Subject: Re: [Request for railML2.4] Different station tracks in one <ocpTT> for
different <operatingPeriod>s
Posted by   on Mon, 04 Jun 2018 09:55:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,

contrary to its title, the previous forum post does not refer to a
request for railML 3, but railML 2.4. Details on the implementation in
railML can be viewed at
 http://forum.railML.org/userfiles/2018-05-22_irfp_saisoniert e-gleisbelegung-railml24.pdf.
The implementation of this proposal in version 2.4 was decided on May
23. We ask for comments and remarks.

With kind regards
Christian Rößiger

Am 22.05.2018 um 15:42 schrieb Dirk Bräuer:
> Dear all,
>
> since quite some time, there is an open demand for a functional "add-on" of railML
<timetable>: It should be allowed to encode different platforms at different operating days of one
<trainPart> without splitting it into two or more <trainPart>s.
>
> The matter has been discussed lengthy during the last <TT> developer meetings and telephone
conferences. The pros and cons of splitting <trainPart>s vs. introducing new elements have been
discussed.
>
> A short summary of the main cons is:
> - <trainPart>s are intended to be the basic atom of trains and therefore should not be divided
furtherly.
> - There is already a solution for the problem by using more than one <trainPart>. Any additional
solution would be a redundancy.
> - This redundancy leads by tendency to higher effort and therefore higher costs for import
interfaces (if there would be a need to support all possibilities).
>
> A short summary of the main pros is:
> - It seems to be state of the art to enumerate different platforms at _one_ train since several
common software programs show this feature.
> - There are already other sub-elements of <trainPart> with an operatingPeriodRef.
> - For passenger information, it may be a too demanding effort to re-merge information in an
import interface which only have been splitted before in an export interface. This applies
especially for passenger information with "aggregated" information over more than one
operating day.
> - This additional effort leads by tendency to higher costs and possibly lower acceptance of
railML at our customers where nobody is interested in.
>

> However, at the last <TT> developer meeting on 19.04.2018 at Berlin there has been a suggestion as a compromise. This would allow to enumerate several <trackInfo> (working title) elements at <trainPart>.<ocpTT>.<stopDescription>. Each <trackInfo> would have one @operatingPeriodRef and one @description. All such @operatingPeriodRef's must be disjunctive and must cover (but not exceed) the @operatingPeriodRef of the <trainPart>.
>
> It should be mentioned that this is a minimum solution which in any case needs a usage description or use case. Therefore, concerning the main "con", in my opinion, there is no general need to support all possible (redundant) solutions in one import interface. For instance, we (iRFP) will support both technologies on export and therefore, allow the import partner to select the best solution for it's demand. So, we regard this redundancy rather as more flexibility and better acceptance of railML.
>
> The new "add-on" is up to be decided for railML 2.4 in near future. An example and suggestion for the scheme change can be found in the Wolke at
> https://cloud.railml.org/remote.php/webdav/TT%20working%20gr oup/railML%202.4/Vorschlag%20Saisonierte%20Gleisbelegung.pdf
>
> With best regards,
> Dirk.
>

--
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