

---

Subject: Re: RFE for connection, DE:Anschluss  
Posted by on Thu, 15 Nov 2012 16:37:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Joachim and all others,

thank you for your reply.

So it seems that our conclusion is to keep the 'trainReverse' attribute in spite of redundancy for easier reading and better understanding of the files. I agree.

There is only one question left:

>>>> --> No ocpRef is allowed to occur more than one time in the same  
>>>> <trainPart>.

> A forced splitting of trainParts whenever an ocpTT would occur several  
> times would be consequent. This would also solve the problem...

> For a simple timetable information system (without dealing with  
> formations) it could still be used within a long trainPart to indicate  
> the symbol <->.

Please specify whether

a) Reversing trains \_must\_ be splitted into several <trainParts>; the attribute 'trainReverse' is only allowed at fist <ocpTT>s.

b) Reversing trains \_must\_ be splitted into several <trainParts> if 'formationRef' is used; in this case, the attribute 'trainReverse' is only allowed at fist <ocpTT>s. If 'formationRef' is not used, 'trainReverse' may occur at each <ocpTT>.

c) Reversing trains need not to be splitted into several <trainParts>; the attribute 'trainReverse' may occur at each <ocpTT>. Both possibilities to express a change of direction (with 'trainReverse' or 'formationReversed') are allowed and shall be understood equally.

Please decide from one of these three options. I would like to fix this in the Wiki and in our software as soon as possible because we already have changes of direction without splitted train parts. If this will become invalid, I do not want to keep it in 2.2.

I would write it into Wiki after your decision.

Thank you and best regards,  
Dirk.

---