

Hello Susanne et.al.,

- > We discussed some open issues of the upcoming speed change / speed
- > profile enhancements (for railML version 2.2) afterwards the todays'
- > railML meeting in Dresden. I conclude the outcomes herein.
- >
- > [directions in speed changes]
- >
- > <speedChange> elements offer the "dir" attribute with the enumeration
- > values "up" and "down".
- >
- > (See also Trac ticket #145 [1] for renaming the enumeration values with
- > next major release.)
- >
- > The current enumeration value "both" is marked deprecated for more
- > clear semantics.

agreed.

- > [position of speed changes in the XML tree]
- >
- > <speedChange> elements stay where they are currently defined.
- >
- > <speedProfile> elements are seperated from the<tracks> and (with
- > respect to its container element<speedProfiles>) a direct
- > child of the<infrastructure> element.

agreed.

- > [different run history]
- >
- > The actual speed aspect depends not only on the rollingstock
- > characteristics as mentioned in the previous postings. It sometimes
- > depends on the route through a "branching station" from a macroscopic
- > point of view.
- >
- > Given the route between the neighbouring stops/stations (ocps) the
- > different speed aspects at the same track for the same rollingstock
- > characteristics may be defined.
- >
- > So far we would need two attributes for refering to<ocp id="">
- > elements at the<speedProfile> element. "from" and "to" don't help in
- > this case because they also apply to the other running direction which
- > would be confusing.

- >
- > How about the attributes "ocpRef1" and "ocpRef2"? Or "neighbour1" and "neighbour2"? Or "neighbourOcpRef1" and "neighbourOcpRef2"?
- >
- > Any other (even better) naming suggestions?

c.f. ongoing discussion in thread "speed profiles for general directions" [2]

- > [train relation]
- >
- > What is a real use case for the enumeration value "midOfTrain"? Are there any speed aspects that are valid since half of the train passed its defined position?
- >
- > If it is not the case, we would suggest not to define it.

c.f. ongoing discussion in thread "train relation" [1]

- > [minimum percentage of brake power]
- >
- > At some railway infrastructure companies the minimum percentage of brake power can't be directly calculated by means of physics. It is somehow defined by some legal body.
- >
- > Therefore we would suggest an additional attribute "minimumBrakePercentage" for this value in the <speedProfile> element.

c.f. ongoing discussion in thread "speed profiles and braking percentages" [3]

[1]
<http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/index.php?group=1&offset= 0&thread=45&id=121>

[2]
<http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/index.php?group=1&offset= 0&thread=46&id=122>

[3]
<http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/index.php?group=1&offset= 0&thread=44&id=120>

Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator
