Subject: Re: Wiki documentation for border <ocpTT> between two chained <trainPart>
Posted by on Fri, 24 Jul 2015 14:17:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello Philip,

Am 24.07.2015 um 12.54 schrieb Philip Wobst:
> Hello Christian,
>
> did you have a use case where the data for the two ocpTTs was not the
> same although it should have been the same?

I got a railML file with different data in two border ocpTTs, but I don't believe that this was intended by the creator. Of course I can imagine usecases where we need different arrival / departure tracks, stop posts and so on, but my intention was to answer the question: Are border ocpTTs the right place to model different arrival and departure locations? I considered the existance of border ocpTTS as a potentially unwanted and completely redundant consequence of the current railML timetable structure, so I wanted to "forbid" using them for things that cannot modeled with non-border-ocpTTs.
If there is consensus under the railML developers that is okay to do so then I exclude all subordinated attributes of ocpTT for locating a trains from my initially request, but I expect all other attributes of border ocpTTs not to be contradictionary. They may be left out e.g. "departure" in the first ocpTT and "arrival" in the second ocpTT, but if present in both elements, they must be equal.

> If we create the MUST criteria for the exporting system to define which
> ocpTT attributes must be identical at a border ocpTT then we also define
> must have rules for the importing system and all other railML tools.

What do you mean with "must have rules for the importing system"? I, as a developer of a importing system look for something like: "The importing system can trust, that border ocpTT do not contain contradictionary information(, except for infrastructure references). It should evaluate both ocpTT elements and merge its data".

> On the Wiki page for the ocpTT an example for such a scenario exists and
> possibly a description of the 'border ocpTT' and the clarification of
> the term makes sense. Together with this we could outline that the
> attributes a, b, c do not change at a border ocpTT in all known 'normal'
> train operation scenarios. Furthermore, no importing system is expected
> to handle/interpret changes if different attributes a, b, c were provided.

I tried to figure out, which attributes come in consideration for a, b, c and I came to the conclusion, that all attributes (if given) should be

equal, as mentioned above. So I would rather define the exception for this rule: infrastructure references.

Kind regards
Christian Rößiger

--
iRFP e. K. · Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung
Hochschulstr. 45, 01069 Dresden
Tel. +49 351 4706819 · Fax. +49 351 4768190 · www.irfp.de
Registergericht: Amtsgericht Dresden, HRA 9347