
Subject: [Request for railML3] Different station tracks in one <ocpTT> for different <operatingPeriod>s

Posted by

on Fri, 15 Jan 2016 13:30:37 GMT

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

Hello everyone,

For railML 3 we suggest to extent the possibilities for modelling stop information in a way, that different kinds of stops can be modelled within the same <ocpTT> instance distinguished by its operating periods. Primarily, this affects a different station track usage (trackRef, serviceSection, platformEdge, etc.), but also other attributes e.g. commercial vs. operational stop, onOff, etc. Cancellation of a stop on a subset of the total operating days (which is already now possible with the stopDescription.operatingPeriodRef attribute) should also be included in the new structure.

Arrival and departure times should not be separated into different operation periods because this would most likely affect the times of the previous or following <ocpTT>. For this reason, modelling of multiple kinds of stops is only possible, if arrival and departure times are identical on all operating days.

--- German translation ---

für railML 3 schlagen wir vor, die Möglichkeiten der Abbildung von Halteinformationen so zu erweitern, dass innerhalb einer ocpTT-Instanz unterschiedliche Haltearten separiert nach Verkehrstagen abgebildet werden können. In erster Linie betrifft dies die unterschiedliche Bahnhofs-Gleisnutzung (trackRef, serviceSection, platFormEdge, etc.), aber auch andere Eigenschaften, wie kommerzieller vs. Betriebshalt, nur Ein-/Aussteigen, usw. Auch ein Halteausfall an einer Teilmenge der Gesamtverkehrstage (derzeit schon mittels stopDescription.operatingPeriodRef möglich) sollte mit Hilfe dieser neuen Struktur abbildbar sein.

Ankunfts- und Abfahrtszeiten sollten nicht nach Verkehrstagen separiert werden, da dies höchstwahrscheinlich auch die Zeiten der benachbarten <ocpTT> beeinflussen würde. Aus diesem Grund ist die Abbildung mehrerer Haltearten innerhalb der gleichen <ocpTT> nur möglich, wenn Ankunfts- und Abfahrts-Zeiten identisch sind.

Kind regards,
Christian Rößiger

--

iRFP e. K. · Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung
Hochschulstr. 45, 01069 Dresden
Tel. +49 351 4706819 · Fax. +49 351 4768190 · www.irfp.de
Registergericht: Amtsgericht Dresden, HRA 9347

Subject: Re: [Request for railML3] Different station tracks in one <ocpTT> for different <operatingPeriod>s

Posted by on Tue, 22 May 2018 13:42:37 GMT

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

Dear all,

since quite some time, there is an open demand for a functional “add-on” of railML <timetable>: It should be allowed to encode different platforms at different operating days of one <trainPart> without splitting it into two or more <trainPart>s.

The matter has been discussed lengthy during the last <TT> developer meetings and telephone conferences. The pros and cons of splitting <trainPart>s vs. introducing new elements have been discussed.

A short summary of the main cons is:

- <trainPart>s are intended to be the basic atom of trains and therefore should not be divided furtherly.
- There is already a solution for the problem by using more than one <trainPart>. Any additional solution would be a redundancy.
- This redundancy leads by tendency to higher effort and therefore higher costs for import interfaces (if there would be a need to support all possibilities).

A short summary of the main pros is:

- It seems to be state of the art to enumerate different platforms at one train since several common software programs show this feature.
- There are already other sub-elements of <trainPart> with an operatingPeriodRef.
- For passenger information, it may be a too demanding effort to re-merge information in an import interface which only have been splitted before in an export interface. This applies especially for passenger information with “aggregated” information over more than one operating day.
- This additional effort leads by tendency to higher costs and possibly lower acceptance of railML at our customers where nobody is interested in.

However, at the last <TT> developer meeting on 19.04.2018 at Berlin there has been a suggestion as a compromise. This would allow to enumerate several <trackInfo> (working title) elements at <trainPart>.<ocpTT>.<stopDescription>. Each <trackInfo> would have one @operatingPeriodRef and one @description. All such @operatingPeriodRef’s must be disjunctive and must cover (but not exceed) the @operatingPeriodRef of the <trainPart>.

It should be mentioned that this is a minimum solution which in any case needs a usage description or use case. Therefore, concerning the main “con”, in my opinion, there is no general need to support all possible (redundant) solutions in one import interface. For instance, we (iRFP) will support both technologies on export and therefore, allow the import partner to select the best solution for it’s demand. So, we regard this redundancy rather as more flexibility and better acceptance of railML.

The new “add-on” is up to be decided for railML 2.4 in near future. An example and suggestion for the scheme change can be found in the Wolke at <https://cloud.railml.org/remote.php/webdav/TT%20working%20gr>

With best regards,
Dirk.

