

A multi-state train-following model for the analysis of virtual coupling railway operations

Quaglietta, Egidio; Wang, Meng; Goverde, Rob M.P.

DOI 10.1016/j.jrtpm.2020.100195

Publication date 2020 **Document Version** Final published version

Published in Journal of Rail Transport Planning and Management

Citation (APA) Quaglietta, E., Wang, M., & Goverde, R. M. P. (2020). A multi-state train-following model for the analysis of virtual coupling railway operations. *Journal of Rail Transport Planning and Management*, *15*, Article 100195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrtpm.2020.100195

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Journal of Rail Transport Planning & Management

journal homepage: http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jrtpm

Sama di Transport Paning 5 Management Kili Presente

A multi-state train-following model for the analysis of virtual coupling railway operations



Egidio Quaglietta^{*}, Meng Wang, Rob M.P. Goverde

Department of Transport and Planning, University of Technology, Stevinweg 1, 2628 CN, Delft, the Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Virtual coupling Train-following model Train separation Railway capacity

ABSTRACT

The increasing need for capacity has led the railway industry to explore next generation signalling concepts such as Virtual Coupling which takes moving-block operations further by separating trains by a relative braking distance, like cars on the road. By means of a Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V) communication architecture trains can move in a virtually coupled platoon which can be treated as a single convoy at junctions to improve capacity. This concept however introduces the need for additional safety constraints, especially at diverging junctions, which could make actual capacity improvements insufficient to justify investments. Hence, there is a need to understand capacity performances of Virtual Coupling and potential gains over state-of-practice signalling systems. This paper addresses this need by developing an innovative train-following model that captures operational states and corresponding transitions of trains running under Virtual Coupling. A comparative capacity analysis has been conducted for a portion of the South West Main Line in the UK. Promising results have been obtained, showing that the biggest capacity gains returned by Virtual Coupling relate to operational scenarios normally found in practice with trains having service stops and using different routes.

1. Introduction

The ever-increasing railway transport demand of passengers and goods has been challenging infrastructure managers to continuously expand capacity of existing networks, which already operate in near-to-saturation conditions. Infrastructure enhancements are costly and not always possible, especially because of lack of space in densely built areas. The railway industry is therefore looking into the adoption of advanced signalling systems which could reduce train separation while increasing reliability and safety of railway operations. Radio-based fixed-block signalling systems like ETCS Level 2 (Theeg and Vlasenko, 2009) have already seen several implementations throughout Europe and showed significant capacity gains due to dynamic supervision of the braking curve. Technological developments are however heading towards moving-block signalling which overcomes traditional fixed-block train separation by replacing vital track-side track vacancy detection with on-board devices for Train Integrity Monitoring (TIM). The European standard ETCS Level 3 (Theeg and Vlasenko, 2009) can implement moving block operations allowing trains to be separated by an absolute-braking distance (i.e. the distance needed to reach a standstill from current speed). Capacity benefits provided by such a system are however limited for high-speed lines, where absolute-braking distances can reach up to 4–5 km when operating at speeds around 300 km/h.

The concept of Virtual Coupling is gaining in popularity since it builds on the principle that trains are separated by a relative-

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* e.quaglietta@tudelft.nl (E. Quaglietta).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrtpm.2020.100195

Received 29 July 2019; Received in revised form 25 November 2019; Accepted 27 March 2020

Available online 9 April 2020

^{2210-9706/© 2020} The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

braking distance, i.e. the distance needed to slow down to the speed of the train ahead. Such a concept entails platoons (here referred as convoys) of trains linked via a V2V communication to slow down synchronously with the train ahead to keep a safety margin in between. Given the relative short distances in between trains, the concept of Virtual Coupling implies trains to be automatically driven by an Automatic Train Operation (ATO) to substantially reduce sight and reaction times of human drivers which would be unsafely long for this kind of operations. Similar setups have been proved already in the road sector for automated cars under cooperative adaptive cruise control (Herman et al., 2017). However, non-negligible safety issues arise when applying this concept in railways which might limit actual capacity improvements. While Virtual Coupling is more effective than moving-block on plain tracks, the same cannot be said for instance at diverging junctions, where trains in a convoy need to be outdistanced to safely move and lock switches in between.

So far, little research has been done on Virtual Coupling. The railway industry is asking to identify whether actual capacity gains returned by this concept will be enough to justify potential investments. The objective of this paper is to provide a wider understanding of operational issues and capacity performances of Virtual Coupling as well as possible gains over state-of-the-practice signalling systems. To this end, a multi-state train-following model is developed which overcomes limitations of state-of-the-art car-following models by considering non-linear vehicle movement dynamics, realistic power characteristics of the traction unit, safety constraints at junctions as well as line resistances due to track gradient and curvature. Different Virtual Coupling operational states and transitions are defined and mathematically modelled. Also, the concept of Virtual Coupling Movement Authority is introduced and an innovative formalisation of V2V messages exchanged among trains is given. A comparative capacity analysis is performed for a portion of the South West Main Line in the UK for different operational scenarios considering stopping and non-stopping train services having the same or a different route. Capacity impacts of Virtual Coupling are benchmarked against traditional (Train Protection Warning System, TPWS) and radio-based (ETCS Level 2) fixed-block as well as moving-block (ETCS Level 3) signalling systems. Outcomes from the model return meaningful insights to support the railway industry during early investment decisions as well as for the development of operational and technological system specifications.

2. Literature review on technology and models for moving-block railway signalling

2.1. Review of moving block train operation concepts

Virtual Coupling signalling advances the concept of moving-block railway operations introduced by ETCS Level 3, allowing trains to be separated by a relative braking distance rather than by an absolute braking distance. In literature (Xu et al., 2012; Ning et al., 2018) the concept of Virtual Coupling is also referred to with the term "moving block with soft wall" to distinguish it from the concept of moving block with hard wall which instead indicates the plain ETCS Level 3 moving block with absolute braking distance separation. Fig. 1 illustrates a schematic system architecture for ETCS Level 3 (a) and Virtual Coupling (b) signalling. In this paper we refer to the moving-block implementation of ETCS Level 3, where vital track-side train detection and line-side signals are totally replaced by on-board devices such as Train Integrity Monitoring (TIM) and the European Vital Computer (EVC). TIM continuously checks that no car is accidentally split from the trainset and dangerously stranded on the way. Trains have a radio-based Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) communication with the Radio-Block Centre (RBC) reporting train position updates every few seconds (usually every 1–5 s). In return the RBC provides each train with a Movement Authority (MA) providing the maximum distance that a train can safely cross



Fig. 1. Schematic system architecture for ETCS Level 3 and Virtual Coupling.

E. Quaglietta et al.

without colliding with another train or a danger point on the route.

