

---

Subject: More concise usage of namespaces

Posted by [Ferri Leberl](#) on Mon, 15 Jan 2018 15:23:51 GMT

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

---

Dear All,

The CO:-pseudonamespace is being used inconsistently: On the one hand it is used for the description of elements that don't belong to a subschema. On the other hand, there are several guidelines placed there. At the same time there is a couple of introductory articles with page names starting with Dev:.

By agreement with the railML coordinators I would like to suggest to reserve the Namespaces CO, IS, IL, RS and TT for element descriptions. Articles that do not refer to a single element should in the medium term be moved to the Dev:-space. If a certain Dev:-article refers to a subschema, this connection should be clarified in the text rather than in the title.

The use cases should be moved to a new UC-namespace, essentially switching e.g. IS:UC to UC:IS, as they are too many to push them all into Dev:.

Please, let us know, whether you agree with our proposal or whether you see any drawbacks. Thank you in advance for your feedback.

Yours,

Mag. Ferri Leberl

---

---

Subject: Re: More concise usage of namespaces

Posted by [Ferri Leberl](#) on Thu, 01 Feb 2018 17:14:47 GMT

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

---

Dear All,

As the coordinators approved my suggestions, I have made the suggested changes:

The namespaces CO, IL, IS, RS and TT are now reserved for elements.

All overview articles except for the five introductions to the subschemas have been moved to the Dev:-space.

For use cases, an UC:-space has been opened:

<https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=UC>

The advantage is, that it will be easier to recognize the function of an article. Especially, the articles that should be moved to the railML3 wiki later is now, with five exceptions, limited to the Dev:-space.

Yours, Leberl

---

---

Subject: Re: More concise usage of namespaces

Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Tue, 11 Dec 2018 11:35:04 GMT

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

---

I agree to the cleanup.

But i understand Dev: as «development» not as common descriptions/ general guidelines. There are multiple Dev: pages that i see as development suggestions and NOT as community consensus. For that purpose the pages make sense

I see the use case for a label for items that span multiple schemas and we also have and need development pages.

We should choose between the following model for the page structure:

A. Use «Dev:» as today for everything not an element or use case. But clearly mark the pages as being a cross schema description or a development page.

B. Move all «Dev:» pages with development into the Wiki «Discussion» tab pages (which are little used today) and

B1 keep all cross schema description pages in «Dev:»

B3 rename the remaining «Dev:» pages with cross schema description into «Desc:»

C. Split the current Dev: pages into:

1. «Dev:» for development page
2. «Desc:» for «Descriptive page» for pages with a cross schema description.

D. Add a page label «CL:» for «code list» which will become more and more important.

I suggest to go for option B (either B1 or B2) with also D as nice to have.

--

TOBR

---

Subject: Re: More concise usage of namespaces

Posted by [Thomas Nygreen JBD](#) on Fri, 28 Dec 2018 16:45:54 GMT

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

---

Torben Brand wrote on Tue, 11 December 2018 12:35

C. Split the current Dev: pages into:

1. «Dev:» for development page
2. «Desc:» for «Descriptive page» for pages with a cross schema description.

Or: Dev: for development pages and no prefix for ordinary informative pages (as is common practice in mediawikis).

-Thomas