
Subject: Re: constraints for OperatingPeriod

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Fri, 09 Nov 2012 14:51:28 GMT

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

Dear Andreas and others,

Andreas Tanner <ata@ivu.de> writes:

> as far as railML 2.x is concerned, my suggestion was just to enhance
> the documentation.

Would you be so kind as to enhance the wiki documentation by the findings of this thread yourselves? If you need any assistance do not hesitate to ask for.

<http://www.wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:operatingPeriod>

> The discussion on redundancy has some philosophical traits and
> therefore, absolute truth cannot be expected to be found.

That's something we should be aware of every time we develop railML.

> For railML 3.0, however, I would like to keep the discussion open and
> let us elaborate a model of validity with a more formally defined
> semantics that allows to address specific instances of trains from a
> timetable.

That is somewhat covered by the below mentioned Trac ticket.

> Am 09.11.2012 10:27, schrieb Susanne Wunsch:
>> 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
