Subject: Re: Identification in the XML list files and its references
Posted by Christian Rahmig on Fri, 04 Jan 2013 16:58:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Susanne,

Am 06.12.2012 11:29, schrieb Susanne Wunsch:
> Dear Dirk, Christian and others,
>
> I would like to discuss the general content structure of the separate
> XML list file in the 'misc' forum, because it concerns all sub-schemas.
>
> The separate XML list files should be an easier to maintain replacement
> for schema-internal enumeration lists.
>
> I will change the already proposed example a bit taking care of the
> parallel discussion about attribute- or element-centric XML
> styles. Please don't discuss this issue here. The following XML
> structure may be easy changed into an attribute-centric one, if that
> comes as consensus from the neighbouring thread.
>
> <registers xmlns="http://www.railml.org/lists">
>   <register id="d1e3">
>   <version code="ENEE">
>   <name>European Railway Location Database</name>
>   <validity/>
>   <remarks/>
>   </version>
>   </register>
>   <register id="d1e51">
>   <version code="RL100">
>   <name>Richtlinie 100</name>
>   <validity begin="xxxx"/>
>   <remarks/>
>   </version>
>   <version code="DS100">
>   <name>Drucksache 100</name>
>   <validity begin="1951" end="xxxx"/>
>   <remarks/>
>   </version>
>   <version code="DV100">
>   <name>Dienstvorschrift 100</name>
>   <validity end="1951"/>
>   <remarks/>
>   </version>
>   </register>
> </registers>

I agree with that structure, but what about Dirk's remark that there hasn't been any naming brake from DS100 to RL100. In order to keep the disjunctive relation, we cannot leave the dates empty although we do not know them.

However, if the OCP only refers to the "not readable" ID of the register entry, its versions do not have to be disjunct since they just define different versions of the same register. Depending on the user, when refering to "d1e51" he/she may think of the "DV100" or the "DS100" or "RL100", but this does not affect the data exchange or the refered ID in particular. Consequently the element <validity> could be removed at all.

> [...]
>
> * Should both possibilities be provided? If the list file is present, it
>   may be looked up for further details, if not, the value is
>   /meaningful/ anyway.
>
>   That would mean to refer to both values.
>
>   <designator register="RL100" registerRef="registers.xml#d1e51" entry="..."/>

That is not a good solution. The reference to the ("not readable") register's ID should be enough.

Regards

--
Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator