
Subject: [railML3] Suggestion for sub-use cases of use case "ETCS Track Net"
Posted by [Karl-Friedemann Jerosch](#) on Tue, 19 Jul 2022 06:16:34 GMT

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

During the certification process, it became apparent that the use case "ETCS Track Net" is too general.

The different ways how infrastructure managers work can result in the following approach to introduce sub-use cases.

That's why we propose the railML sub-use cases within the "ETCS Track Net" use case:

Data transfer from Infrastructure Manager (IM) to signaling supplier for decentralized ETCS solution (without balise group locations): ETCS Level 1

Data transfer from Infrastructure Manager (IM) to signaling supplier for decentralized ETCS solution (with balise group locations): ETCS Level 1

Data transfer from Infrastructure Manager (IM) to the signaling supplier for central ETCS solution (without balise group locations): ETCS Level 1 or Level 2 or Level 1+2

Data transfer from Infrastructure Manager (IM) to the signaling supplier for central ETCS solution (with balise group locations): ETCS Level 1 or Level 2 or Level 1+2

Data transfer from Signaling Supplier to Infrastructure Manager only with infrastructure data (control data set)

Data transfer from Signaling Supplier to Infrastructure Manager with infrastructure data including the railML subschema "interlocking" with ETCS data (based on sub-use case 2)

Data transfer from Signaling Supplier to Infrastructure Manager with infrastructure data including the railML subschema "interlocking" with ETCS data (based on sub-use case 4)

Note:

The schema version railML 3.2 currently contains the generally required information for an ETCS trackside project.

In individual cases, required but not yet available information in railML 3.3 must be supplemented or transferred in a traditional way outside railML (applies in particular to sub-use cases 1 and 2).

We are looking forward to your opinions.

Thank you and best regards from Karl & Martin.

Subject: Re: [railML3] Suggestion for sub-use cases of use case "ETCS Track Net"
Posted by [Jürgen Strandberg](#) on Mon, 01 Aug 2022 13:51:35 GMT

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

Hi,

I too recognize that there is a need to define what contents to be expected of a railml file at the different stages of data preparation:

- Basic Signaling
- ETCS specific design
- Solution specific configuration

Let's build on this idea and see how we can agree on the details.

Subject: Re: [railML3] Suggestion for sub-use cases of use case "ETCS Track Net"
Posted by [Martin Zien](#) on Wed, 26 Oct 2022 07:23:16 GMT

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

Dear all,

in the ETCS-Workgroup meeting on 2022-09-30, four major results were elaborated:

1. The establishment of the individual Sub-Use Cases makes sense and will be continued, since it reflects the conditions of the reality in ETCS-Projects better than a "monolithic" one-for-all-approach. For Certification, each sub-use case can be considered individually.

2. It is not considered as practical to introduce separate use cases for "...from infrastructure manager to supplier with / without Balises"

3. the current XSD does not cover the full need of ETCS-Level 1-Applications. Therefore the related Sub-Use Cases should be postponed to railML V3.3. Since the currently known potential applications are subject to ETCS Level 2, the impact to real live projects is assumed as limited.

4. Considering the above mentioned, there will be three sub use cases implemented in railML 3.2:

A) data transfer from Infrastructure Manager to Signalling Supplier (input for the start of an ETCS Level 2 trackside project based on a centralized technical solution; Details Level 1 to follow with railML V3.3)

B) data transfer from Signalling Supplier to Infrastructure Manager (output as delivery data of an ETCS Level 2 trackside project based on a centralized technical solution; Details for Level 1 to follow with railML V3.3)

C) data transfer of topology data between Infrastructure Manager and Signalling Supplier(s) (input or control data set as basis for all project members, independent of ETCS Level)

@ALL: Please feel free to comment on this conclusion, especially if you see there any obstacles in this approach or in case you have any questions.

Subject: Re: [railML3] Suggestion for sub-use cases of use case "ETCS Track Net"
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 11 Nov 2022 08:21:28 GMT

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

Dear all,

I would like to remind you on Martin's request to comment on the suggested ETCS use case tailoring. So, if you have any questions or remarks or alternative suggestions on splitting the ETCS use case into sub-use cases, please share them with the railML community here in the forum.

Thank you very much and best regards
Christian

Subject: Re: [railML3] Suggestion for sub-use cases of use case "ETCS Track Net"
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 09 Jan 2023 17:50:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

as there has been no further requests on the ETCS use case tailoring approach, I herewith confirm the approach with ETCS-a, ETCS-b and ETCS-c as described in Martin's posting. The adaptation of related wiki pages about ETCS use case will be done by mid January.

Best regards
Christian

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org e.V. (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany

Am 11.11.2022 um 09:21 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

> Dear all,
>
> I would like to remind you on Martin's request to comment on
> the suggested ETCS use case tailoring. So, if you have any
> questions or remarks or alternative suggestions on splitting
> the ETCS use case into sub-use cases, please share them with
> the railML community here in the forum.
>
> Thank you very much and best regards
> Christian
