Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by Joachim.Rubröder   on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 06:37:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,
I agree that the schema should branch below the rollingstock element,
like in the infrastructure. And to rename the somehow cryptic <rs> to
<vehicle> would also be more railML like. So I will also vote for:

```
railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- vehicle     <= vehicle related
                   |
                    -- formations --- formation <= train related
```

besr regards,
Joachim Rubröder

Matthias Hengartner schrieb:
> Hello,
>
> I'd prefer not to have <formations> as another direct child-element of the
> <railml> root element. So I'm in favour of the second option.
>
> But what about separating vehicle and train related data by means of two new
> container elements? I mean something like this:
>
> railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- rs   <= vehicle related
> |
>   -- formations --- formation   <= train related
>
> The naming of these container elements (<vehicles> and <formations>) would
> have to be discussed probably (or shall we rename <rs> to <vehicle>?)
>
> This version would be similar as we have it in the infrastructure (container
> elements lines, tracks, operationControlPoints, etc.)
>
>
> Other opinions?
>
> Best regards,
> Matthias Hengartner
>
>
>
>
> "Joerg von Lingen" <jvl@bahntechnik.de> wrote in message
> news:GlwwHj9GEHA.1168@sifa...
>

```
>> Hallo,
>>
>> as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of
>
>  rollingstock scheme is 0.93
>
>> with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch.
>
>  However, it is still possible
>
>> to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:
>> 1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs      <= vehicle related
>>          |
>>           -- formations --- formation  <= train related
>>   *or*
>> 2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs       <= vehicle related
>>                     |
>>                      -- formation <= train related
>>
>> Please give me your opinions.
>>
>> Best,
>> Joerg von Lingen
>
>
>
```