Subject: Re: RFE for connection, DE:Anschluss
Posted by Susanne Wunsch railML on Fri, 09 Nov 2012 15:29:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dirk Bräuer <dirk.braeuer@irfp.de> writes:
>> It changes its running direction in Eschwege, that means "it reverses".
>
> please do not mix the "trainReverse" attribute with the
> "orientationReversed" attribute.
>
> - "trainReverse" is an attribute of <ocpTT>,
> - "orientationReversed" is an attribute of <formationTT>.

I'm sorry, you're right. I missed the attribute 'trainReverse' in the
'ocpTT' element.

> If only the train reverses but not the formation, there is currently
> no need to separate two <trainParts>.

I'm sorry, I don't see the difference between a train and a formation
reverse.

Do you mean "Lok umsetzen" with "formation reverse"?

The wiki says about the 'trainReverse' in 'ocpTT' (since 2011-05-10):

  trainReverse : is true if train changes direction at this station
          (xs:boolean, optional). After this station the
          rollingstock which is referenced in formationTT changes
          order. This attribute could also been set at the first
          station, indicating that the formation starts in the
          reversed order.

It is currently not forseen to split the train part because of the
reversing - yes.

> With your suggestion to _enforce_ two train parts if a train reverses
> (which I would welcome as mentioned in the previous post), the
> situation changes:
>
> We could now declare "trainReverse" being obsolete since we could
> always use "orientationReversed" (also for single MUs by definition)
> because we always will have to have a new <trainPart>.

+1

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common