
Subject: Re: [railML2] Adding a new element <turningResistance> to <ocp>
Posted by [Michael Gruschwitz](#) on Fri, 06 Aug 2021 13:18:57 GMT

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

Dear Christian, dear all,

Thank you for the modelling, which seems appropriate for us. We ask that you implement it and incorporate it into the railML 2.5 standard (as well as in the 3.x standard later on).

With regard to the <relationship>, we consider the free modelling as a string to be attractive and open for a wide range of applications, but we are afraid of various problems when importing into databases and the resulting inconsistencies. Therefore, we ask for modelling using real references for the time being.

With regard to the turning relationship, we would consider a detailed modelling with regard to train movements and shunting movements to be advantageous and submit a proposal for this.

Best regards,

--

Michael Gruschwitz
Bahnkonzept Dresden/Germany

Am 16.07.2021 um 13:22 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

- > Dear Michael,
- > dear all,
- >
- > did you already have a look at the railML 2.5 solution
- > proposal for the topic of turning resistances in OCPs [1]?
- > How do you like it? What are you missing or what would you
- > change?
- >
- > Further, here is one question from my side:
- > * A <relation> refers with its child elements <from> and
- > <to> and included attributes @line and @ocp to neighbouring
- > elements. Shall this reference be modelled using real
- > references or do we want to allow for plain text strings,
- > too? The first option requires that all referenced lines and
- > OCPs have to exist as elements in the same railML file. The
- > second option is more flexible, but provides potential for
- > conflicting entries.
- >
- > It will be great to hear about opinions and preferences of
- > the community...
- >
- > [1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/413>

- >
 - > Best regards
 - > Christian
-