The MA is given in the form of an encrypted message containing the last safe location until which the train can move, namely the End of Authority (EoA). The EoA is at a safety margin (*sm*) from the Supervised Location (SvL) which represents a potential danger on the train route such as the front or the tail of a nearby train, a speed or track access restriction and/or an unset switch. The EVC elaborates MA messages in order to compute and supervise in real-time a braking curve ensuring that the train does not overrun the EoA. Train location is continuously monitored by the EVC by means of an on-board odometer which is regularly re-calibrated any time the train crosses a track-side transponder (named balise) acting as a fixed geographical reference point.

This paper assumes that Virtual Coupling encompasses the same systems and functionalities of ETCS Level 3 plus an additional V2V communication layer by which trains exchange information about their kinematic parameters (i.e. speed and acceleration), as well as their routes. Additional on-board antennas are considered to enable such a communication. By combining the information broadcasted by both the RBC and the V2V communication layers, trains get an upgraded MA containing the maximum safe movement distance as well as speeds, accelerations and routes of neighbouring trains, to enable virtual coupling "on-the-fly". Such an upgraded Movement Authority will be here referred to as Virtual Coupling Movement Authority (MA_{VC}) to distinguish it from the standard MA defined for ETCS signalling. The end of MA_{VC} is here called Virtual Coupling End of Authority (EoA_{VC}). Differently from the standard ETCS EoA where the train is enforced to stop (V_B needs to be reduced to 0), the EoA_{VC} imposes that the train reaches the same speed of the train ahead (V_B needs to reach V_A) to allow virtual coupling. Clearly, the main purpose of the EoA_{VC} is to improve capacity utilisation by virtually coupling trains together, while the standard EoA has a safety-critical role by guarding trains from any danger point on the route. In Virtual Coupling the EVC shall supervise both the EoA_{VC} when two trains are trying to couple up, as well as the ETCS EoA in case a train is running under ETCS Level 3 and/or two coupled trains need to split when approaching a potential danger point. More details about the different operational modes identified for Virtual Coupling are provided in the next section.

2.2. State-of-the art on traffic modelling under absolute and relative braking distance separation

The main concept behind Virtual Coupling is that trains can synchronously move together in a V2V-linked train convoy which can be treated as a single train at junctions with the aim that capacity can be increased at critical infrastructure bottlenecks. The whole idea of Virtual Coupling mainly builds on the assertion that it is unrealistic that a train stops instantly, allowing for trains behind to safely arrest before a collision, even in case of derailment of the train ahead. The Institution of Railway Signal Engineers (IRSE, 2016) states that the principal hurdle to such a concept does not derive from technology but from a missing definition of clear principles for safe and effective Virtual Coupling train operations. Emery (2010) proposes operational principles for a hybrid version of ETCS L2 and Level 3 aiming to separate trains by an absolute emergency braking distance in order to overcome safety risks that a relative braking distance separation would raise at diverging junctions. Although such a proposition could return some capacity gains over ETCS Level 3, relying on an emergency braking can cause substantial discomfort to passengers while damaging the tracks and the rolling stock. Quaglietta (2019) provides instead an initial definition for safe Virtual Coupling operational principles and an infrastructure occupation model, showing that significant capacity gains can be achieved over ETCS Level 3 when separating trains by a relative braking distance. The model formulated in Quaglietta (2019) refers however to nominal conflict-free fixed-speed train diagrams which do not consider dynamic interaction among trains. Major safety-related risks are however likely to be observed when trains interact within perturbed traffic conditions. Variable-speed models adjusting train speeds as function of nearby trains' kinematics can provide more insight in the safety risks and the actual capacity benefits of Virtual Coupling. Ning (1998) proposes the adoption of Car-Following (CF) models to study train operations under relative-braking distance separation, without providing any scientific application to support such a proposition.

In road traffic flow theory several car-following models have been developed. These models are classified into different groups (Brackstone and McDonald, 1999): safety-distance/speed models, stimulus-response models, psycho-spacing models, and strategy-based models. The most widely used safety-distance/speed model is the Gipps' model (Gipps, 1981). It assumes constant braking rate and reaction time and drivers choose safe speed such that even in the worst-case scenario where the leading vehicle suddenly decelerates to a standstill, a collision can still be avoided. Stimulus-response models describe the reaction of drivers as a function of stimuli. The Helly model (Helly, 1959) belongs to this family, in which the acceleration of a vehicle maintains a linear relationship with the deviation from a desired headway and the deviation from the speed of the leader. Helly's model has been used recently to describe vehicle platoon behaviour (Xiao et al., 2018). The CF model from Wiedemann is a widely used psycho-spacing model (Leutzbach and Wiedemann, 1986). Car-following behaviour is described here on a relative speed - headway distance plane, and the model incorporates human perception thresholds and imperfect human control of the car. Strategy-based models include the Intelligent Driver Model (IDM) (Treiber et al., 2000) and optimal control models (Wang et al., 2016). IDM follows an intelligent braking strategy that ensures that braking is sufficient to bring risky situations back to safe conditions when approaching the leading vehicle at small headways, while optimal control models assume that drivers anticipate on the driving environment to make optimal acceleration in a predicted future. All the mentioned CF models build on the assumption of linear dynamics for cars making them not applicable to describe train dynamics which are strongly non-linear. CF models also neglect factors which are relevant for trains such as traction power limits, gradient and curvature resistances as well as safety constraints at diverging/merging junctions.

The main limitations of current literature are on one hand that both principles and operating states regulating train movements under Virtual Coupling have not been clearly defined yet, preventing a formal assessment of this concept. On the other hand, no model is currently available which consider influencing dynamic factors to accurately describe train movements in following mode with other trains. For this reason, reliable assessments of capacity benefits for Virtual Coupling signalling has not been yet provided.

To this end, this paper overcomes those literature gaps by:

- i) Defining principles, operational states and state transitions for trains running under Virtual Coupling.
- ii) Developing a novel train-following model which advances available car-following models by specifying multiple modes of operations and introducing all factors which affect train dynamics in real-life.
- iii) Formalising content and format of critical telematic messages which shall be exchanged between trains via the V2V communication layer to enable Virtual Coupling operations.
- iv) Performing a comparative capacity assessment to identify potential capacity benefits of Virtual Coupling versus ETCS Level 3 moving block, ETCS Level 2 and conventional multi-aspect signalling systems.



Fig. 2. State flow-diagram and state transition conditions (on the links) of the Virtual Coupling train-following model.

3. Definition of virtual coupling operational states and transitions

The train-following model developed in this paper defines multiple operational states and corresponding transition phases that a train needs to go through when coupling/uncoupling to/from another train under Virtual Coupling signalling. Fig. 2 reports a complete flow diagram of the different Virtual Coupling operational states which have been identified and described in our model. In default operational conditions (State 1) a train is assumed to be running independently under moving-block ETCS Level 3. In this operational state the EVC will always compute and supervise an absolute braking distance (*Abd*) allowing the train to safely stop at any EoA reported by the RBC. The EoA is always located at a given safety margin (*sm*) from the supervised location SvL (i.e. the potential danger point). The safety margin is needed to prevent that potential train location errors might cause the train to overshoot the SvL and cause derailments and/or train collisions. This safety margin will be considered when computing braking curves in any of the Virtual Coupling operational states identified in our model.

Whenever a train is approaching a train ahead, conditions for virtually coupling the two trains are checked. A first necessary condition for virtual coupling is that the train has the next stretch of its route in common with the train ahead. Indeed, it would not make any sense to couple two trains soon diverging at a fast-approaching junction. When a train shares the next part of route with the train ahead, a transition from "ETCS Level 3 running" to a "Coupling" operational state (State 2) will occur. In a "Coupling" operational state the EVC will supervise the train so to attain the speed of the train ahead at the EoA_{VC} located at a safety margin *sm* from the tail of the leading train. It must be noticed that the train behind (train B) will take some time to reach the same speed of the train ahead (train A). This time is called *coordination time* t_{coord} , while the distance crossed by the train during the coordination time is named *Coordination distance* (*Cd*). If train B has a speed V_B lower than the leader's speed V_A (see State 2 in Fig. 2), then *Cd* includes the distance to catch the train ahead by accelerating to a higher speed Vⁱ_B plus the distance to brake to the leader's speed V_A. If train B is running faster than the leading train A then *Cd* is merely the distance to slow down to the speed of train A.

The EoA_{VC} enabling the two trains to couple needs to refer to a prediction of position and speed of the leading train A at the time the follower train B has crossed the entire coordination distance *Cd* (i.e. after the coordination time t_{coord}). During coupling operations, the EVC shall therefore consider such a prediction and not the current position and speed of the leading train. Train B will hence switch to start coupling when the separation between its head S_B and the EoA_{VC} becomes equal or shorter than the predicted distance covered by train A during the coordination time ($t_{coord} \cdot V_A$).

The follower train will transition from "Coupling" to a state of "Coupled running" (State 3) when it reaches the speed of the leader at the predicted EoA_{VC} within given tolerances of speed th_y and distance th_s , respectively. In coupled running the EVC will supervise the train to follow current speed and acceleration of the train ahead, so to keep their separation in a certain threshold from the safety margin sm. Differently from the "Coupling" operational state, the EoA_{VC} considered by the EVC does not refer to any prediction but to the actual speed, position and acceleration currently held by the leading train. While in a "coupled running" state, two state transitions are possible, namely an "Unintentional decoupling" (State 4) or an "Intentional decoupling" (State 5). An unintentional decoupling state is reached any time a virtually coupled train is not able to hold the same speed of the train ahead because of higher motion resistances (due to e.g. a steep uphill gradient ϕ) and/or power limitations of the traction unit. The transition to an "Unintentional decoupling" state is triggered when the separation between the two trains (i.e. $|EoA_{VC} - S_B|$) becomes larger than the coupling threshold distance th_s (see State 4 in Fig. 2). In such a state a train will be driven at the maximum traction power in order to catch up with the train ahead. When dynamic conditions of traction power and motion resistances allow the train to be coupled again to the leading train, a transition to a "Coupling" state will occur. The transition to an "Intentional decoupling" state happens instead when two (or more) coupled trains approach a diverging junction where the leading train will switch over a different route. Such a situation leads to a safety critical issue given that the switch might not have enough time to be safely moved and locked in between the two trains, potentially causing derailments. Within a state of "intentional decoupling" the train behind will need to be decoupled from the leading train by being outdistanced by an absolute braking distance Abd plus the Point switching distance Psd necessary to move and lock the point in the correct position. Afterwards, the EVC will supervise the standard EoA since safety-critical track conditions apply. The transition from coupled running to intentional decoupling will formally occur when the distance between the head of the follower train S_B and the EoA is equal to or shorter than the absolute braking distance Abd, as reported in Fig. 2. After the train has been intentionally decoupled from the train ahead, it will keep on running under ETCS Level 3 until potential conditions for coupling to another train occur.

4. A multi-state train-following model for virtual coupling: general description

A microscopic multi-state train-following model has been developed to describe Virtual Coupling operations while considering accurate details of the railway infrastructure, the RBC and the V2V communication layers as well as the rolling stock. The railway network is modelled as a directed-graph where nodes represent elements like balises, switches, stopping boards at station platforms or line-side signals and/or marker boards in case fixed-block signalling is considered. Any node is characterised by several attributes specifying the geographical position and the type of element it represents (e.g. switch, balise, etc.). Arcs of the graph depict rail tracks connecting two adjacent nodes. Arc attributes capture physical parameters of the track such as the gradient, the curvature radius, the length as well as operational characteristics like the maximum speed limit. Both links and nodes of the graph are identified by means of a unique identification number (ID).

The RBC and the V2V communication layer are represented in terms of the communication delay and the messages they receive/ broadcast from/to trains. The RBC receives information about current train positions and broadcasts MA updates to all trains on the network. The V2V communication layer instead, exchanges MA_{VC} messages among trains running under Virtual Coupling.

Trains are modelled according to an object-oriented paradigm which includes all train characteristics (e.g. traction effort/speed curve, max braking rate, mass), dynamic parameters (e.g. air resistance factors) and operational features (e.g. route, stopping pattern, scheduled station arrival/departure times). A complete description of the MA_{VC} is provided in the following together with a discrete-time formulation of the train-following model for each of the Virtual Coupling operational states identified in Section 3.

4.1. Modelling the Virtual Coupling Movement Authority MA_{VC}

Before introducing the train-following model, it is necessary to have a clear picture of the information available to trains for each of the defined Virtual Coupling operational states. Both in moving-block ETCS Level 3 and Virtual Coupling, trains receive a message from the RBC containing a track description for the EVC to accurately compute and supervise a safe braking curve for a given EoA (or EoA_{VC}).

When running under ETCS Level 3, the RBC sends a standard ETCS MA which has here been modelled in line with the specifications provided for Packet Number 15 by the ERTMS/ETCS SRS Subset-026-7 version 3.6.0 (2016).

The MA contains the position of the EoA and data about type and location of the corresponding danger point. When switching to Virtual Coupling operations, the V2V communication layer enriches the standard ETCS MA with a series of additional information providing target speeds v_{target} and accelerations a_{target} that allow a train to virtually couple/decouple to/from other trains. This yields a novel type of message, defined here as Virtual Coupling Movement Authority MA_{VC}. No specification exists yet for this type of message since this is the first time that such a concept is introduced in literature. A data structure has therefore been formalised for the MA_{VC} as illustrated in Fig. 3. Such a formalisation provides concepts that can be taken forward by the railway industry to define requirements and specifications for Virtual Coupling messages to be exchanged during operations. We assume that the MA_{VC} is generated onboard by the EVC by combining the standard ETCS MA received from the RBC with the information on target acceleration and speed sent from the V2V layer. The basic MA_{VC} nessage is composed of two parameters respectively specifying the geographical position and the type of the last safe location of the MA_{VC}, namely the EoA_{VC}. As for the standard ETCS EoA, the EoA_{VC} is located at a safety margin from a danger point. The type of danger point can either be a movable infrastructure element (i.e. a switch, a level crossing) or the edge (i.e. front or tail) of another train. The RBC is assumed to send basic MA_{VC} information together with the status of movable elements. The V2V layer broadcasts instead information on kinematics of neighbouring trains when a train operates under Virtual Coupling.

