
Subject: Re: [railML3|alpha] Suggestion for an enhanced topology model
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 17 Feb 2017 13:52:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Matthieu,

thank you very much for your feedback. Together with other points, this issue will be discussed within the RailTopoModel Expert Group at their next phone conference on 01.03.2017. So, I hope to provide you an exhaustive answer shortly afterwards.

Best regards
Christian

Am 13.02.2017 um 15:32 schrieb Matthieu Perin:

- > Hi,
- > If I may give my opinion about the philosophy behind a
- > Topological "pure" part for the RTM meta model is good, but
- > I see two major issues with the objects then :
- >
- > If we need only a Topological view, why there have to be
- > difference between linear and non-linear elements ?. Such
- > differences does not exist in the topological level, as
- > these elements are all nodes and can be navigate whatsoever.
- > If we keep separated Linear and Non Linear element for
- > clarity purpose (which is good in my opinion) then the two
- > object MUST have somme differences : e.g. a linear element
- > should have a "length" attribute that is not existing for
- > the non-linear one.
- > I hope It can help thinking about the meta model !

--

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
