
Subject: Re: RFE for connection, DE:Anschluss

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Thu, 15 Nov 2012 17:52:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

coord@timetable.railml.org (Joachim Rubröder) writes:

> Dirk Bräuer wrote:

>>>> 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>.

>

> A forced splitting of trainParts whenever an ocpTT would occur several

> times would be consequent. This would also solve the problem of

> referencing the correct ocpTT within a trainPart

> (<http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/?group=2&offset=0&thead=72&id=247>).

I would also prefer this way of modeling instead of references to single 'ocpTT's from within a '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>.

>> 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.

>

> I would like to keep the 'trainReverse' attribute, for this purpose which

> was also mentioned by T. Kauer (SBB) at the railML meeting. With the

> forced splitting of trainParts, the 'trainReverse' would mainly occur at

> the first ocpTT of a trainPart if you have any formations referenced.

It is some kind of redundancy, but it's a bit tricky to deduce it:

1. Find the commercial train, where this train part is used.
 2. Look at the train parts at the previous trainPartSequence.
 3. Look if the same formationTT is referred.
- > 'trainReverse' is true.

But if the formationTT refers some kind of general formation this deduction may be false.

+1 for keeping "trainReverse"

Instead of allowing the 'trainReverse' attribute only in the first 'ocpTT' we may include it in the 'formationTT' element as this may only occur once per 'trainPart'. This may be ensured by the XSD, but the occurrence of the attribute in the first 'ocpTT' element may only be ensured by Schematron, not XSD.

That would mean, that both attribute 'trainReverse' and 'orientationReversed' will be in the same element, but with some kind of different meaning. I like to explicitly point to it, instead of "hiding" it in different elements:

- * 'trainReverse' important for passenger information systems "<->"

- * 'orientationReversed' referring to the definition of the formation in the rollingstock subschema

There may be a trainPart with 'trainReverse=true' but with 'orientationReversed=false' because of an already reversed formation in the previous "train part sequence".

- > It should therefore no longer be seen as automatically reversing the
- > formation. For a simple timetable information system (without dealing
- > with formations) it could still be used within a long trainPart to
- > indicate the symbol <->.

I would be happy if the railML semantics would be covered by all systems. That would mean, that already today a timetabling information system has to split train parts if the formation changes, nevertheless it does not know the formation type at all.

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
railML Common-Coordinator
