Subject: Re: More detailed 'speed change' definitions
Posted by Christian Rahmig on Sat, 16 Jun 2012 16:59:33 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello Susanne et.al.,

> We discussed some open issues of the upcoming speed change / speed
> profile enhancements (for railML version 2.2) afterwards the todays'
> railML meeting in Dresden. I conclude the outcomes herein.
>
> [directions in speed changes]
>
> <speedChange> elements offer the "dir" attribute with the enumeration
> values "up" and "down".
>
> (See also Trac ticket #145 [1] for renaming the enumeration values with
> next major release.)
>
> The current enumeration value "both" is marked deprecated for more
> clear semantics.

agreed.

> [position of speed changes in the XML tree]
>
> <speedChange> elements stay where they are currently defined.
>
> <speedProfile> elements are seperated from the<tracks> and (with
> respect to its container element<speedProfiles>) a direct
> child of the<infrastructure> element.

agreed.

> [different run history]
>
> The actual speed aspect depends not only on the rollingstock
> characteristics as mentioned in the previous postings. It sometimes
> depends on the route through a "branching station" from a macroscopic
> point of view.
>
> Given the route between the neighbouring stops/stations (ocps) the
> different speed aspects at the same track for the same rollingstock
> characteristics may be defined.
>
> So far we would need two attributes for refering to<ocp id="">
> elements at the<speedProfile> element. "from" and "to" don't help in
> this case because they also apply to the other running direction which
> would be confusing.

>
> How about the attributes "ocpRef1" and "ocpRef2"? Or "neighbour1" and
> "neighbour2"? Or "neighbourOcpRef1" and "neighbourOcpRef2"?
>
> Any other (even better) naming suggestions?

c.f. ongoing discussion in thread "speed profiles for generl directions" [2]

> [train relation]
>
> What is a real use case for the enumeration value "midOfTrain"? Are
> there any speed aspects that are valid since half of the train passed
> its defined position?
>
> If it is not the case, we would suggest not to define it.

c.f. ongoing discussion in thread "train relation" [1]

> [minimum percentage of brake power]
>
> At some railway infrastructure companies the minimum percentage of
> brake power can't be directly calculated by means of physics. It is
> somehow defined by some legal body.
>
> Therefore we would suggest an additional attribute
> "minimumBrakePercentage" for this value in the<speedProfile> element.

c.f. ongoing discussion in thread "speed profiles and braking
percentages" [3]

[1]
 http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/index.php?group=1&offset= 0&thread=45&id=121

[2]
 http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/index.php?group=1&offset= 0&thread=46&id=122

[3]
 http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/index.php?group=1&offset= 0&thread=44&id=120

Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator