

---

Subject: Re: Timetable data elements for railVIVID  
Posted by on Thu, 18 May 2017 10:59:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear all,

I am sceptical that this approach leads to a practical solution.

From my understanding:

- The aim is to avoid a railML file with only "any-fields" (after a minimum of <railML>).
- The statistic approach to reach this, which is discussed here, shall lead to a kind of "cover ratio" of railML in a railML file.

I see the following problems:

- Nobody will know which minimum "cover ratio" will be acceptable.
- It depends on the use case which elements are obligatory and which are optional. So, this approach conflicts with the concept of use cases.

I personally don't think that this should be solved in an automatic and statistic way but if you want to follow this approach, I would recommend to count only this elements which are "common to all use cases". Of course nobody knows all use cases of the future, but analogously it means: Relatively view, basic elements only. So most acceptable railML files will have a high "cover ratio".

The current list, from my opinion, is too much unbalanced by containing too many special and possibly still not all basic elements.

Best regards,  
Dirk.

---