Subject: Re: SpeedChange : Protection system reference
Posted by Christian Rahmig on Fri, 09 Nov 2012 21:29:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Susanne and other railML users,

> A "speed change" is anyway _no_ "physical infrastructure object".

That's somehow true, but worth mentioning :)

> How would you describe it in a semantic model? I think we would add both
> relations: from the speedChange to the facilities (1:n) and back (1:1).
>
> Why not to define both references like already done with the
> <connection> elements? That can be easily assured by special
> constraints. Both sights meet their requirements.

That is a good idea you are bringing up here. From the <speedChange> to
the facilities we have a 1:n relation as you correctly mentioned. But I
am not sure about the 1:1 relation from the facility to the
<speedChange>. Considering a signal, it may show different signal
aspects, which relate to different <speedChange> elements then. If we
want to implement the cross-reference at least on the same level, this
would require to reference all (relevant) signal aspects from the
<speedChange> and not the signals. This might get very big, I think.

However, it is a good idea. Regarding the running time until Zurich, I
want to ask the important question: railML 2.2 or railML 2.x/3.0?

Regards

--
Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator