

---

Subject: [railML 3.1] level crossing parameters  
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Thu, 08 Mar 2018 16:20:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear all,

I would like to ask for your feedback on the following level crossing parameters proposed for railML 3.1 implementation:

@protectionType

.... describes the technical protection of the level crossing  
(doubleHalfBarrier, fullBarrier, halfBarrier, lights, none)

@activation

.... describes how the level crossing is being activated (automatic (by train), local (by staff), remote (by staff))

@obstacleDetection [bool]

.... states whether the level crossing is equipped with technical system for object detection (radar, camera)

@opensOnDemand [bool]

.... states whether the level crossing is by default closed for road transport and the barriers are opened only on demand

Any comments on this implementation proposal are highly appreciated.

Best regards  
Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator  
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)  
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911  
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany [www.railml.org](http://www.railml.org)

---

Subject: Re: [railML 3.1] level crossing parameters  
Posted by [Tobias Bregulla](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2018 08:51:39 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Christian, dear railML community,

Some thoughts from the point of view of video-based infrastructure data measurement on level crossings. First of all: Our modelling concepts are far from being comprehensive and sufficient for an expert in the field of level crossings and mainly reflect the situation in Germany and Austria. We would therefore be very pleased to receive information from other

countries and to have a specialist discussion.

Please note the suggestions and questions under your individual points:

Am 08.03.2018 um 17:20 schrieb Christian Rahmig:> @protectionType

> ... describes the technical protection of the level crossing

> (doubleHalfBarrier, fullBarrier, halfBarrier, lights, none)

- \* singleFullBarrier [de: Vollschranke; DB Netz: LzV or mVS]

- \* doubleHalfBarrier [de: doppelte Halbschranke; DB Netz: LzHH]

- \* singleHalfBarrier [de: einfache Halbschranke]

- \* lightsOnly [de: Lichtzeichen; Lz]

- \* noBarrier (Saltire/Crossbuck only) [de: nichttechnisch gesichert/ntg, nur Andreaskreuz]

- \* none (rarely, only in industrial plants or locomotive workshops) [de: ohne Andreaskreuz (selten, nur in Industriegebieten oder Bahnwerken)]

Question 1: However, a distinction between level crossings “With barriers AND lights [de-DB Netz: LzV = Lichtzeichen+Vollschranke]” and “With barriers but WITHOUT lights [de-DB Netz: mVS = mechanische Vollschranke]” does not seem possible; perhaps a different detailing would be more useful?

Question 2: What about "gates" as level crossing protection? Such gates (which sometimes blocking the railways tracks too, when not used) are common in Scotland and Ireland IMHO (see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xh8XI6t7Oqg> for an example). Shall they included into the barriers in the Middle Europeas sense or should a distinction be modelled?

> @activation

> ... describes how the level crossing is being activated (automatic (by > train), local (by staff), remote (by staff))

- \* infrastructureRoute (IM will care for closing, but level crossing will activated by setting the train route under normal conditions) [de: Hp-abhängig]

- \* infrastructureManual (IM will care for closing, by station master or signal box/CTC operator or level-crossing attendant)

- \* trainAutomatic (RU will 'care' for closing [de: zugbediente Einschaltung FÜ/Lo])

- \* none (default value for @protectionType:nonTechnicallySecured and @protectionType:none; rarely for the others, when level crossing is available but closed forever)

> @obstacleDetection [bool]

> ... states whether the level crossing is equipped with technical system

> for object detection (radar, camera)

This causes the question of a missing (optional) attribute, therefore I suggest to avoid such a optional boolean value.

In addition, a distinction should be made or a clear description given between monitoring the functionality of the level crossing and obstacle-free detection of the intersection area.

- > @opensOnDemand [bool]
- > ... states whether the level crossing is by default closed for road
- > transport and the barriers are opened only on demand

This causes the question of a missing (optional) attribute too. For us the use case of this attribute is not very clear in the railML 3 domain.

Best regards,

Tobias Bregulla and the whole Bahnkonzept team

---

---

Subject: Re: [railML3] level crossing parameters  
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 16 Mar 2020 10:54:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear all,

the railML 3 model use case working group "ETCS Track Net" discussed requirements for modelling level crossings considering their specific use case. In the consequence, the following model adaptations are being suggested (cp. [1]):

- (1) Extend <levelCrossingIS>
  - @etcsID to put the ETCS variable value NID\_TSR or NID\_LX
  - @distanceToStop to put the distance in meters between the stopping point in front of the level crossing to the level crossing itself
  - @linkedSpeedSection to reference the <speedSection> that defines the speed for passing the level crossing when being in unprotected mode.
- (2) Adapt <levelCrossingIL>
  - @unprotectedSpeed is marked deprecated (replaced by <levelCrossingIS>@linkedSpeedSection)

I would like to collect the feedback from the railML community beyond the ETCS working group and ask if there are any objections from other perspectives. As usual, any comments are highly appreciated...

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/377>

Thank you very much and best regards

