Subject: internal connections Posted by Matthias Hengartner on Tue, 16 Nov 2004 15:24:51 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,

visualisation:

In this outline, you can see a corridor (without any trackelements) of 2 tracks, which are each splitted into 3 parts.

The splitting is only for visualisation purposes (e.g. to show a corridor in a compact way, or to disentangle visually a complicated topology) and has no reference to reality.

[con1a1] is "connected" with [con1a2] etc. ("connected" means, that [con1a1] has exactly the same position on Track1 as [con1a2], they have only different visualisation coordinates).

After some first considerations, I see two different possibilities to implement this (shortly outlined):

(1)

We use the existing schema with the <simpleConnection>-elements of <trackBegin>/<trackEnd>. For Track1 in the example above, we have 3 tracks (1A, 1B, 1C), and each of them have the same "trackID" (and the same for Track2).

[con1a1] is the <trackEnd> of 1A and is connected to [con1a2], which is the <trackBegin> of 1B (and so on).

Given the whole Track1 is e.g. 3 kilometers, and the 3 parts each are equally long, we have [con1a1] AND [con1a2] at position 1.000 (kilometer), and [con1b1] AND [con1b2] at position 2.000.

Here an extract of the appropriate sourcecode:

```
<tracks>
<track trackID="Track1">
```

```
<trackTopology>
 <trackBegin>
  <buf><bufferStop pos="0.000"/></br>
 </trackBegin>
 <trackEnd>
  <simpleConnection pos="1.000">
  <connection connectionID="con1a1" branchIDRef="con1a2"/>
  </simpleConnection>
 </trackEnd>
 </trackTopology>
</track>
<track trackID="Track1">
 <trackTopology>
 <trackBegin>
  <simpleConnection pos="1.000">
  <connection connectionID="con1a2" branchIDRef="con1a1"/>
  </simpleConnection>
 </trackBegin>
 <trackEnd>
  <simpleConnection pos="2.000">
  <connection connectionID="con1b1" branchIDRef="con1b2"/>
  </simpleConnection>
 </trackEnd>
 </trackTopology>
</track>
<track trackID="Track1">
 <trackTopology>
 <trackBegin>
  <simpleConnection pos="2.000">
  <connection connectionID="con1b2" branchIDRef="con1b1"/>
  </simpleConnection>
 </trackBegin>
 <trackEnd>
  <buf><bufferStop pos="3.000"/></br>
 </trackEnd>
 </trackTopology>
</track>
</tracks>
```

[We propably should introduce an additional ID for each <track> (which represents only a part of a track), which is unique (within the line/infrastructure). In our case, we have 1A, 1B, 1C]

(2)

Another possibility is to introduce a new trackElement, e.g. <internalConnection> or <trackSplitPoint> (or to allow <simpleConnection> not only on the beginning and end of a track).

(2a) In this case, we have 4 <internalConnection>-elements. Each of them has different visualisation coordinates. There are 2 pairs of them, which have the same position on the track and refer to each other (this reference is not absolutly necessary).

```
<track trackID="Track1">
<trackTopology>
 <trackBegin>
 <buf><bufferStop pos="0.000"/></br>
 </trackBegin>
 <internalConnection pos="1.000" elementID="con1a1" IDRef="con1a2"/>
 <internalConnection pos="1.000" elementID="con1a2" IDRef="con1a1"/>
 <internalConnection pos="2.000" elementID="con1b1" IDRef="con1b2"/>
 <internalConnection pos="2.000" elementID="con1b2" IDRef="con1b1"/>
 <trackEnd>
 <simpleConnection pos="3.000">
  <connection connectionID="con1a1" branchIDRef="con1a2"/>
 </simpleConnection>
 </trackEnd>
</trackTopology>
</track>
```

(2b) In this case, we have only 2 <trackSplitPoints>. Each of them has 2 elementIDs. So in the visualisation part, we can refer twice to each <trackSplitPoint> (and give them 2 visualisation points for each).

```
<track trackID="Track1">
   <trackTopology>
    <trackBegin>
    <buf><bufferStop pos="0.000"/></br>
    </trackBegin>
    <trackSplitPoint pos="1.000" elementID1="con1a1"
elementID2="con1a2"/>
    <trackSplitPoint pos="2.000" elementID1="con1b1"
elementID2="con1b2"/>
    <trackEnd>
    <simpleConnection pos="3.000">
     <connection connectionID="con1a1" branchIDRef="con1a2"/>
    </simpleConnection>
    </trackEnd>
   </trackTopology>
  </track>
```

What do you think about these ideas?

I'll tell you about another application of such internal connections in another posting.
Please ask, critisize and discuss!
Best regartds Matthias Hengartner

Matthias Hengartner
hengartner@ivt.baug.ethz.ch ++ 41 1 633 68 16