

Dear Dirk,

Dirk Bräuer <[dirk.braeuer@irfp.de](mailto:dirk.braeuer@irfp.de)> writes:

>> Do you mean "Lok umsetzen" with "formation reverse"?  
>  
> Of course not. Running 'round with the engine does not reverse the  
> formation, it changes the formation.  
>  
> ---  
> Concerning the meaning of <ocpTT>.trainReverse:  
> ---

[...]

Clarified. Thank you.

> ---  
> Concerning the meaning of <formationTT>.orientationReversed:  
> ---

[...]

Clarified. Thank you.

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

[...]

Thanks for this clarification, too.

> (This refers to the current situation in RailML. It changes if we  
> declare <ocpTT>.trainReverse obsolete and declare  
> <formationTT>.orientationReversed to be used by definition as  
> recommended in the previous post.)

I'm sorry this idea is based on my misunderstanding of the current situation. So what would be the pros and cons of changing the current situation?

PROs:

\* Unambiguous connection definitions

\* "Redundancy reduction": only one place in the schema where to define reversing of train parts and/or whole trains

CONs:

\* Changing current implementations with no strong need

> Hope I was able to clarify the difference between trainReverse and  
> orientationReversed.

I think you got it!

Thanks a lot.

Kind regards...

Susanne

--

Susanne Wunsch

Schema Coordinator: railML.common

---