
Subject: Re: railML3: definition of vehicle

Posted by on Wed, 26 Aug 2020 11:50:45 GMT

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

Dear Jörg,

I agree that the definition "cannot be split for operational purpose but only in a workshop" is practical for vehicles vs. vehicle parts _if_ such a distinction has to be made.

But be careful with the statement "any multiple unit is one vehicle". I could imagine you rather refer to railcars than to the original MUs where the term comes from.

For instance, from your definition the German DB-Baureihe VT 24 (624/634, 614) should be regarded as separated vehicles since they can be split in operation (automatic Scharfenberg couplers also connecting air brake tube and remote control cables). Despite that, I think that many people would regard one set (with two end cars) as one multiple unit.

In general, I think that railML should stay a bit more flexible and leave it to the use case. If passenger information is involved, it may be practical to define such rules. But for instance for rather long-term scenarios, vehicle studies or pure energy calculations, I see no reason why to force users to a certain definition of a vehicle. When we make long-term vehicle scenarios, we often want to make flexible assumptions on possible vehicle combinations such as ICx with 7 vs. 11 parts or ICE1 with 8/12/14 parts etc. We don't define a new vehicle for each assumption; we rather combine "small" vehicles. We do it like the workshop would do it, with an open-end wrench... ;-)

So if you would limit the definition of a vehicle, I'm afraid this could be too much interference into the freedom of users and internal belongings of software tools, leading to low acceptance of railML - or uncontrolled growth usage...

Best regards,
Dirk.
