
Subject: [railML3] Places/Service in rollingstock
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Wed, 14 Oct 2020 09:50:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

for modelling the places and service provided by rollingstock we had a split way in railML2, i.e. using enumeration for specific items and (alternatively) the code number from TAP/TSI B.4.9039 respectively B.4.7161.

Comparing both variants it is obvious that none of them cover all. Thus the question is to do the modelling for railML3 in the same split way or to enhance the enumerations to cover at least all sensible items from the TAP/TSI code lists.

--

Best regards,
Joerg v. Lingen - Rollingstock Coordinator

Subject: Re: [railML3] Places/Service in rollingstock
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Tue, 27 Oct 2020 10:27:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just as additional info here the current modeling draft.

--

Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Rollingstock Coordinator

Joerg von Lingen wrote on 14.10.2020 11:50:

> Dear all,
>
> for modelling the places and service provided by rollingstock we had a split way
> in railML2, i.e. using enumeration for specific items and (alternatively) the
> code number from TAP/TSI B.4.9039 respectively B.4.7161.
>
> Comparing both variants it is obvious that none of them cover all. Thus the
> question is to do the modelling for railML3 in the same split way or to enhance
> the enumerations to cover at least all sensible items from the TAP/TSI code lists.
>

File Attachments

1) [EA6.png](#), downloaded 335 times

Subject: Re: [railML3] Places/Service in rollingstock
Posted by [Milan Wölke](#) on Mon, 11 Jan 2021 13:13:53 GMT

Hi,

just to keep you posted, the general response to this modelling approach by the timetable developer group was positive. We will go forward with this approach. However the group found, that the enumerations are too detailed. I open another thread to discuss the necessary level of detail for this.

Best regards, Milan

Subject: Re: [railML3] Places/Service in rollingstock
Posted by [Milan Wölke](#) on Mon, 11 Jan 2021 13:37:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The discussion regarding the level of detail for the enums is located here.

Thanks in advance for your contribution.

Best regards, Milan

Subject: Re: [railML3] Places/Service in rollingstock
Posted by [David Lichti](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2021 06:11:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have three suggestions regarding the structure of the information:

1. The list of available services (tServiceCategoryListExt) should (also) be available under the places element. While some of the services may be available to all passengers in the vehicle, others may be bound to specific seats or compartments. For example WiFi may be available to all, but USB sockets only on the First Class seats of a divided coach.

1.1. I would then suggest to remove the sleeperWith... categories and rather add a shower (and a lavatory) value to the services enumeration.

2. We should separate accessibility information from the place category. Many of the proposed categories may or may not be accessible and suitable for wheelchair users. One could easily imagine special bistro seats or sleeper compartments for wheelchair users. On the other hand, folding seats or bicycle spaces do not necessarily imply accessibility and suitability for wheelchair users. Instead of duplicating many of these categories to render accessibility (category + categoryWheelchair), it would be better to have a separate attribute or element.

Best regards

David

Subject: Re: [railML3] Places/Service in rollingstock
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Sun, 02 May 2021 07:02:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear David,

thanks for your suggestions.

1. service under places element

Yes, there are services, which are only available for specific places. Thus adding an optional attribute `@placeRelatedService` (`tServiceCategoryListExt`).

1.1. separate shower (and a lavatory)

The info would be only needed together with a sleeper place. Thus having it as a separate attribute would make no sense to me.

2. separate accessibility information

Typically not all areas of a passenger wagon are accessible by wheel chairs.

With the flag at places element this can be marked for each type of place.

Having this separated from the places would be a lost of detail.

In addition to normal seats one might thing about sleeper compartments for wheelchair use or bistro areas.

Best regards,

Joerg v. Lingen - Rollingstock Coordinator
