Subject: Re: Proposal for semantic constraints for usage of GML elements
Posted by Milan Wölke on Tue, 09 Dec 2025 12:49:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi all,

I agree that we need to define what the gml data is supposed to encode in railML. My current understanding would probably mostly align with option 2 of Mathias. I would still think that the proposed semcons would help to structure the multitude of options when describing where a functional infrastructure element is located.

Just to add this to the discussion as I got the feeling this is not considered yet, it is possible to repeat the gmlLocations element. That means that it is still possible to have multiple lineString with the same srsName for the same functional infrastructure element with these semcons active. From my point of view this would bring the usage of of gmlLocations closer to the usage of area-, linear-, and spotLocations. If you have a parallel description of a location you can provide that in another element. Same applies for example for areaLocation. If you have an operational point that is defined on micro and meso level (with the op spanning over multiple meso netElements) then you would need two areaLocations to encode this. One for the micro representation and one for the meso. Both representations would exist side by side describing the same object. The same would apply for gmlLocations. Each gmlLocations element would contain one semantic aspect, possible in multiply coordinate systems (srsNames).

My 3 cents.

Best regards, Milan