Subject: Re: RFE for connection, DE:Anschluss
Posted by   on Tue, 13 Nov 2012 11:50:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Susanne, thank you for clarifying what is clarified... ;-) (Honestly:
It makes it easier to follow the discussion for someone outside.)

> So what would be the pros and cons of changing the current
> situation?

To focus this: You are writing about the following possible change:

>> Can we then clarify that for RailML, there is the following rule:
>> --> No ocpRef is allowed to occur more than one time in the same
>> <trainPart>.
>> 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>.

This would simply be a change of rule and declaring 'orientationReversed'
obsolete but no syntactic change.

> PROs:
> * Unambiguous connection definitions
> * "Redundancy reduction": only one place in the schema where to define
>   reversing of train parts and/or whole trains

I agree these PROs are correct.

> CONs:
> * Changing current implementations with no strong need

I'm afraid I have to add one CON: The current 'trainReverse' attribute
fits to the very common symbol <-> for reversing direction in timetables.
I guess many public information systems have to handle this information.
These public information systems do normally not handle train parts - a
train parts is an object not very common in public information. So by
deleting the 'trainReverse' attribute, we actually would reduce
redundancy, but also we would make it much more difficult to recreate the
'trainReverse' information: One would have to test if all formations of
all train parts have the 'orientationReversed' attribute negated and the
order of the train parts (attribute 'position') has turned around...

Well, now it is 2:2 on the PROs and CONs.

If I see the many redundancies we create right now in <infrastructure>, it
seams reasonable to keep this small redundancy here for the moment to ease

reading of the files for programmes.

Anyway, as written earlier I would agree to and welcome that change.

Best regards,
Dirk.