
Subject: Re: Partial Route

Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Sat, 17 Nov 2018 05:23:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

in comparison to railML2.3nor the list of TVD sections in the route path seems to be considered in addition to the path definition by point positions. They intend to use a similar model with releaseGroups.

Thus the question arise whether to mandatorily have the partialRoutes as reeleaseGroups in each route although each single section is released on its own.

Best regards,
Joerg v. Lingen

Interlocking Coordinator

On 07.11.2018 05:17, Joerg von Lingen wrote:

> Dear Fabiana,

>

> the path of a route is defined by start and end plus the position of facing points. This equals the concept of

> geographic interlocking. The TVD sections composing the route shall be derived from the topology.

> There was also the idea of having an element ControlTable in interlocking to gather the information in tabular style.

> However, this was deemed not really necessary and being a redundancy to the existing way to define routes. Thus it was

> not yet further developed in the schema.

>

> Best Jörg.

> Interlocking coordinator

>

> Fabiana Diotallevi wrote on 05.11.2018 17:08:

>> Hi,

>> I would like to bring this topic up because I have some
>> questions about the partial routes.

>> As far I understood, if the interlocking releases each
>> individual tvd section after use, the release group of the
>> knowsRoute can be omitted.

>> However, in this case, there would be no information about
>> the tvd sections that compose the route.

>> On the other hand, one could avoid this by defining a

>> partial route for each tvd Section (as done in the

>> simpleExample), but in this way the information would be

>> redundant.

>>

>> I was wondering whether it makes sense to reference directly
>> the tvD sections that compose the route as an alternative to
>> the partial routes.

>>

>> What do you think about that?

>>

>> Regards,

>>

>> Fabiana

>>
