

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  
>  
>  
>

---