Subject: Re: Schema version 1.00 RC1 released Posted by Volker Knollmann on Wed, 29 Sep 2004 16:10:46 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi again,

I have a few remarks regarding the concept of the "generalElements". First of all: I really appreciate the idea of that element.

As I explained in Berlin, we have to store various kinds of data and the scope of that data is (currently) beyond the scope of railML. It is a good concept to have a kind of "allround-element" / "dustbin" / "whatever-you-like-to-call-it" to store non-railML data while still being conformitive with the standard.

I would suggest to extend the concept of "generalElements" to other branches of <track>. I can imagine a <generalOCSElements>-container (child of <ocsElements>) and a <generalTrackData>-container (child of <track>).

I give you an example:

I need to store the information, from which station / interlocking (ocpID) a switch is controlled. One method would be to introduce an additional attribute for <switch> (e. g. ocpRefID). Doing so, my xml-file could never again be validated against the official scheme.

The second method would be to have an item called <generalTrackData>, which stores arbitrary data. I would introduce a child <switchOcpMappings> and store my information in some childs like <switchOcpMapping switchRefID="42" ocpID="88"/>. No application except our laboratory would care about that, the file remains valid, everybody's happy.

Of course I see the danger that everybody stores information in the general container instead of the "real" railML-tree. But we should try; and maybe we can move some data structures which proove to be well designed and accepted to the official tree in a later release.

We talked about that topic shortly in Berlin and there seemed to be some acceptance. Since my suggestion is only a minor change to the schema (but with major improvements), we can get an agreement on that topic before the final freeze of V1.0.

Looking forward to your comments, Volker Knollmann