Subject: Re: constraints for OperatingPeriod
Posted by Joachim Rubröder railML   on Wed, 06 Feb 2013 15:46:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,
I totally agree about the different kinds of operatingPeriods and the need
for an 'abstract period'.

The second important point to consider is the operatingPeriod in the
different stages of the planning process. Evolving from an 'abstract
period' to a concrete 'bitmask'.

> Andreas Tanner <ata@ivu.de> writes:
>
> as far as railML 2.x is concerned, my suggestion was just to enhance
> the documentation.
>
> 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.

Many thanks for the discussion in this thread. I will be glad to implement
such a model of validity in a future version of railML.

 I therefore switched the ticket to railML 3.0:
 http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/187

Kind regards,
Joachim

Joachim Rubröder
Schema Coordinator: railML.timetable

--
----== posted via PHP Headliner ==----