When the EoA_{VC} refers to a movable element the MA_{VC} gives the unique identification number (*ID*) and the current direction (*Status*) of the element itself. If the train is coupled to a train ahead (named leader) and the element is already set and locked in the correct direction the MA_{VC} indicates the last known speed v_{lead} and acceleration a_{lead} of the leader as target speed and acceleration to be achieved by the train. In case the element is correctly set but the train is in a Virtual Coupling operational state different than coupled running, then the MA_{VC} provides the speed limit on the element (v_{lim}) as the target speed for the train. If the element is instead unset or



Fig. 3. Data Structure and formalisation of the Virtual Coupling Movement Authority.

set in a different direction, the MA_{VC} will indicate the train to stop before the element ($v_{target} = 0$), independently from the operational state, since this represents a safety-critical condition. When the EoA_{VC} relates to a train edge, the MA_{VC} supplies the *ID* of the train as well information on its *moving direction*. If the train moves in the same direction of the train ahead and shares the next portion of route with it, then the MA_{VC} will provide different information depending on the operational state of the train. If the train is in *coupled running*, the last known speed and acceleration of the leader will be notified as target speed and acceleration to be attained. In case the train is *coupling* or *unintentionally decoupling* to/from the leader, then the MA_{VC} provides the speed of the leader together with the predicted coupling point $P_{coupling}$ where the trains are expected to start coupling. The location $P_{coupling}$ is the EoA_{VC} referring to the forecasted position of leader's tail at the time that the follower train has fully coordinated its speed with the leader (that is the time needed to cross the coordination distance *Cd*).

When a train is instead *intentionally decoupling* from the train ahead, the MA_{VC} will indicate the train to stop ($v_{target} = 0$) before the decoupling location $P_{decoupling}$ (e.g. a diverging junction or a station) to allow the trains to be safely decoupled. If a train moving in the opposite direction enters the vicinity of a train operating in Virtual Coupling, then the MA_{VC} indicates to reach a standstill ($v_{target} = 0$) to avoid collisions and ensuring flank protection.

4.2. Modelling train operations under ETCS level 3 and virtual coupling

To describe train operations under ETCS Level 3 and Virtual Coupling, a multi-state train-following model has been developed. The model builds on a discrete-time solution of the Newton's motion differential equations (Hansen and Pachl, 2014), providing a set of mathematical expressions which capture train dynamics for the identified operational states as well as for state transitions. Input to the model is the information deriving from the broadcasted MA (when in ETCS Level 3) or the MA_{VC} (when in Virtual Coupling) as well as characteristics and dynamic parameters of the trains. The ETCS MA provides the End of Authority (*EoA*) at a safety margin *sm* from a danger point where the train needs to reach a standstill. The MA_{VC} supplies instead the last received speed v_{lead} and acceleration a_{lead} of the train ahead, together with the EoA_{VC} at a safety margin from the train edge (tail or front). Also, the locations where trains are expected to start coupling *P*_{coupling} and where they decouple *P*_{decoupling} are provided.

Physical characteristics of the trains include mass *M*, the rotating mass factor ρ , the service braking rate *b* and maximum braking rate b_{max} , and the tractive effort-speed curve of the traction unit $T(\nu)$. Dynamic parameters refer to speed ν_k , acceleration a_k and front position s_k of the train at current time instant t_k as well as motion resistances $R(\nu, \phi, r)$ due to air drag (depending on the speed ν), track gradient ϕ and curvature *r*. Track characteristics such as gradient, curvature radius and speed limit ν_{lim} are reported by the track description message broadcasted together with the MA and the MA_{VC}. All these input parameters are used by the onboard EVC to compute and supervise a safe braking curve that lets the train reach a standstill before the ETCS EoA or attain a given target speed ν_{target} at the EoA_{VC}. The ATO also relies on these parameters to control the train to meet target speeds and accelerations a_{target} which satisfy operational and safety conditions. The multi-state train-following model here described, can take into account communication delays of the RBC and the V2V communication layer. In case a communication delay ε is considered, the information contained in the MA and the MA_{VC} will refer to kinematic characteristics (position, acceleration, speed) of trains at time instant ($t_k - \varepsilon$), rather than to time t_k . Also, the model can reproduce train operations with both manual and automatic train driving by accordingly modifying the integration time interval (or the reaction time) of the follower train.

State 1: ETCS Level 3 running.

By default, trains start operating under ETCS Level 3 moving-block. The EVC supervises the EoA computing the braking Indication Point *IP*, i.e., the location where the train needs to start braking to reach the target speed at the End of Movement Authority. The *IP* at current speed v_0 is mathematically expressed as:

$$IP(v_0) = s_{target} - \int_{v_0}^{v_{target}} \frac{\rho M v}{\rho M b - R(v, \phi, r)} dv, \tag{1}$$

where s_{target} can be the EoA (where the target speed is zero) or the start of a section with a reduced speed limit (therefore a positive target speed), usually called Limit of Authority (LoA); v_{target} is the speed to be reached at the EoA/LoA, v_0 is the current train speed, M is the train mass, ρ the rotating mass factor, b < 0 the braking rate, $R(v, \phi, r)$ denotes the motion resistance depending on the speed v, the track gradient ϕ and curvature radius r. The integral in equation (1) merely represents the absolute braking distance to the EoA/LoA for a given current speed v_0 .

We implemented a finite-difference integration of Newton's motion formula with time step $t = t_k - t_{k-1}$, where we denote the current time as t_k . A train will be accelerating if at the previous time instant t_{k-1} its speed v_{k-1} is lower than the indicated max ceiling speed v_{lim} and its front position s_{k-1} has not yet reached point IP. Hence, for $s_{k-1} < IP$ and $v_{k-1} < v_{lim}$ the current speed v_k and front position s_k of the accelerating train are then computed from the previous time instant as (acceleration phase)

$$\begin{cases} v_{k} = v_{k-1} + \frac{T(v_{k-1}) - R(v_{k-1}, \phi, r)}{\rho M} \cdot t \\ s_{k} = s_{k-1} + \frac{\rho M}{T(v_{k-1}) - R(v_{k-1}, \phi, r)} \cdot v_{k-1} \cdot (v_{k} - v_{k-1}), \end{cases}$$
(2)

where $T(v_{k-1})$ represents the tractive effort of the train corresponding to the speed v_{k-1} at the previous time step. If at the previous time step the train is instead running faster than v_{lim} or its front position s_{k-1} is beyond point *IP*, the train enters a *braking phase* until it

