes (mandatoryStop and mandatoryBraking)
> from the "speedChange" element for the upcoming 2.2 version.

Ah, I understand.

> And indeed both scenarios
> are some kind of operational-rule-driven.

The "Betriebsbremsung" more than the "mandatory stop".

So I agree to remove "Betriebsbremsung" to somewhere else, may be away
 from <infrastructure> to <rules> or such.

I do not agree concerning "mandatory stops". Their reason is clearly
infrastructure. In the case of level crossings (the case you always quote)
the reason is "bad sight" from street to railway line due to an obstacle
in the triangle between a car, a train, and the level crossing. This
"obstacle" - possibly a house - is clearly infrastructure - somebody has
built it there. May be it's not railway property, but rather
infrastructure in general than rule.

Other examples for "mandatory stops" are at least the same
"infrastructure-like": RETB stop markers are a kind of starter signal, or
H-Tafel or Trapeztafel in Germany.

Of course all these also have a touch of rule: The reason for a starter
signal is a rule (just one train in one section). Despite this, I guess
you would treat starter signals, H-Tafel, and Trapeztafel as
infrastructure, too. So you should do the same with mandatory stop marker
boards.

Another example would be Ra10 / Rangierhalttafel from Germany (limit of
shunting marker board in English). Is it infrastructure or rule? Some of
both, of course. There is no physical need to stop there, as there is no
physical need to stop at any other main signal or marker board.

However, following the rule Christian once said: At least if you can touch
it, it is infrastructure. You can touch a main signal, a Ra10, as well as
a "mandatory stop" marker or these "0 km/h" speed signals at German level
crossings with "bad sight".

Convinced?

> The "mandatoryBraking" attribute, which is the topic of this thread, may
> be modelled as an operational stop with a reference to its level
> crossing. But this idea is also not fully checked and far from "ready to
> implement".

I guess there is a mistake in your writing: You do not mean
"mandatoryBraking" but "mandatoryStop".

The "mandatoryStop" has another character than an operational stop.
Operational stops are by far not mandatory - on the contrary. They can be
skipped (the train is allowed to run through) under certain conditions,
which are pure of "timetabling" matter.

Currently, you cannot create an operational stop in RailML referencing a
level crossing - stops can only reference OCPs, and a level crossing is no
OCP. It would be necessary to additionally create an OCP at the place of
the level crossing to model the operational stop.

Anyway, with this technology you cannot express that stops are regularly
necessary forced by the infrastructure manager (or some other authority)
at this place. I think it should be possible to create infrastructure-only
RaiLML file (a RailML file with just infrastructure, no trains). If this
is given to anybody who wants to create a timetable, it should tell him as
much as he could see "in nature". It should spare him to go outside and
look at each sign. If you agree with this, the "mandatory braking" marker
boards should be infrastructure.

If you do not want to put them as an attribute of <speedChange>, then
please allow a cross-reference from/to <speedChange> to keep background
information.

Best regards,
Dirk.

_____