
Subject: Re: RFE for connection, DE:Anschluss

Posted by on Wed, 30 May 2012 12:50:15 GMT

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

Hi to all,

- > We like to reuse the existing "connection" element to be considered as
- > "transfer connections" but without renaming or lots of restructuring.
- > Therefore we planned to just introduce some new attributes for version
- > 2.2 with a clearly defined purpose.

I agree with Joachim.

- >> I don't know the purpose of the "reason" element but to me it looks
- >> dubious. Maybe a "type" would be more appropriate and could have the
- >> values "external" (for passenger information and printout) and
- >> "internal" (for AVL systems). In fact, a further differentiation could
- >> be needed for different types of printout products and information
- >> systems, so maybe a free subtype element would be wise.
- >
- > The purpose of "reason" was to distinguish between these two main types..
- > * internal / commercial for printouts or online information systems
- > * external / operational for AVL systems
- > * other:xxx for further differentiation
- > I think "commercial/operational/other:xxx" is more specific than
- > "internal/external".

As far as I remember, the background for the 'connection' element comes from the Timetabling Theories as taught for instance here in Germany:

connection = "fahrplantechnische Bindung" (zweier Züge!)
fahrplantechnische Bindung --> Anschlussbindung, Umlaufbindung,
Belegungsbindung, Personalbindung

All of these kinds of "fahrplantechnische Bindung" should then be mapped to 'connections'. There is no distinction between external and internal as the railway is seen as a whole. So should we do in RailML.

I agree with Joachim to avoid 'external/internal' as they could be misunderstood as 'in RailML' or 'outside RailML', for instance only.

- > We have already the two attributes "minConnTime" and "maxConnTime" that
- > could be used instead of "maximalDelayTime". The "priority" is only for
- > the AVL usage and is hard to define. I'd like to leave this for a future
- > version.

I agree with Joachim.

>> And one more point: is the "trainRef" element intended for a reference
>> to a /train/? Shouldn't it refer to some ocpTT? First, a connection may
>> be between two /different/ ocps (Berlin Hbf oben / unten), and second,
>> an ocp may be traversed more than once.
>
> If we think of printouts, this would be part of the "messageText" like
> "connection to IC 7411 on platform 7b". We could not reference an ocpTT
> because there is no "id" to be referenced. I think a Reference to a
> "train" is correct.

I think it is not only about print-outs. It is also about a reading software being able to "understand" the connection - either because of transferring it into another data model or doing some function with it (e.g. calculating the connecting time or, like OpenTrack, simulating the delay of the connecting service).

Concerning the problem that one OCP may occur several times at a train, it may be left to the reading software to find the right instance (nearest departure time or so). But with the problem of connections between different OCPs it is not so easy. So, from my opinion, it would be good to have at least an optional ocpRef there.

>> I would like to implement an open enumeration list for the 'reason'
>> attribute: commercial / operational / other:xxx

I would very much agree with Susanne.

Best regards,
Dirk.