reaches the target speed before the *EoA/LoA*. The train motion for $s_{k-1} \ge IP$ or $v_{k-1} > v_{lim}$ is then computed as (braking phase)

$$\begin{cases} v_{k} = v_{k-1} + \frac{\rho M b - R(v_{k-1}, \phi, r)}{\rho M} \cdot t \\ s_{k} = s_{k-1} + \frac{\rho M}{\rho M b - R(v_{k-1}, \phi, r)} \cdot v_{k-1} \cdot (v_{k} - v_{k-1}), \end{cases}$$
(3)

with b < 0 the service braking rate. If at the previous time step the train has already reached the target speed (that can also represent the max ceiling speed indication v_{lim}) before reaching point *IP*, then the train will cruise at a constant speed v_{target} by selecting the tractive effort equal to the resistance. Hence, for $s_{k-1} < IP$ and $v_{k-1} = v_{target}$ the train motion is computed as (cruising phase)

$$\begin{cases} v_k = v_{k-1} \\ s_k = s_{k-1} + v_{k-1} \cdot t. \end{cases}$$
(4)

State 2: Coupling.

The operational state of a train switches from *ETCS Level 3* to a *Coupling state*, whenever it approaches an EoA_{VC} referring to the tail of a train ahead which moves in the same direction over a common stretch of route. The follower train will actually start coupling to the leader if the condition $|EoA_{VC} - s_{k-1}| \le t_{coord} \cdot v_{lead}$ holds, i.e. when the separation between the position of its head s_{k-1} and the EoA_{VC} becomes equal or shorter than the predicted distance $t_{coord} \cdot v_{lead}$ that the leader will cover during the coordination time t_{coord} . The coordination time t_{coord} is the time needed by the follower train for coordinating its speed with the leader train, and is computed as

$$t_{coord} = \begin{cases} \int_{v_{k-1}}^{v_{B'}} \frac{\rho M}{T(v) - R(v, \phi, r)} dv + \int_{v_{B'}}^{v_{lead}} \frac{\rho M}{\rho M b - R(v, \phi, r)} dv & \text{if } v_{k-1} \le v_{lead} \\ \int_{v_{k-1}}^{v_{lead}} \frac{\rho M}{\rho M b - R(v, \phi, r)} dv & \text{if } v_{k-1} > v_{lead} \end{cases}$$
(5)

This means that if at the previous time step t_{k-1} the follower is not running faster than the leader ($v_{k-1} \le v_{lead}$) then the coordination time (see upper part in (5)) will take account for the time needed to accelerate to a higher speed $V_{B'}$ to get closer to the leader (integral at the first term) and the time to slow down to the leader's speed (integral at the second term). When instead the follower runs faster than the leader ($v_{k-1} > v_{lead}$) the coordination time (lower part in (5)) is merely given by the braking time to reach leader's speed (expressed by the integral).

In a coupling operational state, alongside with the safety-critical MA, a train will also receive an MA_{VC} indicating the last known speed of the leading train v_{lead} to be achieved ($v_{target} = v_{lead}$) and the location where the trains are predicted to start coupling up $P_{coupling}$. The predicted coupling point $P_{coupling}$ is calculated as:

$$P_{coupling} = EoA_{VC} + t_{coord} \cdot v_{lead}, \quad with EoA_{VC} = Tail_{lead} - sm, \tag{6}$$

meaning that $P_{coupling}$ is located at a safety margin *sm* from where the tail of the leading train *Tail_{lead}* will be positioned at the time the follower reaches the same running speed v_{lead} .

In such a prediction of the coupling location, the safety margin *sm* is considered to prevent that calculation errors or exogenous variables (e.g. weather conditions) could result in an unsafe train control.

During coupling operations, speed v_k and front position s_k of the train at current time t_k , are still computed by means of equations (2)–(4) while targeting coupling speed and location $P_{coupling}$.

State 3: Coupled running.

A train transitions to a "Coupled running" state when at the previous time step it reached the predicted coupling location $P_{coupling}$ and the leader's speed v_{lead} within a certain thresholds of distance th_s and speed th_v , respectively. Therefore, if $|v_{k-1} - v_{lead}| \le th_v$ and $|s_{k-1} - P_{coupling}| \le th_s$, the train is coupled to the train ahead and from then current speed v_k and front position s_k are computed according to the train-following equations

$$\begin{cases} v_k = v_{k-1} + a_{k-1} \cdot t \\ s_k = s_{k-1} + v_{k-1} \cdot t. \end{cases}$$
(7)

In coupled running, we assume that a train will accelerate at the same rate of the leader a_{lead} as long as such an acceleration or deceleration is between the maximum a_{k-1}^{max} and minimum a_{k-1}^{min} acceleration boundaries which closely depend upon traction characteristics, motion resistances and the maximum braking rate b_{max} of the rolling stock. Train accelerations a_{k-1} are therefore computed as

$$a_{k-1} = \begin{cases} a_{k-1}^{max}, & \text{if } a_{lead} > a_{k-1}^{max} = \frac{T(v_{k-1}) - R(v_{k-1}, \phi, r)}{\rho M} \\ a_{k-1}^{min}, & \text{if } a_{lead} < a_{k-1}^{min} = \frac{\rho M b_{max} - R(v_{k-1}, \phi, r)}{\rho M} a_{lead}, \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\tag{8}$$

When in coupled running the ATO tracks and follows the acceleration of the leader by reading the target acceleration provided by the MA_{VC}, as illustrated in Fig. 3. The ATO model used here does not include any specific function to filter out possible oscillations in leader's acceleration so to have smoother acceleration trends. Neither a dedicated function to control train headways so to minimise energy consumption of the follower is considered. The ATO simply follows any acceleration variation of the leader, compatibly with safety constraints, track and traction characteristics as well as motion resistances. In this work the EVC dynamically monitors the so-called safety envelope of the follower train, that is the most restrictive relative braking distance computed backwards from the EoA_{VC} (i.e. a safety margin from leader's tail) using follower's service braking rate. By monitoring the distance between the two trains, it is avoided that a train with poorer braking characteristics might overshoot the safety margin from leader's tail in case of sudden braking actions of this latter. In case the follower train violates the safety envelope, the EVC will trigger an immediate warning braking action (using a braking rate 30% higher than the service braking rate) until the train goes back to a safe separation from the leader. Additionally, to avoid frequent warning braking actions of followers with poor braking capabilities it is assumed that the V2V layer provides the leader with the maximum braking rate of the coupled follower. In such a way a smoother safe separation supervision is ensured between the two coupled trains, avoiding that the follower collides with the leader because of poorer braking capabilities, so that the entire convoy can brake according to the lower braking rate among all the trains in the platoon.

State 4: Unintentional decoupling.

