

Dear Torben,

Am 27.03.2019 um 13:30 schrieb Torben Brand:

- > [...]
- >
- > Thank you again for your valuable critical thinking.
- > Your approach is much closer to reality. In fact this is the track number
- > rule in norway for single track lines.
- >
- > But your suggestion would require that the new attribute
- > crossSection@ocpCenterSide is set. This is not always the case.

Why not thinking it the other way around: you can derive the value of  
<crossSection>@ocpCenterSide from the sequence numbers of all the tracks?

- > For your suggestion with starting the sequence at the ocp (or main track
- > for that manner) and with tracks on both sides of the operational center of
- > the ocp we would need negative numbers for the other side of the reference.
- > Unfortunately the attribute is of type xs:positiveInteger.

The type of the attribute <ocp><propEquipment><trackRef>@sequence could  
be changed from xs:positiveInteger into xs:integer without losing  
backwards compatibility. Therefore, if there is a need for it, railML  
2.5 could have this change included.

We alternative

- > could group the sequence to their relative position to the reference (ocp
- > or main reference track). For instance:
- > - 0-99 left of the reference on line with the operational center of the ocp
- > or crossSection of the reference main track
- > - 100-199 right of the reference on line with the operational center of the
- > ocp or crossSection of the reference main track
- > - 200-299 left of the reference in front of operational center of the ocp
- > or crossSection of the reference main track
- > - 300-399 right of the reference in front of operational center of the ocp
- > or crossSection of the reference main track
- > - 400-499 right of the reference behind operational center of the ocp or
- > crossSection of the reference main track
- > - 500-599 right of the reference behind operational center of the ocp or
- > crossSection of the reference main track
- >
- > With this we also could map shunting tracks the are in the ocp and in the
- > same relative position as the secondary tracks but but with a higher
- > kilometration.

This approach seems to be a more complex one...

However, what does the rest of the community think about this proposal?

- > As the ocp has no direction, how do you define the left/right side of the
- > ocp? Here you need to either use track direction or maybe increasing
- > mileage direction. I would prefer track direction.

And I would prefer the direction of increasing mileage :-)

Any other opinions from the community?

Best regards

Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator

railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)

Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911

Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany [www.railml.org](http://www.railml.org)

---