Subject: Re: RFE for connection, DE:Anschluss
Posted by Susanne Wunsch railML on Fri, 09 Nov 2012 14:39:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Dirk,

Dirk Bräuer <dirk.braeuer@irfp.de> writes:

>> But this train reverses at Eschwege. That means there should be at least
>> two train parts in order to define the reversed vehicle order.

> - If the train consists of one MU only (most of the trains do so) -
> what do you want to reverse there?

It changes its running direction in Eschwege, that means "it reverses".

> (Please note that there is no possibility to describe the orientation
> of a single vehicle in a <formation>.)

In the element vehicle/wagon/driversCab/ you may define the
'orderNumber' of the drivers Cab and its 'position' (rear, middle,
front). That could only serve for your mentioned MUs, of course.
Otherwise the orientation is given by the order of vehicles in a
formation.

> - It is not necessary to specify a formation at all (<formationTT> is
> optional). So, for a simple timetable description - may be a passenger
> information like HAFAS - there is no need to use create two train
> parts.

You don't have to give the formation reference at all, yes. But if you
define one train part for both "vehicle orientations" there may be two
railML-representations of the same train.

That is something the railML-Infrastructure-world has to deal with every
day (short vs. long tracks). ;-)

> - I can also send you an exempli gratia where a train passes a station
> twice without reversing...

Would be interested in one example only.

> But another question we should ask ourselves is: If we specify a
> connection with trainPartRef and ocpRef - may it be that the right
> interpretation follows from the contents?
>
> Train #24090 stops at Niederhone 14.28 (direction to Eschwege) and
> again 14.38 (direction to Göttingen). A (hypothetical) bus could

> arrive at Niederhone on 14.25 an referring a connection to #24090.
> - Do the min/maxConTime attributes help us to specify the right stop?
> - Should we (alternatively) refer to <ocpTT>.sequence (the counter)
> instead of <ocp>?
> - Should we (alternatively) provide optional "directionToOcpRef" and
> "directionFromOcpRef" attributes to clarify the situation?

No questions would arise if we would model this case with two train
parts. ;-)

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common