If the acceleration of the leader exceeds the max acceleration of the follower a_{k-1}^{max} , then the two trains will inevitably increase their separation. In that case the follower train will unintentionally decouple from the leader if $|s_{k-1} - EoA_{VC}| > th_s$, with $EoA_{VC} = Tail_{lead} - sm$, i.e. when the separation between the head of the follower s_{k-1} and the EoA_{VC} relative to the tail of the leader becomes larger than the coupling threshold th_s . As the follower train unintentionally decouples from the leader, then it immediately switches back to a "Coupling" operational state so to reduce again the separation with leader as soon as motion resistances and/or traction power will allow that. In this operational state, speed v_k and front position s_k of the train at current time step t_k , are again computed by means of equations (2)–(4), since the train is momentarily decoupled from the leader.

As mentioned, the decoupling is defined "unintentional" since it is not intentionally triggered by the signalling system to meet safety constraints (e.g. to prevent derailments at diverging junctions) but merely occurs because of temporary constraining operational conditions due to increased motion resistances (e.g. on a steep uphill) or limited traction power.

State 5: Intentional decoupling.

When a coupled train convoy approaches a diverging junction where trains split over different routes, non-negligible safety risks arise. Switches might not have enough time to be safely moved and locked in between trains, potentially causing derailments. For safety reasons, trains will need to be outdistanced by an absolute braking distance at diverging junctions so that a train can safely stop should the switch not properly be set and locked. In case a coupled train is going to diverge from its leader, the V2V layer will provide the location of the diverging junction which represents the supervised location *SvL*. The EVC will compute the braking Indication Point *IP*_{decoupling} where the train needs to start braking to intentionally decouple from the leader. The point *IP*_{decoupling} is located at least at a safety margin *sm* from the *SvL* plus the distance needed to move and lock the point *Psd*, namely:

$$IP_{decoupling} = SvL - sm - Psd - \int_{v_{k-1}}^{0} \frac{\rho Mv}{\rho Mb - R(v, \phi, r)} dv,$$
(9)

with b < 0. Thus, intentional decoupling occurs if $(s_{k-1} \ge IP_{decoupling})$ and $(v_{k-1} > 0)$, after which the train switches to State 1 (ETCS Level 3 running) with a full-braking distance supervision. While in a state of intentional decoupling, current speed v_t and position s_t of the train are returned by equations (2)–(4), given that the train goes back to ETCS Level 3 operations.

5. Case study

A C++ object-oriented implementation of our multi-state train-following model has been embedded in the EGTRAIN platform (Quaglietta, 2014), to perform a capacity assessment of Virtual Coupling signalling.

EGTRAIN is a microscopic environment for detailed synchronous (i.e. time-driven) railway traffic simulations, featuring an API module to add/customise functions and interface external tools (e.g. for optimal traffic management or planning). Several fixed-block signalling systems are already implemented in EGTRAIN among which the British three and four-aspect with TPWS, ETCS Level 2 as well as the moving-block ETCS Level 3. A comparative analysis of these signalling systems has been performed versus Virtual Coupling to identify capacity benefits that this latter system can provide over state-of-the-practice signalling technologies. The analysis has been conducted for the 20 km long corridor between London Waterloo (WTL) and Surbiton (SBN) on the South West Main Line (SWML) in the UK (Fig. 4). This corridor develops over four tracks with a very hilly elevation profile, especially after Clapham Junction. Currently, more than 40 trains per hour operate on the line, including intercity, regional, suburban and commuter trains.

The objective of our analysis is applying the developed multi-state train-following model to understand operational implications of Virtual Coupling and the sensitivity of capacity gains to relevant service characteristics such as the *choice of train routes* and the *presence of service stops*. If two trains of a virtually coupled convoy need indeed to diverge over different routes, an absolute-braking distance separation is imposed at the junction which might result in negligible capacity improvements of Virtual Coupling when compared to plain moving-block ETCS Level 3. The same can happen when trains have service stops along their routes. When approaching station areas at lower speeds the difference between relative and absolute braking distances significantly reduces at the point that capacity gains of Virtual Coupling might be practically irrelevant to justify investments. To this end, our investigation refers to two main

scenarios. The first scenario considers only non-stop train services while the second scenario assumes that trains perform four service stops at Clapham Junction (CpJ), Wimbledon (Wbn), Raynes Park (RnP), and Surbiton (Sbn), respectively. All trains depart from Waterloo (Wtl) passing by timetabling locations such as Vauxhall (Vxl), Earlsfield (Eld), New Malden (NMn) and Berryland (Bld). For each scenario we then compare the case in which trains have the same route (Route A), versus the case in which trains operated on different routes (Route A and B) that are only partially shared and diverge at Berrylands Junction (BlJ). Capacity is measured in terms of space separation and time headway between consecutive trains. Simulation experiments hence consider just two consecutive trains, since this is sufficient to achieve our investigation objectives. Also, limiting the number of simulated trains makes the analysis of Virtual Coupling operations clearer, allowing a better understanding of how specific train dynamics can affect capacity measures. The two train services (respectively named A3-Wtl-Surbiton-1 and A3-Wtl-Surbiton-2) use the same rolling stock, namely a 161.8m long eight-car British Rail Class 455. In the experiments we assume that the follower train enters the network as soon as the signalling system allows it. The MA and the MA_{VC} are broadcasted with an update interval of 1s and a communication delay of 1s. A safety margin sm of 50 m is used for both the EoA and the EoA_{VC}. A space tolerance th_s of 30 m and a speed tolerance th_y of 0.278 m/s (i.e. 1 km/h) have been adopted in the train-following model to identify whether a follower train is coupled/unintentionally decoupled to/from the train ahead. In ETCS Level 3 and Virtual Coupling, trains are automatically driven by ATO with a reaction time of 0.5 s. In addition, for these signalling systems we allow the two trains to enter a station area together and line up at the same platform to perform their stop. Such an assumption has been made to estimate capacity gains when using the entire potential of moving-block operations. For ETCS Level 2 and TPWS a human driver is instead considered with a sight and reaction time of 2.5 s. For these fixed-block signalling systems state-of-practice rules have been used for modelling stopping operations where a train cannot enter a platform if it is already occupied by another train.

5.1. Analysis of virtual coupling operational states

Simulation results produced by the Virtual Coupling multi-state train following model are reported for the first (non-stopping trains) and second scenario (stopping trains) in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively.

Simulated time-distance diagrams of the two trains and the sequence of operational states of the follower (letters (a) and (b) at the top) are illustrated, together with the speed difference and the separation between the trains over their route (letters (c) and (d) at bottom). The diagrams on the left-side refer to the case in which trains have the same route (*route A*), while those on the right-side relate to the case of different train routes where the leader runs over *route A* and the follower on *route B*.

The diagrams show that the developed train-following model captures the different operational states of a train when running under Virtual Coupling. The sequence of operational states always starts with the follower train running under ETCS Level 3, switching to a "coupling" state as soon as it approaches the train ahead. When the conditions for coupling are satisfied (see condition (10)), the train enters a state of "coupled running" assuming the same accelerations and speed of the leader.

