Subject: [railML3] Proposal of a semantic constraint for mileageChange
Posted by Milan Wölke on Thu, 20 Apr 2023 10:33:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi all,

I would like to propose the introduction of two new semantic constraints for the mileageChange element of the railML 3 infrastructure.

First one would restrict the scope of referencing spot locations with the "from" and "to" attribute to those spot locations that are enclosed by the mileageChange element that carries the attributes.

The second one would ensure that both these spot locations actually refer to the same net element.

Both these constraints should not have a negative impact on any existing interfaces as the described is actually what one would expect anyway. However, I would still propose formalizing this in order to make life easier for importing system.

What does the community think?

Best regards, Milan

Subject: Re: [railML3] Proposal of a semantic constraint for mileageChange
Posted by christian.rahmig on Thu, 04 May 2023 07:00:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Milan,

although I am not "the community" I understand your argumentation and support your SemCon proposal. So, if there are no further replies by end of next week, I suggest to adapt the SemCons accordingly.

Best regards
Christian

Subject: Re: [railML3] Proposal of a semantic constraint for mileageChange
Posted by Thomas Nygreen on Wed, 10 May 2023 13:55:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,

I think we should be very careful about assuming what (every)one expects. Why would one expect never to find a netElement that is split at a mileage change? In that case, would it not be expected that the mileage change refers to the end of one and the start of the other? Or should this be

modelled without any mileage change?

Why do we need the attributes from and to at all? Is it not given that the spot locations given for the mileage change represent the same location? And the type attribute takes care of the order.

Best regards,
Thomas

Subject: Re: [railML3] Proposal of a semantic constraint for mileageChange
Posted by christian.rahmig on Thu, 25 May 2023 19:01:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Thomas,

interesting thoughts, thank you.

For the first question regarding the location of a mileage change on more than one netElement, I would ask the community for their opinion: Do you want to model mileage changes on two netElements?

Concerning the second point: Yes, the attribute <mileageChange>@type already tells you what to expect: a gap or an overlap. Therefore, the attributes seem to be indeed redundant.

As usual I appreciate any kind of further opinion from the community...

Best regards
Christian

Subject: Re: [railML3] Proposal of a semantic constraint for mileageChange
Posted by Thomas Langkamm on Wed, 31 May 2023 14:11:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I know mileage changes only as a spot object. We have a point in the network at which we change the mileage. So I would indeed question if we need "from" and "to" as well. After all, mileages are like coordinate systems for a railway -- how would you describe a point between "from" and "to" with a single mileage?

Which would also take care of the question if we could reference 2 or more netElements.

Subject: Re: [railML3] Proposal of a semantic constraint for mileageChange
Posted by christian.rahmig on Mon, 04 Sep 2023 12:39:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Thomas, dear all,

I conclude from your remarks and feedback that the <mileageChange> attributes @from and @to shall be marked deprecated for future railML 3 versions, because they are redundant. I created a Git issue here [1].

[1] https://development.railml.org/railml/version3/-/issues/517

Best regards
Christian
