

---

Subject: Request for a new optional attribute for train coupling and sharing

Posted by on Thu, 21 Jan 2016 15:02:29 GMT

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

---

Dear <timetable> community,

we would like to make a petition for one more attribute in railML 2.3 at the meeting tomorrow in Berlin. In preparation of that meeting, we have created a document as a kind of (electronic) hand-out. Following Vasco's suggestion, I provide a download link for the document here for everyone who wants to take part in the discussion: [1].

It is not a big matter. The suggested attribute and background is described on the first two pages only. The other pages contain examples only.

Also, it is probably clear that the new attribute will last for 2.3 only and will be obsolete with 3.0 due to the "re-factoring" already planned. But, as long as we do not have 3.0, we have a problem without that attribute in 2.2/2.3. That's why we (iRFP) have to do the attribute anyway, at least as a custom attribute. For more compatibility, I would prefer an official attribute rather than a custom one.

Best regards,  
Dirk Bräuer.

[1] [http://download.irfp.de/umsteigefreie\\_verbindungen\\_in\\_railml .pdf](http://download.irfp.de/umsteigefreie_verbindungen_in_railml.pdf)

---

---

Subject: Re: Request for a new optional attribute for train coupling and sharing

Posted by [Philip Wobst](#) on Thu, 18 Feb 2016 15:31:27 GMT

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

---

Dear Dirk,

this topic was discussed during the timetable developer meeting in Berlin last month and the conclusion was that it is not needed as a temporary solution for 2.3 if the use case exists only for iRFP and one other potential data consumer.

If you do have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

BR, Philip

---

---

Subject: Re: Request for a new optional attribute for train coupling and sharing

Posted by on Fri, 26 Feb 2016 09:02:26 GMT

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

---

Dear Philip,

I know about the "conclusion" of the meeting in Berlin on this subject and of course, we can easily accept it by implementing an own railML extension.

I only want to warn because I think that "only for two data consumers" should not be a real reason to refuse a suggestion. Always somebody will be the first, won't it?

I think any reason for refusing a suggestion should be a technical one. So which technical reason can be said against our suggestion? So far, I think iRFP has always tried to argue with technical background so shouldn't we have the right to get a technical answer as well, should we?

--

My concern is not a personal or embittered one but I am worried about that we come to a stand still with the development of <timetable> if we block improvements in railML 2.x and at the same time do not go ahead with 3.x. iRFP has also made several attempts to start a <timetable> 3.x with came to nothing so far, and in the case of the Berlin meeting do not even have been discussed.

Sorry, but I think we have come to a stand still. I ask myself what we should get some greater steps forward with <timetable> if even the smaller steps are blocked. You should be careful not to administrate a <monster> 2.x which went into a mess.

Best regards,  
Dirk.

---

Am 18.02.2016 um 16:31 schrieb Philip Wobst:

> Dear Dirk,  
>  
> this topic was discussed during the timetable developer  
> meeting in Berlin last month and the conclusion was that it  
> is not needed as a temporary solution for 2.3 if the use  
> case exists only for iRFP and one other potential data  
> consumer.  
> If you do have any further questions please do not hesitate  
> to contact me directly.  
>  
> BR, Philip

---

Subject: Re: Request for a new optional attribute for train coupling and sharing

Posted by [Vasco Paul Kolmorgen](#) on Thu, 02 Jun 2016 10:51:12 GMT

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

---

The problem was explained by Dirk Bräuer and the issue was discussed again in the railML's Timetable developer meeting in Berlin on June 2nd, 2016.

Conclusion: As a solution in a (possibly) upcoming railML 2.x is not urgent as a <any> field was used by the proposer. The issue has to be take into consideration for the refactoring in railML 3.x and -if not solved by the refactoring process- to be discussed again.

Regards,

--

Vasco Paul Kolmorgen  
railML.org Coordinator  
Dresden; Germany [www.railml.org](http://www.railml.org)

---