Speed difference diagrams (red line) reported in letters c) and d) of Figs. 5 and 6, clearly illustrate that speed differentials between leader and follower oscillate around zero while in coupled running. As described in Section 4.2, the ATO model used to control the follower train simply follows variations in acceleration of the leader without filtering out oscillations for a smoother train control. This explains the oscillating trend in the speed differences. The impact of such oscillations on energy consumption of the follower train goes beyond the scopes of this work, although it is an aspect which definitely deserves to be studied in future research.

Trains travel in a virtually linked convoy until motion resistances increase at the point that the follower cannot longer hold leader's speeds, resulting in an increasing train separation. A state of unintentional decoupling is obtained, that for our railway corridor is due to a very hilly elevation profile which makes it hard for the follower on a steep uphill to catch up with the leader running instead on a flatter ground or even downhill. As shown by the separation diagrams (blue line) in letters c) and d) of Figs. 5 and 6, the unintentional



Fig. 4. Schematic layout and elevation profile of the London Waterloo - Surbiton railway corridor on the South West Main Line in the UK.



Fig. 5. Distance-time diagram (top), separation and speed differentials (bottom) between leader and follower for non-stopping trains with the same (left) or a different route (right).

separation between the two trains keeps however below 215 m at an average train speed of 22 m/s (\approx 80 km/h) that is anyway a much shorter separation when compared to existing fixed-block signalling systems and ETCS Level 3 (which would at least require 405 m for the same braking rate of 0.6 m/s²). After having been unintentionally decoupled, the follower train switches again to a coupling state driving at maximum power in the attempt to catch up and couple with the leader. In the scenario of non-stopping trains (Fig. 5) the follower will steadily stay in a "coupling" state until track and vehicle conditions allow the train to couple again with the leader (if they have the same route) or to intentionally decouple from it before the diverging junction in Berryland (when using different routes). The transition to the state of "intentional decoupling" is immediately visible in Fig. 5d) where separation and speed difference between the two trains reach a peak before the diverging junction. Dashed lines represent separation and speed differential after the two trains have decoupled and run over different routes again under the supervision of ETCS Level 3.

In the scenario of stopping trains (Fig. 6), the follower unintentionally decouples from the leader every time they leave a stopping station. From a state of "unintentional decoupling" the follower then switches to a "coupling" state, until it catches up with the leader as this latter reduces its speed to approach the next stop. The two trains manage to couple just before any stopping station, meaning that they approach, cross and leave any of those stations as a virtually-coupled train convoy. When performing a stop, our model allows the two trains lining up at the same platform, as well as leaving the station together as if they were physically coupled. Of course, in the case of trains having different routes, the follower train transitions to an "intentional decoupling" state before Berryland Junction so to diverge to a different stopping platform in Surbiton. The intentional decoupling can be seen in Fig. 6d) where the diagrams of separation and speed differential have a peak before the trains undertake different routes. From that point on, trains operate on separate routes (dashed lines in the diagram) switching to ETCS Level 3.

5.2. Comparative capacity analysis

A specific analysis has been carried out to assess capacity performance of Virtual Coupling and potential gains that such a concept can provide when compared with moving-block ETCS Level 3, as well as the radio-based fixed-block signalling ETCS Level 2 and the multi-aspect fixed-block system with TPWS. As already mentioned, capacity is here evaluated in terms of train separation over the route and time headways (HW) at main interlocking areas, experienced by the trains during simulation experiments. Outcomes from the capacity analysis are depicted in Fig. 7 for the scenarios of non-stopping (top) and stopping trains (bottom), and for the cases in which trains have the same (letters (a) and (c)) or a different route (letters (b) and (d)). Train separation over the entire route (distance is given on the x-axis) is represented with solid lines while a histogram is used to report time headways at main interlocking areas. Results for Virtual Coupling are reported in blue, while those for ETCS Level 3, ETCS Level 2 and TPWS are given in orange, grey and



Fig. 6. Distance-time diagram (top), separation and speed differentials (bottom) between leader and follower for stopping trains with the same (left) or a different route (right).

gold, respectively. For all scenarios and cases, Virtual Coupling massively reduces train separations and time headways, when compared to the other signalling systems. A fair comparison with ETCS Level 3 shall however exclude the area of Vauxhall (*Vxl*), since when simulating Virtual Coupling the follower crosses that location while still being supervised by ETCS Level 3 and just transitioning to a "coupling" operational state. Given that in such a location Virtual Coupling train separation is still governed by an absolute braking distance, a comparison with ETCS Level 3 does not make much sense, since it would practically mean to compare ETCS Level 3 to itself. For this reason, capacity measures of Virtual Coupling and ETCS Level 3 in *Vxl* are similar. Also, in the case of trains with different routes, it makes sense to compare train separation and time headways only for those location along common portions of infrastructure. This means for instance that Surbiton (*Sbn*), where routes A and B use different tracks, is excluded when computing the most critical experienced headway for the different signalling systems.

In the case of non-stopping trains having the same route (Fig. 7a) we observe that the capacity bottleneck (i.e. the location with the maximum experienced time headway) shifts from Vauxhall (*Vxl*) to Berryland Junction (*BLJ*) when passing from fixed-block signalling (TPWS and ETCS Level 2) to moving-block (ETCS Level 3 and Virtual Coupling).

The maximum headway reduces from 55s for fixed-block signalling to 32 s if ETCS Level 3 is implemented, getting down to only 15 s when referring to pure Virtual Coupling operations. Virtual Coupling reduces critical headways by 67%, 61% and 53% when compared with TPWS, ETCS Level 2 and ETCS Level 3, respectively. In terms of maximum train separation, this translates into a corresponding decrease of 50%, 44% and 25%.

When non-stopping trains have different routes (Fig. 7b) the location with the most critical headway changes from BlJ for TPWS to *Vxl* for ETCS Level 2, and from *RnP* for ETCS Level 3 to again *BlJ* when pure Virtual Coupling operations are considered (so excluding Vlx where trains still operate under ETCS Level 3). As already said, in this case *Sbn* is not considered, given that in that location trains use different tracks. A maximum time headway of 27 s is experienced by trains under Virtual Coupling, which means a reduction by 48%, 37%, and 13% versus TPWS (with a max HW of 52s), ETCS Level 2 (max HW = 43s) and ETCS Level 3 (max HW = 31s), respectively. When referring to maximum train separation, it means a respective reduction by 62%, 42% and 24%. Capacity benefits of Virtual Coupling are even more significant for the scenario of stopping trains. In this scenario we also observe that TPWS and ETCS Level 2 have a very similar performance, especially in terms of train separation, as their separation diagrams are almost entirely overlapped.



Train Separation and Headway

Fig. 7. Train separation and time headway (HW) at main interlocking areas for non-stopping (top) and stopping trains (bottom) using the same (left) or a different route (right).