Subject: Re: [Request for railML2.4] Different station tracks in one <ocpTT> for different <operatingPeriod>s

Posted by on Mon, 04 Jun 2018 09:55:42 GMT

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

Dear all,

contrary to its title, the previous forum post does not refer to a request for railML 3, but railML 2.4. Details on the implementation in railML can be viewed at

http://forum.railML.org/userfiles/2018-05-22_irfp_saisonierte-gleisbelegung-railml24.pdf.

The implementation of this proposal in version 2.4 was decided on May 23. We ask for comments and remarks.

With kind regards
Christian Rößiger

Am 22.05.2018 um 15:42 schrieb Dirk Bräuer:

> Dear all,

>

> since quite some time, there is an open demand for a functional “add-on” of railML <timetable>: It should be allowed to encode different platforms at different operating days of one <trainPart> without splitting it into two or more <trainPart>s.

>

> The matter has been discussed lengthy during the last <TT> developer meetings and telephone conferences. The pros and cons of splitting <trainPart>s vs. introducing new elements have been discussed.

>

> A short summary of the main cons is:

> - <trainPart>s are intended to be the basic atom of trains and therefore should not be divided furtherly.

> - There is already a solution for the problem by using more than one <trainPart>. Any additional solution would be a redundancy.

> - This redundancy leads by tendency to higher effort and therefore higher costs for import interfaces (if there would be a need to support all possibilities).

>

> A short summary of the main pros is:

> - It seems to be state of the art to enumerate different platforms at one train since several common software programs show this feature.

> - There are already other sub-elements of <trainPart> with an operatingPeriodRef.

> - For passenger information, it may be a too demanding effort to re-merge information in an

import interface which only have been splitted before in an export interface. This applies especially for passenger information with "aggregated" information over more than one operating day.

> - This additional effort leads by tendency to higher costs and possibly lower acceptance of railML at our customers where nobody is interested in.

>

> However, at the last <TT> developer meeting on 19.04.2018 at Berlin there has been a suggestion as a compromise. This would allow to enumerate several <trackInfo> (working title) elements at <trainPart>.<ocpTT>.<stopDescription>. Each <trackInfo> would have one @operatingPeriodRef and one @description. All such @operatingPeriodRef's must be disjunctive and must cover (but not exceed) the @operatingPeriodRef of the <trainPart>.

>

> It should be mentioned that this is a minimum solution which in any case needs a usage description or use case. Therefore, concerning the main "con", in my opinion, there is no general need to support all possible (redundant) solutions in one import interface. For instance, we (iRFP) will support both technologies on export and therefore, allow the import partner to select the best solution for it's demand. So, we regard this redundancy rather as more flexibility and better acceptance of railML.

>

> The new "add-on" is up to be decided for railML 2.4 in near future. An example and suggestion for the scheme change can be found in the Wolke at

> <https://cloud.railml.org/remote.php/webdav/TT%20working%20group/railML%202.4/Vorschlag%20Saisonierete%20Gleisbelegung.pdf>

>

> With best regards,

> Dirk.

>

--

iRFP e. K. · Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung

Hochschulstr. 45, 01069 Dresden

Tel. +49 351 4706819 · Fax. +49 351 4768190 · www.irfp.de

Registergericht: Amtsgericht Dresden, HRA 9347

Subject: Re: [Request for railML2.4] Different station tracks in one <ocpTT> for different <operatingPeriod>s

Posted by _____ on Fri, 22 Jun 2018 10:10:49 GMT

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

Dear all,

After internal discussion, we have decided to update our proposal for the modeling of seasonal track use in stations. The following points have been changed:

- Attribute "description" is omitted and replaced by the two attributes

"track" and "platform"

- All attributes of the new element <trackInfo> are now optional

Many Greetings
Christian Rößiger

Am 04.06.2018 um 11:55 schrieb Christian Rößiger:

> Dear all,

- >
- > contrary to its title, the previous forum post does not refer to a
 - > request for railML 3, but railML 2.4. Details on the implementation in
 - > railML can be viewed at
 - > http://forum.railML.org/userfiles/2018-05-22_irfp_saisontiert_e-gleisbelegung-railml24.pdf.
 - > The implementation of this proposal in version 2.4 was decided on May
 - > 23. We ask for comments and remarks.

--

iRFP e. K. · Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung

Hochschulstr. 45, 01069 Dresden

Tel. +49 351 4706819 · Fax. +49 351 4768190 · www.irfp.de

Registergericht: Amtsgericht Dresden, HRA 9347
