Subject: Re: Restricted Areas: limitedBy vs. elements inside
Posted by Joerg von Lingen on Sat, 26 Jan 2019 04:03:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

only <isLimitedBy> for RestrictedArea, but <controlledElement> for PermissionZone

Joerg von Lingen wrote on 16.01.2019 12:08:
> Dear all,
>
> we discussed this issue on the today telco. The preference for defining areas like work zone or local operation area or
> shunting area is to use isLimitedBy only. Thus the trackAssetInArea can be removed as redundant.
>
> However, for permission zones it might be better to name all the elements which are in the "group" (area) of this
> special permission. With the now direct linking it would be no problem to have the permissionZone not an instance of
> RestrictedArea and thus having different child elements.
>
> Could you please give me your opinion concerning your practise to define each of the particular areas:
> - work zone
> - local operation area
> - shunting zone
> - permission zone
>
> Regards,
> Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator
> Thomas Nygreen wrote on 14.01.2019 13:49:
>> Dear Jörg,
>>
>> I have a strong preference for using only the <isLimitedBy>s
>> to define the area. This is also the current approach of the
>> Norwegian sector in railML2.4nor.
>> https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=636& start=0&.
>> The latter is also required (one or more). There can easily
>> be a very large number of assets within an RA, resulting in
>> a large number of such references. Through the topology and
>> positioning systems these assets are easily identifiable
>> without direct references.
>>