Subject: Re: problems with <train>s: uniqueness constraints, scope
Posted by   on Wed, 13 Mar 2013 11:54:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Andreas,

>>> If a designated "primary" path is needed, the constraint should at
>>> least be relaxed to allow multiple trains with scope secondaryXXX.
>>
>> This is already the case with additionalTrainNumber.
>
> Ok, it seems that I have to backtrack here. We were tempted to use the
> additionalTrainNumber for some customer-specific train attribute. Maybe
> the wiki should provide guidance that this is a bad idea.

We already have:

 http://www.wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:trainCouplingA ndSharing

especially:

 http://www.wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:trainCouplingA
ndSharing#Why_not_to_use_the_.27scope.27_attribute.3F

and:

http://www.wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=TT:train#Example

(external links - sorry, I am not able to create wider text formations in
Wiki).

I will extend the examples especially on "additionalTrainNumber" in
future. The decision to use "additionalTrainNumber" for "Nummer des
Ergänzungsfahrplans" is newer than some of the examples (see News-Posts on
this from last year).

Best regards,
Dirk.