

---

Subject: Re: infrastructure\_V094\_13

Posted by [nfrries](#) on Fri, 28 Nov 2003 14:41:36 GMT

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

---

Hi Matthias,

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

> How do you say "jein" in English? "Yo" or "Nes"?!  
> But seriously: I named this attribute "otherID" because it refers either to  
> a connection or to another switch element. I thought if I named it "connId"  
> oder "connSwitchId", it would be a little bit confusing. But if we rename  
> it, it'll be fine with me.  
> Alternatively, we could remove this attribute and introduce an attribute  
> "connId" for junctions and "connSwitchId" (or "otherSwitchId") for  
> crossovers.

Would it not be best to unify all possibilities of connecting two tracks  
i.e. always use the <connection> element? I propose to leave it like that  
except add the attribute "connDir" and change the type of "connID" to  
"uniqueIDType". As well, we do not really need both - "connId" and  
"uniqueID" - do we?

Additionally it will be linked to <junction> and <crossover> which allows  
us to cancel "branchLineId", "otherID", "branchTrackID", "branchPos" and  
"branchDir" inside the <switch> element.

> By the way, what do you think about the "location" of the new  
> <connection>-element in the scheme?  
> Alternatively, we could also place it in <trackData>.

No, it should be all right here.

>> 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?

> Yes, you're right; using two different types of IDs implies redundance. But  
> the old IDs are meant to refer to reality and are probably not globally  
> unique (e.g. the ID of a operation control point is probably "only" unique  
> within one specific country). Nevertheless we should keep them in the scheme  
> for informational purposes (like other attributes, e.g. the name).  
> I think, "uniqueId" will become a required attribute later on.

> Please have also a look on the following quotation from Joachim Büchse,  
> 25.9.03:

> --- begin quotation  
>> Hence my suggestion is:  
>>  
>> RailML should use IDs (attribute with the name ID) for main elements  
>> like track, line etc. IDs MUST be of type string. IDs SHOULD have a  
>> minimal length of 8 and a maximal length of 32 symbols. Applications  
>> SHOULD create IDs that are globally unique. Applications SHOULD preserve  
>> IDs when importing and reexporting a data set with RailML. The content  
>> of IDs MAY be arbitrarily chosen but SHOULD NOT be semantically  
>> interpreted by an application. IDs SHOULD NOT be used to order elements.  
>>  
>> Please note: I do not suggest the IDs should be used to replace  
>> attributes like `linelid`, `trackid`, etc in the current schema [except where  
>> those are only used to reference elements].  
> --- end quotation

> The remaining question is, which of those two types of IDs should be used in  
> which cases. If there should be the possibility to enter an ID (for  
> reference, which might be the case for "ocpld" of `<crossSection>`), it surely  
> would not be practical to use "uniqueid". "uniqueid" should stay an  
> attribute for datastructure-internal use only.

I agree. Logical references should not be replaced by structural references ("uniqueid"), although from the structural point of view it might define the same relation.  
Have a nice weekend,

Nikolaus

---