
Subject: Re: infrastructure_V094_13

Posted by [nrfries](#) on Thu, 27 Nov 2003 15:47:06 GMT

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

Hello back,

thanks for your effort to integrate these elements!

- > --- begin switches ---
- > A <switch> can be either a <junction> (Abzweigung) or a <crossover>
- > (direkter Gleiswechsel). A crossover refers to another crossover, while a
- > junction refers to a <connection> element.
- > For each track, there can be at maximum 2 connection elements. A connection
- > element is meant to be the begin or the end of another track. It refers
- > either to another connection element (to connect 2 tracks) or to a switch
- > element (which has to be a junction in this case).

- > Additionally, I added the attribute "branchFile" to the switch element to
- > give the possibility to refer another railML infrastructure file in which
- > the branch track (and its superior line) is stored.

- > If a switch is a crossover, there can be appended one or more
- > <clearTrackContrElements>, which can be <trackCircuitBorders> or
- > <axleCounters>. clearTrackContrElements can also appear as "normal" track
- > elements (in trackData). This idea is fully adopted from the scheme of
- > Nikolaus and covers parts of the suggestions from Volker Knollmann.
- > --- end switches ---

What did you mean by "otherID"? Is it meant to replace the attribute "connSwitchID"?

- > --- begin unique IDs ---
- > According to the suggestions of Joachim BÜchse on sept 25 about unique IDs.
- > For a first approach, I've added an attribute named "uniqueId" to the
- > elements <infrastructure>, <line>, <track>, <ocp> and all the elements in
- > <trackData>. The "old" IDs (lineId, trackId etc.) are kept in the scheme,
- > because they are intended to correspond to "real-world"-IDs.
- > If we really introduce these unique IDs, it becomes unnecessary to provide
- > lineId, trackId and elemId to identify an track element uniquely. But we
- > could leave these attributes to accelerate search in the data structure.
- > --- end unique IDs ---

Here we will have to define how to use them. Keeping the old IDs implies once again the danger of redundant information. Is the "uniqueID" meant to become a required attribute later on?

- > --- begin other ---
- > Finally, I reintroduced the attribute "ocpld" for the element

> <crossSection>, which refers to a <ocp> and I adapted the visualisation part
> of the scheme according to the changes described above.
> --- end other ---

However, I can cope very well with this version.
Best regards,

Nikolaus
