
Subject: Representation of operational stations

Posted by [Tobias Bregulla](#) on Mon, 26 Mar 2018 11:50:12 GMT

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

=== Deutsche Version siehe unten ===

Currently railML 2.4 knows the following four enumeration values of the attribute <ocp><propOperational>@operationalType for stations:

- * passenger
- * freight
- * shunting
- * other

For Bahnkonzept programme export the question arises, how operational stations should be modeled in railML 2.x. This means stations at which passengers cannot get in and out, goods aren't loaded or unloaded nor wagons are shunted (usually). Typical examples are the overtaking stations on the high-speed lines, where mainly slower trains are overtaken by faster trains, e.g. Saubachtal station on the high-speed line VDE 8.1 of the DB Netz (Kilometre 236.5 of line 5919

Nuremberg-Erfurt-Leipzig, see

<https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/75/%C3%9Cberholbahnhof-Saubachtal-Okt2015.jpg>
for an overview picture).

We propose the addition of a fifth attribute "operational" in railML 2.4 (and 3.x for sure) for such stations. Otherwise the leaving of any value could be an option, but this could intersect with an "unknown" value. (Maybe another word could reflect the common British term better?)

In addition, we suggest an addition to the descriptions of the elements and, if necessary, a list of the meaningful combinations on the corresponding wiki page. We will be happy to contribute constructively, if desired.

Kind regards,

Tobias Bregulla and the whole Bahnkonzept team

=====
Abbildung von Betriebsbahnhöfen

Gegenwärtig kennt railML 2.4 die folgenden vier Aufzählungs-Werte des Attributs <ocp><propOperational>@operationalType für Bahnhöfe:

- passenger (Fahrgäste/Passagiere)
- freight (Güter/Fracht)
- shunting (Rangieren/Verschieben)
- other (anderes)

Für uns stellt sich die Frage, wie Betriebsbahnhöfe (in der Schweiz:

Dienstbahnhöfe), in railML 2.x modelliert werden sollen. Das betrifft Bahnhöfe, an denen weder Fahrgäste ein- und aussteigen können, keine Güter ein- oder ausgeladen werden oder (in der Regel) keine Wagen rangiert werden. Typische Beispiele sind die Überholbahnhöfe an den Schnellfahrstrecken, an denen vor allem Überholungen von langsameren durch schnellere Züge stattfinden, wie z.B. der Bahnhof Saubachtal an der Schnellfahrstrecke VDE 8.1 der DB Netz (Kilometer 236,5 der Strecke 5919 Nürnberg-Erfurt-Leipzig; siehe <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/75/%C3%9Cberholbahnhof-Saubachtal-Okt2015.jpg>)

Wir schlagen die Ergänzung eines fünften Attributes "operational" in railML 2.4 sowie 3.x für derartige Stationen vor.

Zudem schlagen wir einer Ergänzung der Beschreibungen der Elemente und ggf. eine Aufzählung der sinnvollen Kombinationen auf der entsprechenden Wiki-Seite vor. Gern tragen wir dabei konstruktiv bei, sofern gewünscht.

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2018 08:42:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Tobias,

Am 26.03.2018 um 13:50 schrieb Tobias Bregulla:

- > Currently railML 2.4 knows the following four enumeration values of the
- > attribute <ocp><propOperational>@operationalType for stations:
- > * passenger
- > * freight
- > * shunting
- > * other

I assume you are referring to the attribute @trafficType? The attribute @operationalType is used to define the operational functionality of an OCP containing the values

- * station
- * stoppingPoint
- * depot
- * crossover
- * junction
- * blockPost
- * blockSignal
- * other

Further values and adaptations are currently under discussion, see [1].

- > For Bahnkonzept programme export the question arises, how operational
- > stations should be modeled in railML 2.x. This means stations at which

- > passengers cannot get in and out, goods aren't loaded or unloaded nor
- > wagons are shunted (usually). Typical examples are the overtaking
- > stations on the high-speed lines, where mainly slower trains are
- > overtaken by faster trains, e.g. Saubachtal station on the high-speed
- > line VDE 8.1 of the DB Netz (Kilometre 236.5 of line 5919
- > Nuremberg-Erfurt-Leipzig, see
- > <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/75/%C3%9Cberholbahnhof-Saubachtal-Okt2015.jpg>
- > for an overview picture).
- >
- > We propose the addition of a fifth attribute "operational" in railML 2.4
- > (and 3.x for sure) for such stations. Otherwise the leaving of any value
- > could be an option, but this could intersect with an "unknown" value.
- > (Maybe another word could reflect the common British term better?)

The proposal sounds reasonable to me. What do other users/developers think about it? Does anybody have a better English term for "operational"?

- > In addition, we suggest an addition to the descriptions of the elements
- > and, if necessary, a list of the meaningful combinations on the
- > corresponding wiki page. We will be happy to contribute constructively,
- > if desired.

Thank you for your offer! Every contribution with the aim to enrich best practices and examples in our railML wiki is highly appreciated.

[1] https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=483&goto=1583&#msg_1583

--

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

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2018 08:47:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Tobias,

Am 26.03.2018 um 13:50 schrieb Tobias Bregulla:

- > [...] Typical examples are the overtaking
- > stations on the high-speed lines, where mainly slower trains are
- > overtaken by faster trains, e.g. Saubachtal station on the high-speed
- > line VDE 8.1 of the DB Netz (Kilometre 236.5 of line 5919
- > Nuremberg-Erfurt-Leipzig, see
- > <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/75/%C3%9Cberholbahnhof-Saubachtal-Okt2015.jpg>

rholbahnhof-Saubachtal-Okt2015.jpg

> for an overview picture).

Btw, isn't this an OCP of type "siding" as proposed in [1]?

[1] https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=483&goto=1741&#msg_1741

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

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 27 Mar 2018 09:35:36 GMT

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

Dear all,

I filed a Trac ticket for this issue, see [1].

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/328>

Best regards

Christian

Am 27.03.2018 um 10:42 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

> Dear Tobias,

>

> Am 26.03.2018 um 13:50 schrieb Tobias Bregulla:

>> Currently railML 2.4 knows the following four enumeration values of the

>> attribute <ocp><propOperational>@operationalType for stations:

>> * passenger

>> * freight

>> * shunting

>> * other

>

> I assume you are referring to the attribute @trafficType? The attribute

> @operationalType is used to define the operational functionality of an

> OCP containing the values

> * station

> * stoppingPoint

> * depot

> * crossover

> * junction
> * blockPost
> * blockSignal
> * other
> Further values and adaptations are currently under discussion, see [1].
>
>> For Bahnkonzept programme export the question arises, how operational
>> stations should be modeled in railML 2.x. This means stations at which
>> passengers cannot get in and out, goods aren't loaded or unloaded nor
>> wagons are shunted (usually). Typical examples are the overtaking
>> stations on the high-speed lines, where mainly slower trains are
>> overtaken by faster trains, e.g. Saubachtal station on the high-speed
>> line VDE 8.1 of the DB Netz (Kilometre 236.5 of line 5919
>> Nuremberg-Erfurt-Leipzig, see
>> <https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/75/%C3%9Cberholbahnhof-Saubachtal-Okt2015.jpg>
>>
>> for an overview picture).
>>
>> We propose the addition of a fifth attribute "operational" in railML 2.4
>> (and 3.x for sure) for such stations. Otherwise the leaving of any value
>> could be an option, but this could intersect with an "unknown" value.
>> (Maybe another word could reflect the common British term better?)
>
> The proposal sounds reasonable to me. What do other users/developers
> think about it? Does anybody have a better English term for "operational"?
>
>> In addition, we suggest an addition to the descriptions of the elements
>> and, if necessary, a list of the meaningful combinations on the
>> corresponding wiki page. We will be happy to contribute constructively,
>> if desired.
>
> Thank you for your offer! Every contribution with the aim to enrich best
> practices and examples in our railML wiki is highly appreciated.
>
> [1] https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=483&goto=1583&#msg_1583
>

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations

Posted by _____ on Wed, 28 Mar 2018 08:50:45 GMT

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

Dear Tobias,

in my understanding of the current railML schemes, a purely-operational station as you describe them is a station without any traffic service (dt: Bahnhof, der keine Zugangsstelle ist, keine verkehrlichen Eigenschaften hat).

So, to model such stations, we use an <ocp> without the sub-element <propService>.

To make it explicitly, if you fear a misunderstanding with an unknown <propService>, you can either use an empty <propService> element or set all its services to false:

```
<ocp id='ocp_DKT_B' name='Dresden-Klotzsche Bbf.' type='operationalName'>
  <propOperational operationalType='station' orderChangeable='true'
ensuresTrainSequence='true' />
  <propService />
  <designator register='RL100' entry='DKT B' />
</ocp>
```

or

```
<ocp id='ocp_DKT_B' name='Dresden-Klotzsche Bbf.' type='operationalName'>
  <propOperational operationalType='station' orderChangeable='true'
ensuresTrainSequence='true' />
  <propService passenger='false' goodsLoading='false' />
  <designator register='RL100' entry='DKT B' />
</ocp>
```

Please be aware that it is always good provide your interface with an own specification of which elements/attributes you used and how, complementing the railML scheme - a kind of use case documentation. Here, you can specify what a missing or an empty <propService> means.

> We propose the addition of a fifth attribute "operational" in railML 2.4...

I think that this would not be in the original sense. Even a station with "services" (dt: verkehrlichen Eigenschaften) would be operational as well. Please be also aware the possible misunderstanding with the sub-element <propOperational>.

> Btw, isn't this an OCP of type "siding" as proposed in [1]?

As far as I know, "siding" has been intended for sidings (dt: Nebengleise; hier: Anschlussstelle = Nebengleis abzweigend auf freier Strecke).

A pure station for overtakings or crossings (dt: reiner Überholungs- oder Kreuzungsbahnhof) would be a "loop". But in the operational meaning, it is still a station (dt: i. S. v. Zugmeldestelle). Since the name of the attribute is `_operational_Type`, the value should be 'station'.

(Dt: Im betrieblichen Sinne sind auch reine Überholungsbahnhöfe Zugmeldestellen. Da der Name des Attributs "`_betrieblicher_Typ`" ist, sollte hier für alle Zugmeldestellen einheitlich 'station' verwendet werden. Die Unterscheidung der verkehrlichen Eigenschaften (Reiseverkehr, Güterverkehr oder keiner davon) sollte nicht im Element <propOperational> = "betriebliche Eigenschaften", sondern im Element <propService> = "verkehrliche Eigenschaften" erfolgen.)

With best regards,

Dirk.

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 03 Apr 2018 08:48:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Dirk,

Am 28.03.2018 um 10:50 schrieb Dirk Bräuer:

```
> So, to model such stations, we use an <ocp> without the sub-element <propService>.
>
> To make it explicitly, if you fear a misunderstanding with an unknown <propService>, you can
either use an empty <propService> element or set all its services to false:
>
>   <ocp id='ocp_DKT_B' name='Dresden-Klotzsche Bbf.' type='operationalName'>
>     <propOperational operationalType='station' orderChangeable='true'
ensuresTrainSequence='true' />
>     <propService />
>     <designator register='RL100' entry='DKT B' />
>   </ocp>
>
> or
>
>   <ocp id='ocp_DKT_B' name='Dresden-Klotzsche Bbf.' type='operationalName'>
>     <propOperational operationalType='station' orderChangeable='true'
ensuresTrainSequence='true' />
>     <propService passenger='false' goodsLoading='false' />
>     <designator register='RL100' entry='DKT B' />
>   </ocp>
```

I prefer the second solution explicitly stating the boolean service parameters with value "false". Missing service parameters can be interpreted as being "unknown". As suggested by you we then need to add this set of "interpretation rules" in the railML Wiki [1].

