
Subject: Proposal for new timetable schema version 2.0(?)

Posted by [Tai Truong](#) on Tue, 19 Sep 2006 16:14:58 GMT

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

Hello railway friends :-)!

We have a product RailOpt 2T that is a system for Intelligent Resource Management (IRM). It is a planning- and production-system for the railway industry. With the experience with the customers SJ (Sweden), CFL (Luxemburg), BLS and SOB (both Switherland) we would like to use the timetable schema as the STANDARD for integrating (and exporting) timetables from (and to) external systems (like SYFA, Roman, BITS etc.).

Please check the attached draft for the revised extensions and suggestions for a new major release 2.0 for the timetable schema. Here is a quick summary of the revision for version 2.0:

NEW top elements: netNodes and sections:

This helps to reduce the timetable entries. The network nodes ("posID"), sections and distance being used in the timetable entries are replaced by ONE sectionID referring to the section in the top element.

MOVING top element: operatingPeriods below a timetablePeriod:

Operating periods should always refer to a specific timetable period. An operating period like "11" (containing all Mondays - e.g. in Bit Mask format) may exist in several different timetable periods but have different Bit Masks!

NEW element: project below timetable period; MOVING element: train below a project:

A timetable period should have several projects. The train elements are moved below a project. This allows systems like RailOpt to create different sets of trains in different projects within one timetable period. Trains could be merged and copied between projects.

The new XML structure for the timetable interface would look like this:

railML

timetable

networkNodes

sections

timetableperiods

operatingPeriods

projects

trains

I have signed up for the 10th railML conference and our company Qnamic has a stand at the InnoTrans exhibition in Berlin this week. I am looking forward to discuss the timetable specification with somebody! Our office is in Switzerland and everybody is happily invited!

Cheers,

Tai Truong

Manager Research & Development

Qnamic AG

Fabrikstrasse 10

Switzerland

Phone: +41 62 209 70 52

Mobile: +41 78 861 40 02

Fax: +41 62 209 70 44

tai.truong@qnamic.com

www.qnamic.com

--> Qnamic is at InnoTrans in Berlin

--> 19.-22. September 2006

--> Hall 4.1, Booth 138

File Attachments

1) [timetableSchema2.0_proposal.pdf](#), downloaded 476 times

Subject: Re: operatingPeriods

Posted by [Joachim.Rubröder](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 18:14:08 GMT

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

Hello,

I don't think we should regard operatingPeriods as a subelement of timetablePeriods.

The operatingPeriod "11" in Switzerland means "on every days, treated as Mondays" (i.e. all Mondays and days after a holiday). It is therefore depending on a special timetablePeriod (which is referenced by "timetablePeriodID") and has its own bitMask. Anyway, you need different serviceIDs (like "2005_11", "2006_11") to distinguish between the operatingPeriod "11" in separate timetablePeriods.

But the German "TGL" or the Swiss "17" (meaning "daily") or the real "on every Monday" are operatingDays with a short 7-day bitmask and clearly independent of any timetablePeriod. They could be defined in any train and keep valid, even if you transfer the timetable from one timetablePeriod to the next.

Cheers,

Joachim

Subject: Re: projects

Posted by [Joachim.Rubröder](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 18:52:38 GMT

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

Hi,

every timetable could be seen as part of a certain project in the sense of "planned timetable for new City-Tunnel Berlin". But the same is true for every infrastructure. I think the relation to such a project is additional (meta-)information and not part of the timetable itself. I would therefore prefer to create a new optional element "projects" somewhere, which could be referenced by a train or a timetable via projectID.

If you like to use projects for separating "simulated" from "productive" trains, why don't you create different timetables for each type? The "planned" and the "actual" train are two different types (views) of the very same train and it will be confusing to have them in the same

timetable.

Best wishes,

Joachim

Subject: Re: networkNodes, sections

Posted by [Joachim.Rubröder](#) on Tue, 26 Sep 2006 19:14:13 GMT

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

Hi,

your "networkNode" and your "sections" are part of a high-level infrastructure, which is referenced by most timetables. Most planned trains are driving from "station A" to "station B". The "networkNodes" could be found as "operationControlPoints" in the infrastructure, but the "sections" between these points are still missing. This is a known lack. The reason is, that it is easier to agree on a common description of the tracks and switches than on the network, because "sections" are defined differently in every railway.

Nevertheless, "networkNodes" and "sections" should be part of the infrastructure not the timetable. A timetable could reference them via "posID" and "sectionID" in the way you described.

Cheers,

Joachim
