Subject: Re: constraints for OperatingPeriod
Posted by Susanne Wunsch railML on Fri, 09 Nov 2012 09:27:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Dirk, Andreas and others,

Dirk Bräuer <dirk.braeuer@irfp.de> writes:
>> With the redundancy, I do have a problem. It does allow to be
>> lenient when /writing/ railML, but the costs incur at the import
>> side. For serious import software, one has to
>> - extend the customer-specific specification as to disallow
>> inconsistencies between bitmask and rule
>> - code a check of the resulting precondition
>> - add a test case for the software.
>
> Please consider:
> When writing a RailML file, the software does normally not know for
> which purpose the RailML file will be used. It has to create a RailML
> file which is most possibly general.
> When reading a RailML file, the software can exactly know the
> requirements of the target system and therefore can decide which
> elements and attributes are relevant and which additional rules
> apply. From my opinion, there always will be additional (semantical)
> rules which are out of the scope of RailML.

Thank you, Dirk, for the above described explanations.

Andreas, are you convinced by them?

How about the wanted re-structuring of 'operatingPeriod' for the next
major release? Can we drop it? Or do you propose another easier to
implement/validate/understand structure?

> Anyway, I agree with you: We would need a possibility to identify
> "instances" within a period to describe 'actual' information
> additionally to 'timetable' information - either in 'timetable'
> schema or somewhere else.
>
>>> Additionally, I would prefer to allow an abstract operating period to
>>> refer to a 'real' operating period. In my opinion, any abstract
>>> operating period earlier or later becomes real.
>>
>> Here I understand that you aim at the mapping of different stages in
>> the planning process.
>
> Yes. I exactly "aimed" on
>
>> a concept of unrolling rule-based operating periods onto a calendar

>
> So far, this should have been the bit mask.

I filed a ticket for the issue of an "abstract operating period":

http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/187

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common