Subject: Re: Datatype for distance in sectionTT
Posted by on Mon, 26 Mar 2012 09:29:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hallo Christoph and all other,

this is a known problem since a long time. I do not know the origins anymore but we already had discussions about it some years ago. I guess some of the reasons may be that, the decimal separator in XML and Switzerland is the thousand separator in Germany (a dot), and there are 6 (!) fraction digits allowed in this unit which really does not make sense if it is meters...

At the moment, we (iRFP) take part at the confusion by writing km into our RailML files and so we violate the XSD. (We write "distance='0.460'" which shall mean 460 meters and not 460 kilometers.)

However, we cannot change it back in time for RailML 2.0 but we still can change it in RailML 2.1 (which is shortly before release here) and we surely will change it in 2.2. So, I would prefer to write meters ("distance='460'" in the example above) and this is my recommendation. This would mean not to change the XSD but to change the examples and FBS output.

If all the others agree (and this means especially the companies reading FBS RailML output), we will do so from our 2.1 release but we will never change our 2.0 output.

Sorry for my contingent of this confusion...

Best regards,
Dirk.

Subject: Datatype for distance in sectionTT
Posted by Christoph.Jobmann on Mon, 26 Mar 2012 10:27:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello everyone,

during recent discussions it was noted that the attribute "distance" of the element "sectionTT" is interpreted as length in km, at least it looks this way in the examples.
Yet the schema defines its type as "tLengthM" instead of "tLengthKM".

I would appreciate if there was clarification whether the error lies within the examples or within the schema.

Kind regards
Christoph Jobmann

--
----== posted via PHP Headliner ==----

Subject: Re: Datatype for distance in sectionTT
Posted by Susanne Wunsch railML on Mon, 26 Mar 2012 20:22:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello Dirk, Christoph and others interested,

Dirk Bräuer <dirk.braeuer@irfp.de> writes:

> this is a known problem since a long time. I do not know the origins
> anymore but we already had discussions about it some years ago.

+1

> So, I would prefer to write meters ("distance='460'" in the example
> above) and this is my recommendation. This would mean not to change
> the XSD but to change the examples and FBS output.

That would be easier for us maintaining the schemas. But is it helpful
for the export and import interfaces?

I thought that the distance between two 'ocp's should be in kilometers
as well. If we look into the new rostering sub-schema we introduced the
attribute 'runLength' in the element 'blockPart'. It should be given in
kilometers.

We should harmonize both values, either the sectionTT or the blockPart
attribute.

BTW all infrastructure length values are expected in meters. That may be
a cause for this "old" attribute.

....just my 2 cents

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common

Subject: Re: Datatype for distance in sectionTT
Posted by on Fri, 30 Mar 2012 10:50:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello to all,

with my statement

> but we will never change our 2.0 output

I did not want to force any additional work at other software companies.
Of course we can change our 2.0 output but with a different dc:identifier
(see Header information, Dublin Core Metadata Element Set) only. So there
would be two different kinds of 2.0 output of FBS. If someone wants to
implement such a 2.0 please contact us.

On the other hand there seams to be no other 2.0 files at the moment and
no import interface which cannot handle the distances in kilometers. So
there seams to be no reason to change anything in 2.0.

> That would be easier for us maintaining the schemas. But is it helpful
> for the export and import interfaces?

I have the agreement of PTV to
- keep importing kilometers in 2.0
- accept meters from 2.1

There are several other interfaces (companies, software) dealing with our
2.0 output. But due to the (sadly) happenings on station identification
(abbreviation, code, number...) I think that none of them can handle 2.1
without any change in programming. And if there has to be a change in
programming at all, it should be a little work to change the kilometers in
meters.

This is my opinion, and so I would prefer this solution and it is also ok
for PTV. Anyway, we have to decide it very soon. SO PLEASE ANY OF THE
OTHER SOFTWARE COMPANIES PLEASE READ THIS AND WRITE WHETHER IT IS OK FOR

YOU OR NOT... ;-)

> I thought that the distance between two 'ocp's should be in kilometers
> as well.

> BTW all infrastructure length values are expected in meters.

I have a strong preference on not using floating point (non-integer)
values at all. Of course, in XML everything is string so even the values
with decimal separator in RailML could be assumed to be fixed-pointed. But
a decimal value in RailML could mislead to put in into a float-point value

in programming. This should be be avoided in any case. So let's skip that unnecessary decimal separator! It only makes the RailML file unnecessary longer...

It's ok to have all IS length values in meters. Let's do so in TT.

Dirk.

Subject: Re: Datatype for distance in sectionTT
Posted by Susanne Wunsch railML on Tue, 06 Nov 2012 10:06:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dirk Bräuer <dirk.braeuer@irfp.de> writes:
> It's ok to have all IS length values in meters. Let's do so in TT.

I filed a Trac ticket for this issue (for next major release):

https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/179

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common

Subject: Re: Datatype for distance in sectionTT
Posted by Joachim Rubröder railML on Tue, 06 Nov 2012 14:19:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello to all,

Dirk wrote:
> I have the agreement of PTV to
> - keep importing kilometers in 2.0
> - accept meters from 2.1

I agree, the field 'distance' is implemented as length in [m] and documented in the same way. Therefore ony the examples are wrong and misleading.

I'll change them: http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/180

If certain exporting and importing Programs agreed to use the field 'distance' with [km] it's fine for them. For a new implementation within a

future version 2.2, the field should be used with [m].

Kind regards,

Joachim

--
----== posted via PHP Headliner ==----