

[another try]

Hello,

there are some open discussion points about the V1.00 RC1.  
Since it's planned to release V1.00 tomorrow, I give a summary of them here.

\*\*\* switches/crossings on <trackBegin>/<trackEnd>\*\*\*

3 suggestions for modelling these:

1) according to my posting (28.09.04, 15:01) and Volker Knollmann's posting (29.9.04, 11:54), with <switchRef>/<crossingRef> as child-element of <trackBegin>/<trackEnd>, with the convention/restriction (how ever you call it) to let the <switch>-element be part of track at the switch's tip.

2) according to my posting (4.10.04, 14:57): Abandon the "special treatment" of switches/crossings on <trackBegin>/<trackEnd>.

3) according to my posting of today (14.10.04, 18:00): Reference from a <simpleConnection> to a <switch>/<crossing> on the same track.

\*\*\* signals \*\*\*

suggestions from Gregor Theeg:

1) discard attributes "automatic" + "dangerpoint"

2) discard subelements <vdirect> + <vdistant>

3) additional attributes "trackDist" + "height"

4) split attribute "maskable" into "maskableRoute" and "maskableATC"

5) additional subelements <identification>, <position>, <physical>, <signalAspects>

--> In my opinion, we could also leave the "elementBaseType"-attributes (elemID, name, absPos, pos, dir) in the <signal>-element, and the subelement <geoCoord> as (direct) child-element of <signal>.

\*\*\* speedChanges \*\*\*  
suggestion from Gregor Theeg:  
discard attribute "vRestricted" (\*\*)

\*\*\* blocks \*\*\*  
suggestion from Gregor Theeg:  
discard <blocks>/<block> (\*\*)

I think, these suggestions from Gregor Theeg can be adopted, since most of them won't bring any problems for the further development.

.... more to come tomorrow!

Best regards from Zurich (meanwhile in pitch dark clouds...)  
Matthias

---