
Subject: missing bitMask at <trainPart><operatingPeriodRef>

Posted by _____ on Thu, 17 May 2012 11:32:25 GMT

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

Dear Joachim and all others,

there is one small issue which we should fix with RailML 2.2:

A <trainPart> references its operating days with <operatingPeriodRef>. Normally one should expect that there is a 'ref' to an operatingPeriod only and nothing more.

However, there are some more elements there for reasons which I do not know. They are repeated from 'operatingPeriod' and therefore tend to be redundant.

1) There are 'startDate' and 'endDate' which allow to reduce the given operatingPeriod. I suppose this is to reduce the number of operatingPeriods. It is easy to understand how it works and so I think we should keep that possibility in spite of its redundancy. But: There is currently no 'bitMask' for such a reduced operatingPeriod. Since the 'bitMask' becomes more and more the most important attribute of operating days we should provide it here also.

--> I herewith plead for an optional 'bitMask' attribute at <operatingPeriodRef> with the annotation: "to be used together with startDate and endDate".

2) More confusing, there is a sequence <specialService> at <operatingPeriodRef>. It seems that one can alter the referred 'operatingPeriod' using special days!

- To define an <operatingPeriod> and later alter it at <operatingPeriodRef> is very much confusing. It would be better to define one more <operatingPeriod> and not to alter them. The size of the file has never been a question with RailML.

- If we allow altering of operatingPeriods, why with <specialService> and not with <operatingDay>?

- The altered operatingPeriod would again have no bitMask.

From my opinion, we should clear that situation as soon as possible. We have two possibilities:

a) Simple to delete the sequence <specialService> from <operatingPeriodRef>.

b) To allow the definition of operating days without an <operatingPeriod>. This would mean

- to copy the sequence <operatingDay> into <operatingPeriodRef>,
- to add some attributes including 'bitMask',

- to declare the attribute 'ref' as optional,

--> I would plead for (a) for reasons of simplicity and less redundancy.

Best regards,
Dirk.
