Subject: V1.00 RC1: switchRef/crossingRef
Posted by Matthias Hengartner on Tue, 28 Sep 2004 13:01:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,

I'm fine with the changes and answers in the discussion thread of V.095-02.

There are some little remarks and questions left about V1.0 RC1.

One of them is about switches/crossings on trackBegin/trackEnd (as mentioned in the discussion thread v.095.02).

In Berlin, we forgot to discuss about the implementation of switches/crossings which are placed on a <trackBegin>/<trackEnd>. In the last thread of this newsgroup, I suggested the following:
"I'd prefer to have only a reference to a switch/crossing which is located in the <connections>-container."

Concretely, I have the following outlined example of a very simple possible implementation of this idea:

```
----------------------------
<track trackID="track1" ...>
    <trackTopology>
        <trackBegin>
            ...
        </trackBegin>
        <trackEnd>
            <switchRef elemIDRef="SW01"/>
        </trackEnd>
        <connections>
            <switch elemID="SW01" ...>
                <connection connectionID="connection1A"...(to track2,
connection2)/>
                <connection connectionID="connection1B"...(to track3,
connection3)/>
            </switch>
        </connections>
    <trackTopology>
</track>
<track trackID="track2" ...>
    <trackTopology>
        <trackBegin>
            <simpleConnection ...>
                <connection connectionID="connection2" ... (to track1,
connection1A)/>
            </simpleConnection>
```

```
        </trackBegin>
        <trackEnd>
            ...
        </trackEnd>
</track>
<track trackID="track3" ...>
    <trackTopology>
        <trackBegin>
            <simpleConnection ...>
                <connection connectionID="connection3" ... (to track1,
connection1B)/>
            </simpleConnection>
        </trackBegin>
        <trackEnd>
            ...
        </trackEnd>
</track>
----------------------------
```

Explanations:

- elemIDRef is required and must refer to a switch within the SAME <track>!! For tracks which begin/end connected to a switch of another track, we have the <simpleConnection>

- in the example above (and in fact in case in which we use this construct), we have 3 tracks which are connected in one switch. The switch is defined in exactly ONE of these tracks (in our example in track1), the other 2 tracks are connected via simpleConnections.

```
                    / track3
                   /
                  /
track1 --------/--------------track2
```

- analogously, there would be a crossingRef as child of <trackEnd>/<trackBegin>, which would refer to a <crossing>. analogous to the previous explanation point, there are normally 4 tracks which are connected in one crossing, the crossing is defined in exactly ONE of these tracks, and the other 3 tracks are connected via simpleConnections.

This is a possible modelling. Please tell me your opinion about this. Especially, I'm not quite sure if it's ok that we have only the attribute "elemIDRef" in <switchRef>/<crossingRef>. Perhaps, we should include some attributes like "pos" ore "elemID" there, too. What do you think?

Thanks for your answers and best regards

Matthias Hengartner

Matthias Hengartner

++ 41 1 633 31 09
hengartner@ivt.baug.ethz.ch

"Ulrich Linder" <ULinder@Railways.TU-Berlin.de> wrote in message
news:cirfid$b0k$1@sifa.ivi.fhg.de...
> Hello,
>
> the first release candidate of V1.00 is released:
>
> http://www.railml.org/genesis/infrastructure
>
> The handling of switches and crossings is improved. The orientation and
the
> course of a connection is moved from the switch/crossing the the relevant
> "connection"-child. Look at the discussion thread of V0.95-02 for more
> informations about other (minor) changes.
>
> With best regards
>
> Ulrich Linder
>
> ------------------------------
> Dr.-Ing. Ulrich Linder
> Linder Rail Consult

> D-14169 Berlin
>
> Tel. +49.30.84 72 56 87
> Fax. +49.30.84 47 11 56
>
> Email mailto:Ulrich.Linder@linder-rail-consult.de
> www http://www.Linder-rail-consult.de
>

>
>
>