
Subject: Re: [railML2] Extension proposal: pattern trains, distributions and slots
Posted by on Fri, 08 Jan 2021 18:36:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello all,

I agree with Milan. In my opinion, the train parts referenced by <patternTrain>s should be a separate XML class, apart from the existing <trainPart>s.

If the existing <trainPart> were to be reused, we would have to document very extensively which attributes may be used in which use case and what their meaning is in each context.

By creating a separate class, we can provide for the new "<patternTrainPart>" exactly the attributes that are needed.

Another argument is that there are implementations of railML readers that are initially only interested in the <trainPart>s (not trains) of a railML file. If a railML file contained both "classic" <trainPart>s and new <patternTrainPart>s, it would be difficult to decide which type of <trainPart> it was.

As with Thomas' suggestion for modelling the <patternTrain>, I would prefer to create a common (internal) base class for the existing <trainPart> and the new <patternTrainPart> to reuse as much of the modelling as possible.

Best regards
Christian

--

iRFP e. K. · Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung
Hochschulstr. 45, 01069 Dresden
Tel. +49 351 4706819 · Fax. +49 351 4768190 · www.irfp.de
Registergericht: Amtsgericht Dresden, HRA 9347
