

---

Subject: Re: UIC train transport id  
Posted by on Tue, 27 Mar 2012 14:46:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm sorry, there has been again a crossing at the double-track Internet....  
(It seems that an old "Reichsbahner" like me is not familiar with too much double-track.)

I've seen that Andreas has already answered so of the open questions.

I had a look into the source which Andreas sent. It seems to be an 'approach' to the problem of train numbers but only from the view of one Infrastructure Company and also more for freight traffic than for passenger traffic.

Some of the problems are well-known. So for instance they write:

"Uniqueness of the code"

"It is the responsibility of the company that creates the code to ensure its uniqueness. Because a code is prefixed with the type and company codes a company only needs to ensure the "core element" is unique in each timetable period."

It deals a little bit with the problem of more than one Operator being involved in one train by defining a 'lead operator' (lead RU). Even this is - from my opinion - a little bit blauäugig because in most cases one Train Operating Company (TOC) does not 'subordinate' under another. At least it is my experience.

But what it does not deal with is the problem of one train crossing over the infrastructure of more than one Infrastructure Company - and that is by far not an academic problem! There is no "leading infrastructure company" and it would also be unrealistic. So that means, there may be a 'train' (in general) München - Zürich which has a different "UIC train transport id" at DB Netz tracks than it has at SBB tracks. The same applies to a train Hagenow Land - Neustrelitz which crosses three Infrastructure Companies, one double. So this train then has three "UIC train transport ids"? Or four because DB Netz cannot use one double?

Anyway, we should be very careful here.

- It is now-days hard to imagine that a 'company' like DB Netz follows the rules of this document. At least it will take a 'few' years until the "big" Infrastructure Companies of our world recognise this "UIC train transport ids" and again a 'few' years until they implement it in their software...

- If we must implement it now in RailML, it seems to be better to put it to the train part because I guess (I'm afraid) that each Infrastructure Company uses its own "UIC train transport id".

- It is the philosophy of RailML to put everything which can change into a train part and let the train do only the grouping of train parts. We should not break this principle.

I would prefer to wait with this "UIC train transport id" and to handle it in a wider topic like "compatibility to Pathfinder" where we could assign a Diplomarbeit or so.  
But this is only my opinion.

Best regards,  
Dirk.

---