

---

Subject: Something about platforms, platformEdges, serviceSections and their relation to a track

Posted by [Carsten Weber](#) on Tue, 20 Nov 2012 10:03:17 GMT

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

---

Dear infrastructure users,

regarding to the current developer version and the discussions at the

1. At the moment I can not see any real difference between the <platformEdge> and the <serviceSection>. The <platformEdge> is predefined for passenger exchange and <serviceSection> describes the same things for all other things which can be exchanged between vehicles and the current station. So for me it is usefull to combine both elements by adding the boolean attribute /passengerExchange/ to the <serviceSection>. Please make sure that such combined "platforms" exist. For example at Wien Westbahnhof you can load or unload your car at the same platform where you board or disembarque the coaches. It think it is not a use case to describe this platform as a <platformEdge> and a <serviceSection> too.

2. Both elements (<serviceSection> and <platformEdge>) are at the moment a child of ONE track. This will bring trouble in a case where you will find a point at the platform section if you use the microscopic infrastructure model. So you have to change the track at the platform. In the current version you will find the first section at track A and the second section at track B but both sections are one and the same platform. At the end it means you have to put the elements at the same level like tracks. So every element has to have the option to define one or more relations to a track. This relation includes the ref to a track, the position at the track, the direction, the side and so one. For further use it would be usefull to group these coordinates in an attribute group to recall them several times and for use in other elements which might be described in the (near?) future. (This topic is the same for tunnels, bridges, levelCrossings and so on.)

3. It would be usefull to implement an element like <platform> which has several childs like <serviceSection> or <platformEdge> (or maybe both). So you can find out whether a connection will be done at the same platform or not. This is helpful if you do some routing for passenger information. This mother element can also include the link to an ocp so it can be taken away from the <platformEdge>. So you are also able to link a <platform> or a <platformEdge> depending on the information you want to give to the following systems.

<platformEdges> from an ocpTT. (This is more topic for timetable scheme).

Best regards.

---

Subject: Re: Something about platforms, platformEdges, serviceSections and their relation to a track

Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2012 20:08:41 GMT

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

---

Dear Carsten,

> 1. At the moment I can not see any real difference between the  
> <platformEdge> and the <serviceSection>. The <platformEdge> is predefined  
> for passenger exchange and <serviceSection> describes the same things for  
> all other things which can be exchanged between vehicles and the current  
> station. So for me it is usefull to combine both elements by adding the  
> boolean attribute /passengerExchange/ to the <serviceSection>. Please make  
> sure that such combined "platforms" exist. For example at Wien Westbahnhof  
> you can load or unload your car at the same platform where you board or  
> disembarque the coaches. It think it is not a use case to describe this  
> platform as a <platformEdge> and a <serviceSection> too.

your comment made me smile, because in the forum discussion in [1] we agreed on defining two separate types for describing platforms and service sections. However, they are not that different anyway and the <serviceSection> element contains the same attributes as a <platformEdge> plus few boolean parameters for further specification of the provided service. In case there is a PLATFORM where passengers can board the coaches AND the vehicle can be loaded etc., you need to define both elements: a <serviceSection> and a <platformEdge>.

> 2. Both elements (<serviceSection> and <platformEdge>) are at the moment a  
> child of ONE track. This will bring trouble in a case where you will find a  
> point at the platform section if you use the microscopic infrastructure  
> model. So you have to change the track at the platform. In the current  
> version you will find the first section at track A and the second section at  
> track B but both sections are one and the same platform. At the end it means  
> you have to put the elements at the same level like tracks. So every element  
> has to have the option to define one or more relations to a track. This  
> relation includes the ref to a track, the position at the track, the  
> direction, the side and so one. For further use it would be usefull to group  
> these coordinates in an attribute group to recall them several times and for  
> use in other elements which might be described in the (near?) future. (This  
> topic is the same for tunnels, bridges, levelCrossings and so on.)

Having a platform that is longer than one track remains a problem, which cannot be solved at the level of the track-referenced platform-edges. As you correctly mentioned, this requires an element at the same level like

tracks, and thus is independent from the single track. In my opinion, this aspect is closely linked with your next point...

- > 3. It would be useful to implement an element like <platform> which has
- > several children like <serviceSection> or <platformEdge> (or maybe both). So
- > you can find out whether a connection will be done at the same platform or
- > not. This is helpful if you do some routing for passenger information. This
- > mother element can also include the link to an ocp so it can be taken away
- > from the <platformEdge>. So you are also able to link a <platform> or a
- > <platformEdge> depending on the information you want to give to the
- > following systems.

I absolutely agree with you that the <platformEdge> is not sufficient to model the complete functionality of the "operational platform" such as interchanges between platform edges situated at the same platform. Therefore, the introduction of a track-independent new element <platform> is a good idea. Until now, I thought about this enhancement as a topic for railML version 2.x with x>2 since I wanted to give it some time in order to see how the introduced element <platformEdge> is being used by the railML applicators before further extensions.

- > 4. As discussed in Zürich it is necessary to link two <platform> or
- > <platformEdges> from an ocpTT. (This is more topic for timetable schema).

