

---

Subject: Re: Request for a new optional attribute for train coupling and sharing  
Posted by \_\_\_\_\_ on Fri, 26 Feb 2016 09:02:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Philip,

I know about the "conclusion" of the meeting in Berlin on this subject and of course, we can easily accept it by implementing an own railML extension.

I only want to warn because I think that "only for two data consumers" should not be a real reason to refuse a suggestion. Always somebody will be the first, won't it?

I think any reason for refusing a suggestion should be a technical one. So which technical reason can be said against our suggestion? So far, I think iRFP has always tried to argue with technical background so shouldn't we have the right to get a technical answer as well, should we?

--

My concern is not a personal or embittered one but I am worried about that we come to a stand still with the development of <timetable> if we block improvements in railML 2.x and at the same time do not go ahead with 3.x. iRFP has also made several attempts to start a <timetable> 3.x with came to nothing so far, and in the case of the Berlin meeting do not even have been discussed.

Sorry, but I think we have come to a stand still. I ask myself what we should get some greater steps forward with <timetable> if even the smaller steps are blocked. You should be careful not to administrate a <monster> 2.x which went into a mess.

Best regards,  
Dirk.

---

Am 18.02.2016 um 16:31 schrieb Philip Wobst:

> Dear Dirk,  
>  
> this topic was discussed during the timetable developer  
> meeting in Berlin last month and the conclusion was that it  
> is not needed as a temporary solution for 2.3 if the use  
> case exists only for iRFP and one other potential data  
> consumer.  
> If you do have any further questions please do not hesitate  
> to contact me directly.  
>

> BR, Philip

---