
Subject: Re: missing bitMask at <trainPart><operatingPeriodRef>
Posted by [Andreas Tanner](#) on Mon, 21 May 2012 07:23:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

as a general rule, I see absolutely no point in providing alternative means of expressing one and the same thing. It only drives up the cost of implementing the standard.

I would therefore pledge for removing these attributes from the trainPart element and strictly restrain the standard to use of operatingPeriods.

Best regards, Andreas.

Am 17.05.2012 13:32, schrieb Dirk Bräuer:

> 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.
