
Subject: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 13:08:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hallo,

as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of rollingstock scheme is 0.93 with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch. However, it is still possible to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:

1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

 |
 -- formations --- formation <= train related

or

2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

 |
 -- formation <= train related

Please give me your opinions.

Best,
Joerg von Lingen

Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by [Matthias Hengartner](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 13:17:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,

I'd prefer not to have <formations> as another direct child-element of the <railml> root element. So I'm in favour of the second option.

But what about separating vehicle and train related data by means of two new container elements? I mean something like this:

railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- rs <= vehicle related

 |
 -- formations --- formation <= train related

The naming of these container elements (<vehicles> and <formations>) would have to be discussed probably (or shall we rename <rs> to <vehicle>?)

This version would be similar as we have it in the infrastructure (container elements lines, tracks, operationControlPoints, etc.)

Other opinions?

Best regards,
Matthias Hengartner

"Joerg von Lingen" <jvl@bahntechnik.de> wrote in message
news:GlwwHj9GEHA.1168@sifa...
> Hallo,
>
> as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of
rollingstock scheme is 0.93
> with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch.
However, it is still possible
> to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:
> 1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related
> |
> -- formations --- formation <= train related
> *or*
> 2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related
> |
> -- formation <= train related
>
> Please give me your opinions.
>
> Best,
> Joerg von Lingen

Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by [Joachim.Rubröder](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 06:37:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,
I agree that the schema should branch below the rollingstock element,
like in the infrastructure. And to rename the somehow cryptic <rs> to
<vehicle> would also be more railML like. So I will also vote for:

```
railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- vehicle    <= vehicle related
          |
          -- formations --- formation <= train related
```

best regards,
Joachim Rubröder

Matthias Hengartner schrieb:
> Hello,

>
> I'd prefer not to have <formations> as another direct child-element of the
> <railml> root element. So I'm in favour of the second option.
>
> But what about separating vehicle and train related data by means of two new
> container elements? I mean something like this:
>
> railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- rs <= vehicle related
> |
> -- formations --- formation <= train related
>
> The naming of these container elements (<vehicles> and <formations>) would
> have to be discussed probably (or shall we rename <rs> to <vehicle>?)
>
> This version would be similar as we have it in the infrastructure (container
> elements lines, tracks, operationControlPoints, etc.)
>
>
> Other opinions?
>
> Best regards,
> Matthias Hengartner
>
>
>
> "Joerg von Lingen" <jvl@bahntechnik.de> wrote in message
> news:GlwwHj9GEHA.1168@sifa...
>
>> Hallo,
>>
>> as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of
>
> rollingstock scheme is 0.93
>
>> with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch.
>
> However, it is still possible
>
>> to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:
>> 1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related
>> |
>> -- formations --- formation <= train related
>> *or*
>> 2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related
>> |
>> -- formation <= train related
>>

>> Please give me your opinions.

>>

>> Best,

>> Joerg von Lingen

>

>

>
