

---

Subject: Re: [railML2] Adding a new element informationArea to ocp  
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 16 Jul 2021 11:47:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Thomas,  
dear all,

Thomas Nygreen wrote on Sat, 10 July 2021 22:11

1: We should avoid two completely different <area> elements in IS (see Christian's comment from 25 June 2021). Of the options listed there, I prefer calling the new element <genericArea>. Another alternative is something like <infrastructureArea>.

thank you for your feedback on the terms. As there has been not such a big resonance on my forum post from June 25, I wanted to pickup the topic and ask again for feedback from the community: <area> or <genericArea> or <infrastructureArea>?

Thomas Nygreen wrote on Sat, 10 July 2021 22:11

2: I find the requirement that the first and final point of a polygon must be identical to be

the final edge of the polygon, from the final to the first vertex is implied. In addition to remove redundancy, this also removes the question how to interpret a provided polygon where the first and final vertices do not match. Should anyone still happen to copy the first vertex at the end, the interpretation is still unambiguous and unchanged.

Interesting point! When I developed this solution proposal I was inspired by OpenStreetMap's approach with the element <way> [1]. There, repeating the first point is required in order to distinguish between an open way and a closed way / area. As our railML area is clearly focused on an area only, we can assume that all of these geometric forms are closed. So, I support your idea. What about other opinions from the community?

[1] <https://wiki.openstreetmap.org/wiki/Way>

Best regards  
Christian