In the case in which trains have the same route (Fig. 7c), Sbn is the most critical location for all the signalling systems. The time headway in this location decrease from 163 s for TPWS to 151s for ETCS Level 2 and from 83s for ETCS Level 3-59s when considering Virtual Coupling. This latter signalling system hence reduces the maximum headway on the line by 63%, 61% and 28% when referenced to TPWS, ETCS Level 2 and Level 3, respectively. This translates into a corresponding decrease in the maximum train separation that equals 85%, 84%, and 40%. When trains have different routes instead (Fig. 7d), the location with the largest headway moves from BlJ in the case of TPWS to RnP when considering ETCS Level 2, Level 3 and Virtual Coupling. In such a case, Virtual Coupling has a maximum experienced headway of 34 s, corresponding to a reduction of 79%, 77% and 43% when compared with TPWS (max HW = 165s), ETCS Level 2 (max HW = 148s) and Level 3 (max HW = 60s), respectively. Referring to maximum train separations on the line this means a respective decrease by 85%, 64% and 43%.

6. Conclusions

This paper introduces a detailed capacity analysis of the Virtual Coupling concept which upgrades moving-block train operations by imposing a relative braking distance separation rather than an absolute one. An innovative train-following model has been developed that overcomes limitations of car-following models currently available in road traffic literature by considering non-linear train dynamics and relevant factors such as motion resistances due to track gradient and curvature as well as power limitations of the traction unit and safety constraints at junctions. Different states and corresponding transitions have been defined and mathematically modelled to describe trains operating under Virtual Coupling signalling. The novel concept of Virtual Coupling Movement Authority MA_{VC} has been introduced together with an innovative formalisation of the messages exchanged among trains via the V2V communication layer.

The developed train-following model has been applied to part of the South West Main Line in the UK to simulate train operations under Virtual Coupling with the aim of identifying capacity performances of this concept and potential benefits over state-of-practice signalling systems. Simulation experiments referred to different scenarios considering non-stopping and stopping trains having the same or a different route. Outcomes show that Virtual Coupling significantly reduces train separation and time headways for all considered scenarios, when compared to TPWS, ETCS Level 2 and Level 3. The biggest capacity benefits have been however found for the scenario of trains having service stops and using different routes, where Virtual Coupling can decrease the maximum headways by

E. Quaglietta et al.

79%, 77% and 43% when compared to TPWS, ETCS Level 2 and Level 3, respectively. This represents a very promising result since Virtual Coupling provides the best capacity improvements for the operational scenario most frequently seen in practice for real-life operations (i.e. the one with stopping trains having different routes).

It is worth mentioning that the results have been obtained for the case of trains having the same rolling stock characteristics and above all the same braking rates. The presence of trains with heterogenous operational performances such as different braking capabilities and/or speed categories might be limiting factors to capacity benefits of Virtual Coupling. A sensitivity analysis of those factors will be essential to investigate the impact of heterogeneous traffic characteristics on Virtual Coupling capacity performances. The next steps of this work will be dedicated to analysing interactions of more than just two virtually coupled trains, while including different braking and speed characteristics of the rolling stock. Experiments will be broadened to also include other kinds of manoeuvres such as overtaking and/or merging at junctions which could affect minimum headways between platooning trains. Future research will be addressing validation of the developed train-following model by modelling trains as a homogeneous strip with a length, rather than a point-mass, as traditionally assumed in literature. Relevant is also to identify implications of V2V communication delays on safety and capacity. Also, a multi-criteria analysis of Virtual Coupling will be needed to assess potential effects on the transport demand and the railway business.

Acknowledgement

The research in this paper is funded by the MOVINGRAIL project granted by the Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking of the European Commission, under Grant Agreement GA 826347.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrtpm.2020.100195.

References

Brackstone, M., McDonald, M., 1999. Car-Following: a historical review. Transport. Res. Part F 2, 181–196.

Emery, D., 2010. Enhanced ETCS L2/L3 train control system. WIT Trans. State-of-the-art Sci. Eng. 46, 112–122.

ERTMS/ETCS System Requirements Specification - Subset 026, Issue 3.6.0, May 2016.

Gipps, P.G., 1981. A behavioural car-following model for computer simulation. Transp. Res. Part B Methodol. 15 (2), 105-111.

Hansen, I.A., Pachl, J., 2014. Railway Timetabling and Operations. Eurail Press, Hamburg.

Helly, W., 1959. Simulation of bottlenecks in single lane traffic flow. In: Proceedings of the Symposium on Theory of Traffic Flow. Research Laboratories General Motors, pp. 207–238.

Herman, I., Martinec, D., Huràk, Z., Sebek, M., 2017. Scaling in bidirectional platoons with dynamic controllers and proportional asymmetry. IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr. 63 (4), 2034–2040.

IRSE International Technical Committee, 2016. ERTMS Level 4, Train Convoys or Virtual Coupling-Report on Topic 39, vol. 219. IRSE News, pp. 1–3.

Leutzbach, W., Wiedemann, R., 1986. Development and Applications of Traffic Simulation Models at the Karlsruhe Institute Fuer Verkehrswesen. Traffic Engineering and Control, pp. 270–278.

Ning, B., 1998. Absolute braking and relative distance braking - train operation control modes in moving block systems. Trans. Built Environ. 34, 991-1001.

Ning, B., Dong, H., Gao, S., Tang, T., Zheng, W., 2018. Distributed cooperative control of multiple high-speed trains under a moving block system by nonlinear mapping-based feedback. Sci. China Inf. Sci. 61, 1–12.

Quaglietta, E., 2014. An approach to design the layout of railway signaling system to maximize the economic efficiency of the network. Simulat. Model. Pract. Theor. 46, 4–24.

Quaglietta, E., 2019. Analysis of Platooning Train Operations under V2V communication-based signalling: fundamental modelling and capacity impacts of Virtual Coupling. In: Proceedings of the 98th Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting, Washington DC, 13th-17th January.

Theeg, G., Vlasenko, S., 2009. Railway Signalling and Interlocking International Compendium. Eurail Press.

Treiber, M., Hennecke, A., Helbing, D., 2000. Congested traffic states in empirical observations and microscopic simulations. Phys. Rev. 62 (2), 1805.
Wang, M., Daamen, W., Hoogendoorn, S.P., van Arem, B., 2016. Cooperative car-following control: distributed algorithm and impact on moving jam features. IEEE Trans. Intell. Transport. Syst. 17 (5), 1459–1471.

Xiao, L., Wang, M., Schakel, W., van Arem, B., 2018. Unravelling effects of cooperative adaptive cruise control deactivation on traffic flow characteristics at merging bottlenecks. Transport. Res. Part C 96, 380–397.

Xu, Y., Cao, C.-X., Li, M.-H., Luo, J.-L., 2012. Modeling and Simulation for Urban rail traffic problem based on cellular automata. Commun. Theor. Phys. 58 (6), 847–855.