
Subject: [railML3]: Identification of preferred route path
Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Sat, 11 Jul 2020 04:41:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

currently can the path of a route from start A to destination B uniquely described. This is especially necessary, if there are more than one possible path between A and B. However, at the moment it is not possible to mark the preferred route path in case of several routes from A to B, i.e. the path which is used as standard one from A to B.

- 1) Is such a marking needed?
- 2) If such a marking needs to be included shall it be:
 - a) mark the standard path (used for the majority of routes even if only one path possible) ?
 - b) mark the alternative paths (used only in case of additional possible paths) ?

--

Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

Subject: Re: [railML3]: Identification of preferred route path
Posted by [Henrik Roslund](#) on Thu, 16 Jul 2020 07:28:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Jörg,

Here in Switzerland do we have a parameter that tells which train route between A and B is the default/preferred for the Interlocking.
If I remember correctly, in Sweden, they also have a similar parameter for the preferred train route.

Kind regards,

Henrik Roslund
Senior Consultant ETCS, MIRSE
TÜV SÜD Schweiz AG

Member of the Workgroup «ETCS Track NET»

Subject: Re: [railML3]: Identification of preferred route path
Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Fri, 17 Jul 2020 03:48:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Henrik,

it seems the first part of my question is a clear YES. But the second part is more difficult. I would prefer to name the attribute "alternativePath" for rather practical reasons. Thus the additional marking is only necessary, in case of having alternatives.

If we would use "defaultPath" instead almost each route shall be extended with this marking.

Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

Subject: Re: [railML3]: Identification of preferred route path
Posted by [Henrik Roslund](#) on Fri, 17 Jul 2020 07:31:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Jörg,

Sorry for not answering the second question.
Here comes more background information.

In Switzerland:

If there exist more train routes between A and B, the preferred train route has a variable set, which tells that this is the preferred train route.

For all other train routes between A and B is this attribute/variable not set (the variable value is empty (empty == "", but not null))

If there only one possible train route between A and B is this variable not set, the value is empty (empty == "", but not null).

How they in the planning data distinguish the preferred train route in Sweden, unfortunately, I have forgotten it.

My answer to your second question is "2a-extended":

- If it exists more than one train route between A and B, mark the preferred train route with a variable with a value, e.g. "defaultPath"/"Preferred", all other train routes is the variable not set.
- If it only exists one train route between A and B is the variable not used/not set.

Kind regards,

Henrik

Subject: Re: [railML3]: Identification of preferred route path
Posted by [Thomas Nygreen](#) on Thu, 05 Nov 2020 00:30:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Jörg,
Dear Henrik,

For a more general approach, maybe the preference should be given as a priority or rank. This would also allow ranking the alternative routes. It can be implemented similarly to Henrik's suggestion:

- * If only one route is given, the rank is not specified
- * If two or more routes are given, the preferred route is given the minimum allowed rank (e.g. 1), and the alternate routes are given a higher rank value. The different alternate routes can have the same rank, or be ordered using different ranks.

Best regards,
Thomas

Subject: Re: [railML3]: Identification of preferred route path
Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Thu, 05 Nov 2020 05:14:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks to Henrik and Thomas for the input.

Yes, the suggestion looks feasible. I will incorporate an attribute "priorityRank" as positiveInteger in
<CombinedRoute>, which is used for itinerary.

Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator
Thomas Nygreen wrote on 05.11.2020 01:30:

- > Dear Jörg,
 - > Dear Henrik,
 - >
 - > For a more general approach, maybe the preference should be
 - > given as a priority or rank. This would also allow ranking
 - > the alternative routes. It can be implemented similarly to
 - > Henrik's suggestion:
 - > * If only one route is given, the rank is not specified
 - > * If two or more routes are given, the preferred route is
 - > given the minimum allowed rank (e.g. 1), and the alternate
 - > routes are given a higher rank value. The different
 - > alternate routes can have the same rank, or be ordered using
 - > different ranks.
 - >
 - > Best regards,
 - > Thomas
 - >
-