How about the possibility of grouping platform edges similar to the concept of the ocp grouping? Using the optional parameter "parentPlatformEdgeRef" several platform edges (with lengths) can refer to their common parent platform edge (without length). The ocpTT from the timetable schema may then refer to the parent platform edge and there is no need for further references.

[1] <http://www.railml.org/forum/ro/?group=1&offset=0&thead=40&id=104>

Regards

--

Christian Rahmig  
railML.infrastructure coordinator

---

Subject: Re: Something about platforms, platformEdges, serviceSections and their relation to a track

Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2012 21:26:02 GMT

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

---

Dear railML users,

- >> 3. It would be useful to implement an element like <platform> which has

>> several childs like <serviceSection> or <platformEdge> (or maybe  
>> both). So  
>> you can find out whether a connection will be done at the same  
>> platform or  
>> not. This is helpful if you do some routing for passenger information.  
>> This  
>> mother element can also include the link to an ocp so it can be taken  
>> away  
>> from the <platformEdge>. So you are also able to link a <platform> or a  
>> <platformEdge> depending on the information you want to give to the  
>> following systems.

>  
> I absolutely agree with you that the <platformEdge> is not sufficient to  
> model the complete functionality of the "operational platform" such as  
> interchanges between platform edges situated at the same platform.  
> Therefore, the introduction of a track-independent new element  
> <platform> is a good idea. Until now, I thought about this enhancement  
> as a topic for railML version 2.x with x>2 since I wanted to give it  
> some time in order to see how the introduced element <platformEdge> is  
> being used by the railML appliers before further extensions.

I filed a trac ticket for this aspect [1].

[1] <https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/209>

Regards

--

Christian Rahmig  
railML.infrastructure coordinator

---

Subject: Re: Something about platforms, platformEdges, serviceSections and their relation to a track

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2012 22:30:19 GMT

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

---

Dear Christian, Carsten and others,

Christian Rahmig <coord@infrastructure.railml.org> writes:

>> 4. As discussed in Zürich it is necessary to link two <platform> or  
>> <platformEdges> from an ocpTT. (This is more topic for timetable scheme).

>  
> How about the possibility of grouping platform edges similar to the  
> concept of the ocp grouping? Using the optional parameter  
> "parentPlatformEdgeRef" several platform edges (with lengths) can  
> refer to their common parent platform edge (without length). The ocpTT  
> from the timetable schema may then refer to the parent platform edge

> and there is no need for further references.

I'm sorry I don't really understand the difference between this aspect (Trac ticket #122, comment #8, [1]) and the one written in Trac ticket #209 [2].

The grouping of platform edges offers the possibility to refer only one platform from the ocpTT (from the train part). That's is already an important step into the direction of modelling "real" platforms.

The "parentPlatformEdgeRef" should only refer to platform edges that are "in sequence" not "parallel", shouldn't it? If you may group "parallel platform edges" that would mean to model a "platform" and should not be defined with the same "parentPlatformEdgeRef".

If the "parent platform edge" should not have any length and/or height parameters (what I would prefer because of reduced redundancy) their should be another element definition for it. It is not similar to the 'ocp concept' because you may not "overwrite" some features at the children level and inherit some features from the parent level. It is more or less a grouping concept like the "trackGroup/line" concept.

This would possibly need to define two distinct levels, one for single platform edges with defined length and height and side values and one for grouping them with the ocpRef reference. The grouping element should be referred from the ocpTT. That would enable to define a "platform number" without any knowledge of length and height.

Any comments appreciated.

[1] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/122#comment:8>

[2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/209>

Kind regards...  
Susanne

--

Susanne Wunsch  
Schema Coordinator: railML.common

---

Subject: Re: Something about platforms, platformEdges, serviceSections and their relation to a track

Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Thu, 22 Nov 2012 08:46:37 GMT

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

---

Good morning Susanne,

- > I'm sorry I don't really understand the difference between this aspect
- > (Trac ticket #122, comment #8, [1]) and the one written in Trac ticket
- > #209 [2].

The Trac ticket #209 was created, because I closed the ticket #122, which belongs to railML 2.2 while the topic of a track-independent <platform> element belongs to railML 2.x or higher.

- > The grouping of platform edges offers the possibility to refer only one
- > platform from the ocpTT (from the train part). That's is already an
- > important step into the direction of modelling "real" platforms.
- >
- > The "parentPlatformEdgeRef" should only refer to platform edges that are
- > "in sequence" not "parallel", shouldn't it? If you may group "parallel
- > platform edges" that would mean to model a "platform" and should not be
- > defined with the same "parentPlatformEdgeRef".

The parameter "parentPlatformEdge" is only used for grouping platform edges "in sequence" e.g. platform edges with different heights that still form one physical PLATFORM EDGE. As you correctly mentioned, the grouping of platform edges at one PLATFORM will be only possible with the <platform> element suggested in Trac ticket #209.

- > [1] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/122#comment:8>
- > [2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/209>

Regards

--

Christian Rahmig  
railML.infrastructure coordinator

---