The central question to be solved: do we need to have a complementary information with the attribute <ocp><propOperational>@trafficType in addition to the attributes in <ocp><propService>? Any comments on this question are highly appreciated.

>> We propose the addition of a fifth attribute "operational" in railML 2.4...

```
>
> I think that this would not be in the original sense. Even a station with "services" (dt:
verkehrlichen Eigenschaften) would be operational as well. Please be also aware the possible
misunderstanding with the sub-element <propOperational>.
```

This conflict could be solved by changing the current attribute

<ocp><propOperational>@trafficType into an element
<ocp><propOperational><traffic> that can be repeated. The modified
example may look like this:

```
<ocp id='ocp_DKT_B' name='Dresden-Klotzsche Bbf.' type='operationalName'>  
  <propOperational operationalType='station' orderChangeable='true'  
ensuresTrainSequence='true'>  
  <traffic type="operational"/>  
  </propOperational>  
  <propService passenger='false' goodsLoading='false'/>  
  <designator register='RL100' entry='DKT B'/>  
</ocp>
```

[1] <https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=IS:propService>

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

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2018 10:34:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

let me summarize the current proposal for changing the OCP traffic type
as formulated in Trac ticket #328 [1]:

* adding new value "operational"

Further, I want to direct your focus on the new wiki page [2] about
different types of OCPs. Although the examples describe the situation in
Germany, they provide a very good insight in specific modelling of
different types of OCPs. Thank you very much, Dirk and Mr. Leberl, for
this contribution!

My question to Tobias (and all others that have a need for it):
Looking at the explanations in [2], do you still agree with current
proposal of Trac ticket #328 to be implemented with railML 2.4 or would
you like to change it? In particular: Does the "Betriebsbahnhof" (en:
loop and/or overtaking track with no passenger nor freight access) fit
to what you originally intended to model and are you satisfied with the

solution described in the wiki?

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/328>

[2] https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=Dev:Types_of_ocps

As usual I am looking forward to receiving your comments...

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

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations
Posted by [Tobias Bregulla](#) on Thu, 30 Aug 2018 15:14:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all!

Am 22.06.2018 um 12:34 schrieb Christian Rahmig:
> let me summarize the current proposal for changing the OCP traffic type
> as formulated in Trac ticket #328 [1]:
> * adding new value "operational"

We would ask to enrich the OCP traffic type by adding new value
"operational" as formulated in Trac #328 for railML 2.4.

> My question to Tobias (and all others that have a need for it):
> Looking at the explanations in [2], do you still agree with current
> proposal of Trac ticket #328 to be implemented with railML 2.4 or woul
> you like to change it? In particular: Does the "Betriebsbahnhof" (en:
> loop and/or overtaking track with no passenger nor freight access) fit
> to what you originally intended to model and are you satisfied with he
> solution described in the wiki?

Reason: For the export of the operational meaning of an OCP we use the
element <propOperational>, since in our view the element <propService>
only specifies the peripheral and additional offers or services of a
station. For this reason, this element is often not evaluated in reading
subsequent systems, but an explicit specification of the status is required.

For railML 3.x we would suggest to find a unified modelling with lesser
or no overlaps between <propOperational> and <propService> to avoid
these possible misunderstandings.

Best regards,

Tobias and the Bahnkonzept team

Am 27.03.2018 um 10:42 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

- > I assume you are referring to the attribute @trafficType? The attribute
- > @operationalType is used to define the operational functionality of an
- > OCP containing the values

Yes, that hint and the assumption were completely correct. I apologize for the mix-up.

Subject: Re: Representation of operational stations
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 02 Oct 2018 12:14:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

Am 22.06.2018 um 12:34 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

- > [...]
- > let me summarize the current proposal for changing the OCP traffic type
- > as formulated in Trac ticket #328 [1]:
- >
- > * adding new value "operational"
- >
- > [...]
- > [1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/328>

based on your feedback the modifications described in Trac ticket #328 [1] have been implemented for railML 2.4.

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