

---

Subject: UIC train transport id

Posted by [Andreas Tanner](#) on Thu, 15 Mar 2012 12:22:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hello friends of RailML,

what about a dedicated attribute for the UIC "train transport id"? We have indeed customers that use this id. The appropriate location would be at the train element.

Regards

Andreas Tanner.

---

---

Subject: Re: UIC train transport id

Posted by [Andreas Tanner](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2012 09:00:19 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Am 15.03.2012 13:22, schrieb Andreas Tanner:

> Hello friends of RailML,

>

> what about a dedicated attribute for the UIC "train transport id"? We

> have indeed customers that use this id. The appropriate location would

> be at the train element.

>

> Regards

>

> Andreas Tanner.

The specification of the id can be found here:

[http://www.uic.org/IMG/pdf/111122\\_wg\\_10\\_handbook\\_final.pdf](http://www.uic.org/IMG/pdf/111122_wg_10_handbook_final.pdf)

The id has the following structure:

"Object Type" : alphanumeric enumeration with values "TR", "PA", "PR", "CR"

"Company": four digits numeric

"Core": 12 letters alphanumeric

"Variant": 2 letters alphanumeric

"Timetable year": year

"Start date": date (optional)

The id should be modeled as an optional child of <train>.

---

---

Subject: Re: UIC train transport id  
Posted by on Tue, 27 Mar 2012 13:42:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hello Andreas,

as far as I can remember, on 19th March 2012 we thought about having an example and may be a recommendation where and how you wanted this new attribute to be included.

- Can you write an official source of "UIC train transport id"?
- Is it a property of an operational train, a commercial train or of a train part? This means: Will it be used with timetable to be 'published' in any kind (which would bring us to commercial trains) or with trains of an Infrastructure Company (which may bring us to operational trains) and/or can it change during a run of a train (which would bring us to train parts but I think this is improbable).
- How does it work with these typical trains having the same train number (DB: "Ergänzungsfahrpläne")? Or: Is it sure that each train has a different "UIC train transport id" or may it be that there are two trains with the same "UIC train transport id"?

Since you are the only one who needs it so far and who knows the origins, I think you are the only one who knows this.

> We have indeed customers that use this id.

Yes, but that does not necessarily bring it into RailML. There are many information used by customers but not in RailML. To get it into RailML, there should be a demand on `_exchanging_` these information, which normally means that at least two programmes need it.

"UIC train transport id" sounds as general as if we could implement it ahead in advance. But we have to make a good decision where and how because if we make a mistake there, it is not easily to correct in future.

Best regards,  
Dirk.

---

---

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 seams 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.

---

---

Subject: Re: UIC train transport id  
Posted by [Joachim Rubröder railML](#) on Thu, 26 Apr 2012 18:47:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I discussed this question with Andreas at the meeting on 24.04.2012 and he agreed that such a field would be fine but it's a bit too early to decide how to define the field in the proper way. I therefore created an issue #147 for version 2.x

Dirk BrÄuer wrote:

- >
- > 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
  
- > 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 blauÄugig 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) MÃ¼nchen - ZÃ¼rich 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.  
>  
>

--  
----- posted via PHP Headliner -----

---

Subject: Need of UIC Train Transport ID in railML 2.5 / 3.2? (Re: UIC train transport id)

Posted by [Vasco Paul Kolmorgen](#) on Mon, 24 Jun 2019 14:04:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

in the today's Coordinators Meeting in Zurich we browsed through ancient tickets and found #147 with the "UIC Train Transport ID" which was asked and discussed in 2012 (see <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/147>).

Is there a need of this "UIC Train Transport ID" in railML 2.5 / 3.2?

Please answer until End of June 2019 with a detailed description of the request and citeable sources (the old link to UIC.org is dead and no other sources could be found on a quick web research).

If there is no request from the community we will close the ticket. For sure it can be reopened if there is a request from the railway sector.

Best regards,

--

Vasco Paul Kolmorgen - Governance Coordinator  
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)  
Phone railML.org: +49 351 47582911  
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany [www.railML.org](http://www.railML.org)

Am 15.03.2012 um 13:22 schrieb Andreas Tanner:

> Hello friends of RailML,  
>  
> what about a dedicated attribute for the UIC "train transport id"? We  
> have indeed customers that use this id. The appropriate location would  
> be at the train element.  
>  
> Regards  
>  
> Andreas Tanner.

---

Subject: Re: Need of UIC Train Transport ID in railML 2.5 / 3.2? (Re: UIC train transport id)

Posted by [\[Name\]](#) on Tue, 25 Jun 2019 06:12:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

it seems to me that this proposed "UIC train transport id" corresponds exactly to the tafTapTsiTrainID ( [https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:tafTapTsiTrainID\\_train](https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:tafTapTsiTrainID_train)) that we introduced in railML with version 2.3.

Best regards,  
Christian Rößiger

Am 24.06.2019 um 16:04 schrieb Vasco Paul Kolmorgen:

- > Dear all,
- >
- > in the today's Coordinators Meeting in Zurich we browsed through ancient
- > tickets and found #147 with the "UIC Train Transport ID" which was asked
- > and discussed in 2012 (see <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/147>).
- >
- > Is there a need of this "UIC Train Transport ID" in railML 2.5 / 3.2?
- >
- > Please answer until End of June 2019 with a detailed description of the
- > request and citeable sources (the old link to UIC.org is dead and no
- > other sources could be found on a quick web research).
- >
- > If there is no request from the community we will close the ticket. For
- > sure it can be reopened if there is a request from the railway sector.
- >
- > Best regards,

--

iRFP e. K. · Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung  
Hochschulstr. 45, 01069 Dresden  
Tel. +49 351 4706819 · Fax. +49 351 4768190 · [www.irfp.de](http://www.irfp.de)  
Registergericht: Amtsgericht Dresden, HRA 9347

---