

---

Subject: Re: Semantic Constraints for Train Section  
Posted by [Milan Wölke](#) on Wed, 22 Feb 2023 14:33:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi all,

in another discussion among the timetable developer group, we found that the semantic constraints would need to be restricted to allow for overlapping in certain scenarios. We found that overlapping would need to be allowed for cancellations as well as for on-request trains. This would apply for both, commercial and operational train sections.

The reasoning behind this is that if a section of a variant is cancelled, it should be possible to describe the replacement. That replacement would then overlap with the cancelled section.

Similarly, it should be possible to describe multiple on-request train sections that could be run if requested.

However the developer group also agreed that a semantic constraint would make sense if those exceptions would be made. That would mean, that the above wording proposals would need to be adapted:

Quote:

The itinerary sections of an `operationalTrainVariant`, defined by the `operationalTrainSections` and their respective ranges, that are not cancelled and not marked as `onRequest`, must be pairwise disjoint, except for their respective first and last `baseItineraryPoints`.

The second proposed rule, from my point of view, still applies.

Quote:

The first(last) `baseItineraryPoint` of each `operationalTrainSection` within an `operationalTrainVariant` must either be the referenced itinerary's first(last) base point, or coincide with another section's last(first) base point.

What are your thoughts on this. Do you see other scenarios, where these proposed semantic constraints would pose a problem?

Thanks in advance for your contribution.

Best regards, Milan

---