Subject: [railML2] Do we need a solution to declare the states of rolling stock?
Posted by Torben Brand on Wed, 11 Nov 2020 09:57:32 GMT

Dear railML-community,

We have had a previous mishap where the wrong vehicle (and formation that is built on the vehicle) was used for runtime calculations. This as the same vehicle was in several versions in the same database/railML exchange file. The different versions were due to different states of the vehicle. In an early stage the vehicle was conceptual with "glossy marketing paper" values from the vendor. At a later stage the vehicle was planned and the values dropped/got more realistic. Finally, when the vehicle was in operation the values where investigated and found to be even lower.

To mitigate this source of potential error and to transmit more information in railML should we consider adding a construct like <states> under infrastructure (example: https://wiki2.railml.org/wiki/IS:state) in rolling stock?
Or do you suggest it's enough to demand from the user to transmit information outside railML of which correct vehicle to be used, to describe the vehicle further in the human-readable @description attribute or to purge the dataset transmitted on the desired state of vehicles (for instance only operational vehicles in data set)?

What does the community think? Any feedback is highly appreciated.

Kind regards

Torben Brand
Jernbanedirektoratet

Subject: [railML2] Re: Do we need a solution to declare the states of rolling stock?
Posted by Carsten Weber on Wed, 18 Aug 2021 08:23:59 GMT

Dear community,
dear Torben,

in my eyes your suggestion makes sense. Bound a data field like status
to the vehicle so that you can check whether it is one current in use or
it is only an idea or whatever. Maybe it should be checked before
whether all entries of the infrastructure field could be taken one by one.

Best regards.

Carsten Weber
Bahnberatung Carsten Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit

iRFP e.K.
Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung
Hochschulstraße 45
01069 Dresden

Am 11.11.2020 um 10:57 schrieb Torben Brand:
> Dear railML-community,
>
> We have had a previous mishap where the wrong vehicle (and
> formation that is built on the vehicle) was used for runtime
> calculations. This as the same vehicle was in several
> versions in the same database/railML exchange file. The
> different versions were due to different states of the
> vehicle. In an early stage the vehicle was conceptual with
> "glossy marketing paper" values from the vendor. At a later
> stage the vehicle was planned and the values dropped/got
> more realistic. Finally, when the vehicle was in operation
> the values where investigated and found to be even lower.
> To mitigate this source of potential error and to transmit
> more information in railML should we consider adding a
> construct like <states> under infrastructure (example:
> https://wiki2.railml.org/wiki/IS:state) in rolling stock?
> Or do you suggest it's enough to demand from the user to
> transmit information outside railML of which correct vehicle
> to be used, to describe the vehicle further in the
> human-readable @description attribute or to purge the
> dataset transmitted on the desired state of vehicles (for
> instance only operational vehicles in data set)?
>
> What does the community think? Any feedback is highly
> appreciated.
>
> Kind regards
>
>
> Torben Brand
> Jernbanedirektoratet

Subject: Re: [railML2] Re: Do we need a solution to declare the states of rolling stock?
Posted by Joerg von Lingen on Wed, 18 Aug 2021 14:07:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,

ticket #478 was created for the issue. A possible solution is included for review in commits [1246] and [1247].

Basically the <state> element from infrastructure was re-used in rollingstock for formation and vehicle. As a rule the information at formation shall overwrite possible information in vehicle.

Best regards,
Joerg v. Lingen - Rollingstock Coordinator

On 18.08.2021 10:23, Carsten Weber wrote:
> Dear community,
> dear Torben,
>
> in my eyes your suggestion makes sense. Bound a data field like status to the
> vehicle so that you can check whether it is one current in use or it is only an
> idea or whatever. Maybe it should be checked before whether all entries of the
> infrastructure field could be taken one by one.
>
> Best regards.
>
> Carsten Weber
> Bahnberatung Carsten Weber