Subject: Re: Extension suggestion for on which (track)side of a crosSection the referenced ocp is
Posted by   on Tue, 21 Aug 2018 15:32:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Torben and all,

so far, an <ocp> was not intended to be a station, building or any other material object. It was simply intended to be a _virtual_ cross-section, a reference place to measure run-times in timetables, so a "linkable container" to reference infrastructure from timetables.

Concerning infrastructure itself (i. e. "material" things), railML was rather intended to be a microscopic model. Any real objects as signal boxes, station buildings etc. should be modelled as own <element>s, not as part of <ocp>. Otherwise, we would get much redundancy, since many of such objects already are available as <element>s and also need to be modelled as <element>s.

Of course it is possible to make compromises and also to leave the original intention. But please take into account always to avoid redundancy as much as possible. The more we try to make railML to be a "Swiss army knife", the more difficult it will be to use and to understand. Therefore, at the end, this could also lead to reduced acceptance.

Please consider that there are many <ocp>s which are not linkable to any station building nor signal box.

Please consider that one station building or signal box is normally linked to more than one track, possibly of different lines.

Please consider that station buildings and signal boxes may also be placed between, above or below tracks.

> In the Norwegian national version of network statement ...
> we also declare on which side of a line the
> station/stoppingPoint is placed.

Why? Which functionality do you want to express by that? In railML, you already have <platforms> which can be placed left and/or right of <track>s. Wouldn't it be equal or even better to use the already existing <platform> railML elements for the purpose you intend?

Ok, I will keep back from this discussion in future, only asking for much sensibility and thinking twice before adding more <ocp> properties.

Best regards,
Dirk.