
Subject: Re: Mapping of availability periods of the infrastructure by
TT:operatingPeriod
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 22 Jun 2018 11:09:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Christian,
dear railML community,

Am 19.06.2018 um 08:43 schrieb Christian Rößiger:

> Hello Christian,

>

> Am 18.06.2018 um 13:42 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

>> <timetable ...>

>> <timetablePeriods>

>> <timetablePeriod id="ttp01" startDate="2017-12-15"

>> endDate="2018-12-14"/>

>> </timetablePeriods>

>> <operatingPeriods>

>> <operatingPeriod id="opp01" startDate="2018-04-28"

>> endDate="2018-04-29" bitmask="0000011" timetablePeriodRef="ttp01"/>

>> </operatingPeriods>

>> </timetable>

>>

>> Is that correct?

>

> Almost ;-) But: The length of the bitmask must correspond to the length
> of the <timetablePeriod>, not that of the <operatingPeriod>.

>

> See: <https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:operatingPeriod>, section
> "constraints", attribute "bitmask"

To be honest: this does not make any sense to me. Wouldn't it be better
to just leave out the timetablePeriod and the bitmask? Maybe it is a
better idea to model the time aspect for _infrastructure availability_
independent from the timetable related <operatingPeriod>. Otherwise I
see too many constraints that are not needed for the purpose of
describing the time of closing e.g. a <track>.

Any comments from the community?

Best regards
Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator

railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)

Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911

Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany www.railml.org
