Posted by   on Mon, 12 Nov 2012 12:04:09 GMT

Dear all,

in March 2012 we have created the <operatingPeriod>.dayOffset attribute. The original thought was to allow bitmasks with one or more digits than the there are days in the period. This was to describe a midnight-overrun before the station where the bitmask relates to.

Anyway, the longer bitmasks were not agreed. Instead, the new <operatingPeriod>.dayOffset attribute was created.

Since then, I have written some strange explanations at [1] and elsewhere but I am not satisfied with the redundancy which comes with <operatingPeriod>.dayOffset. With implementation, it becomes once more clear that it is always possible to avoid <operatingPeriod>.dayOffset>0 by using the already existing arrival/departureDay even at the first <ocpTT> of a <trainPart>. Even more worst, dayOffset leads by trend to define every <operatingPeriod> several times, one with dayOffset=0 and one with dayOffset=1 a.s.o.

See last sentence of my writings:

"It seams as if it is redundant whether a <trainPart> starts with departureDay=1 or refers to an <operatingPeriod> with dayOffset=1. It is not, since a train shall always start with departureDay=0 at its fist <ocpTT> in its first section; departureDay>0 is intended to happen only in first <ocpTT>s in further sections."

I think we should throw it away before it becomes valid for the sake of less redundancy. Instead, we should turn that sentence around and say:

"Always when we thought we have to use dayOffset=1 we should use departureDay=1 instead."

Therefore, I plead for deleting <operatingPeriod>.dayOffset before it ever became valid with RailML 2.2.

If the others agree, I would simplify the Wiki in that way.

Dirk.

[1] http://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:times#notes