

Dear Dirk,

Dirk Bräuer <dirk.braeuer@irfp.de> writes:

- > concerning the file structure: I would prefer using named attributes
- > rather than default attributes with element names for shortness
- > (<version code='ENEE'> rather than <code>ENEE</code>).

Yes, that is a break in the current railML encoding style.

We often stumble over attributes that would need to occur more than once. That's obviously not possible with XML. We need to convert them to elements so far. That is a "structure-braking-change". In contrast changing the elements multiplicity from "1" to "unbounded" is a small change.

That's the reason for changing the style concept starting with these new "separate XML file" additions.

- > concerning the contents: Please do not provide redundant elements for
- > the same register ("RL100", "DS100", "DV100" are all the same).

That is one example for showing how this register renaming may be defined with the newly created structure.

- > You find examples for different registers in Wiki.

Yes, we will fill out the other values, too. But I tried to only cite an excerpt from the file for two use cases - two registers, one with historic names, one with only one name.

- > If you feel necessary to provide different names for the same
- > register, disjunctive validities should be enforced. This is not the
- > case in your example.

Yes, you are right. I tried to find out, when the renaming from "DS100" to "RL100" was done, but I couldn't find it. That's the reason for the blank "begin" and "end" attributes. It was my intention to show this use case with disjunctive validities. I'm sorry for that.

Kind regards...
Susanne

--

