
Subject: Re: <track>@mainDir

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 16 Apr 2018 14:51:47 GMT

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

Dear Torben,

thank you for sharing your application view that I would like to comment on from railML.org coordinators view. However, the view of the whole community is important to us.

Am 14.04.2018 um 15:23 schrieb Torben Brand:

- > We use track@mainDir in Norway in railML2.3nor for our use
- > case SCTP and capacity planning.
- >
- > <track @mainDir>
- > We use mainDir for three things:
- > 1. to indicate on a macroscopic level if the line is single
- > (mainDir="none") or double track (mainDir="up" or "down")

Actually, reasoning is only possible in one direction: if there is a single track line, it cannot have a main driving direction and the usage of @mainDir="none" is recommended (see [1]). It is not possible to conclude from the main driving direction whether a line is single track or double track. The remaining question in particular: how to distinguish between single track line and double track line without preferred main direction?

- > 2. to indicate the usual driving direction of the double
- > track

Agreed. This is the original and described intention of <track>@mainDir as modelled in railML 2.x. Since we thought to recognize a lack of usage in the community and additionally noticed a wider usage of free float in modern railways with doubled signalling in electronic signalling systems, we tried to adapt and clarify the current model to serve the community.

- > 3. to indicate the position of the track in a mesoscopic
- > level (mainDir="up" track on the right side in increasing
- > mileage)

Sorry, but I do not understand the meaning of this usage scenario. Could you please provide an example for a track with mainDir="up" and mainDir="down" following your proposal? From my current understanding, this approach does not work since the rule "driving on right side" is not unique among European railway lines and even can differ along a single railway line. However, maybe your examples may convince me ;-)

- > We ask to reverse the deprecation or give us an alternative
- > suggestion towards our mapping needs.

I respect your request and leave it up to the discussion here in the forum to come to a conclusion for railML 2.4.

[1] <https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=IS:track>

Best regards
Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany www.railml.org
