
Subject: Re: [railML2] Extension of annotations for passenger information within trains

Posted by

on Wed, 24 Mar 2021 12:47:27 GMT

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

Hello Milan and Thomas,

it was very helpful for me to see how the proposed extensions should be used in an XML example. I agree with Milan on many points in this.

Am 22.03.2021 um 16:28 schrieb Milan Wölke:

- > Regarding an origin and destination text other
- > than the last station we actually already have something in
- > railML, that is being introduced with railML 2.5.

Just one addition to this: The railML 2.5 elements <origin> and <destination> mentioned by Milan are subelements of <trainPart> (not of <train>). This is the right place from my point of view, because different <origin>s and <destinations> can occur for a coupled/shared <train> at the same time.

- > Regarding the current station, I have to admit I'm a bit
- > confused. I would interpret your requirement here, that you
- > need a way to determine a valid station name for displays
- > and announcements of the next station. I would presume the
- > next station itself would be determined by your system on
- > its own. Regarding how to specify these aspects, I would
- > propose to introduce a new root element below timetable
- > (/railML/timetable/passengerInfoForInfrastructure - the name
- > could be debated), that would reference the actual ocp's of
- > the infrastructure and provide the necessary passenger info
- > details. From my point of view that would be a working
- > theory at first. Once the actual structure of this was
- > specified and discussed, we could ask the infrastructure
- > group to incorporate that model into infrastructure itself,
- > as in my opinion that is rather an infrastructure dependent
- > content than a timetable dependent one. > <railML>

```
> <timetable>
>   <passengerInfoForInfrastructure>
>     <ocpPIs>
>       <ocpPI ocpRef="..." code="...">
>         <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>         <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>       </ocpPI>
>     </ocpPIs>
>     <platformPIs>
>       <platformPI>...</platformPI>
>     </platformPIs>
```

```

> <trackPIs>
>   <trackPI>...</trackPI>
> </trackPIs>
> </passengerInfoForInfrastructure>
> </timetable>
> </railML>
>
> That would be the general outline of this new section. In
> contrast to your approach I would simply add this to the
> file and not reference it from neither trainPart nor ocpTT.
> Since ocpTT is referencing an ocp anyway, it should be
> possible to determine the mapped passenger information by
> checking for entries in passengerInfoForInfrastructure that
> refer to that ocp.
Good suggestion.

```

What bothered me about Thomas' design was that sometimes the `<annotation>` is referenced directly from the `<trainPart>` and sometimes the `<ocpTT>` initially references the `<ocp>` and from there the `<annotation>`. I would prefer a unified solution (direct reference from the `<trainPart>` or `<ocpTT>` to the `<annotation>`), what is provided by Milans proposal. Another argument for this is, that different trains may use different `<annotation>`s at the same station, e.g. due to different display sizes or requirements of the railway undertaking. I would therefore rather avoid referencing `<annotation>`s from an `<ocp>`.

```

> Regarding the target you are suggesting, could you provide
> us with a list of necessary values for that enumeration. For
> the annotations we have the option to specify one or more
> additionalNames. This could be used to classify texts as
> well. For example you could specify it like this:

```

```

>
> <ocpPIs>
>   <ocpPI ocpRef="ocpHH" code="...">
>     <additionalName name="FrontDisplayText"/>
>     <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>     <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>   </ocpPI>
>   <ocpPI ocpRef="ocpHH" code="...">
>     <additionalName name="SideDisplayText"/>
>     <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>     <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>   </ocpPI>
>   <ocpPI ocpRef="ocpHH" code="...">
>     <additionalName name="InteriorDisplayText"/>
>     <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>     <text xml:lang="...">...</text>
>   </ocpPI>

```

> </ocpPIs>

For this aspect, I would prefer the use of a "real" enum, as suggested by Thomas ("target" attribute). This way, at least the most common values can be defined in the schema.

As a consequence of this approach, we would need different annotation types with different attributes, e.g.:

- annotation (standard, without further special attributes)
- ocpAnnotation (with additional attribute "target")
- trackAnnotation (with additional attribute "class")

So far my ideas.

Best Regards

Christian

--

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
