

---

Subject: Validity times

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Tue, 20 Mar 2018 14:49:27 GMT

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

---

Dear all,

the information that a NetElement is valid (for operation) is currently modelled with the attributes @validFrom and @validTo. A resulting small example looks like this:

```
<netElement ... validFrom="2018-01-01" validTo="2018-12-31"/>
```

This implementation of validity times has two drawbacks:

- \* It is not possible to model other infrastructure states, e.g. "under construction"
- \* It does not allow to model segmented validity times, e.g. before and after a construction blocking

The second point is really essential. Therefore, I propose to change the RTM modelling in the following way: instead of attributes @validFrom and @validTo, use a repeatable child element <valid> with attributes @from and @to to define the different segments of validity time. The resulting small example may look like this:

```
<netElement ...>  
  <valid from="2018-01-01" to="2018-06-29"/>  
  <valid from="2018-07-02" to="2018-12-31"/>  
</netElement>
```

Any feedback is highly appreciated...

Best regards  
Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator  
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)  
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911  
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany [www.railml.org](http://www.railml.org)

---

---

Subject: Re: Validity times

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Wed, 04 Jul 2018 04:58:07 GMT

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

---

Dear all,

although there has not been an answer on that topic so far, we need to

find a solution for the problem, because it is essential for railML 3.1 and related "beta 2" version scheduled for end of August [1].

In particular, I already implemented the required RTM related change in railML 3.1. The latest version of railML 3.1 is available in the railML3 SVN trunk [2]. An overview of all the changes is provided in [3].

In this overview, replacing validity attributes by new Base class Validity to allow for multiple validity times is marked as issue number 3.

[1]

<https://www.railml.org/en/public-relations/news/reader/33rd-railml-conference-and-version-roadmap.html>

[2] <https://svn.railml.org/railML3/trunk>

[3]

[http://forum.railML.org/userfiles/2018-07-02\\_railml\\_railml3-induced-changes-to-rtm12.pdf](http://forum.railML.org/userfiles/2018-07-02_railml_railml3-induced-changes-to-rtm12.pdf)

Best regards

Christian

Am 20.03.2018 um 15:49 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

> Dear all,

>

> the information that a NetElement is valid (for operation) is currently  
> modelled with the attributes @validFrom and @validTo. A resulting small  
> example looks like this:

>

> <netElement ... validFrom="2018-01-01" validTo="2018-12-31"/>

>

> This implementation of validity times has two drawbacks:

> \* It is not possible to model other infrastructure states, e.g. "under  
> construction"

> \* It does not allow to model segmented validity times, e.g. before and  
> after a construction blocking

>

> The second point is really essential. Therefore, I propose to change the  
> RTM modelling in the following way: instead of attributes @validFrom and  
> @validTo, use a repeatable child element <valid> with attributes @from  
> and @to to define the different segments of validity time. The resulting  
> small example may look like this:

>

> <netElement ...>

> <valid from="2018-01-01" to="2018-06-29"/>

> <valid from="2018-07-02" to="2018-12-31"/>

> </netElement>

>

> Any feedback is highly appreciated...

>

> Best regards  
> Christian  
>

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator  
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)  
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911  
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany [www.railml.org](http://www.railml.org)

---

---

Subject: Re: Validity times  
Posted by [Airy Magnien](#) on Tue, 04 Sep 2018 09:27:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

There is a twofold debate here:

- Whether we are discussing the operational availability of net elements or net entities (recent call with C. Rahmig rather pointed at the IT object lifecycle management);
- Whether the time intervals should be attributes (current case) or references to time interval objects (as proposed).

On the first aspect, there is a strong opinion that RTM, being a conceptual model describing the railway network, should not deal with IT object lifecycle details ; there are by the way many options to handle IT objects, depending on how much traceability is needed and how archiving is organized;

On the second aspect, the debate goes on.

---