
Subject: Re: Some problems with/questions about the infrastructure schema...

Posted by [Matthias Hengartner](#) on Fri, 18 Jun 2004 12:08:45 GMT

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

Hello,

For the moment I have only one comment regarding the discussion around the several ID-attributes.

> Hmm, I would prefer the opposite syntax. For example, I would
> appreciate a common attribute "elemID" for all elements. Right now, we
> have "ID", "elemID", "ocpID", "connectionID", etc. "elemID" is used in
> many children of <trackData>, why not everywhere?

At least the attributes "ocpID" and "trackID" are meant to be "close to reality", so they should represent the identifiers which are also used in reality. I don't know which elements of <trackData> and <trackTopology> do have also such an identifier in practice, but certainly not all of them (e.g. <trackBegin>/<trackEnd>, probably also <crossSection> have none).

So we have to deal with different types of IDs.

Further there was a discussion about globally unique IDs (GUIDs), which has still not come to an definite end.

Roughly, there are two possibilities:

1. We introduce GUIDs.

Then I think we should leave "real-ID-attributes" like ocpID and trackID (and keep also this names) and discard other ID-attributes with no reference to reality.

2. We do not introduce GUIDs.

So we surely keep the ID-attributes. And I think we should also keep the naming of most of them. Personally, I find it a little confusing to have a connectionID and not an elemID in a <bufferstop>-element.

So far for the moment.

Have a nice weekend!
Matthias Hengartner
