

---

Subject: Re: Infrastructure registers

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 20 Nov 2017 15:19:35 GMT

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

---

Dear all,

the described problem may be solved with version 2.4. The related Trac ticket #310 is available in [1].

I would like to have your feedback on answering the main question: Do you prefer having one codelist including all the different existing registers for providing codes and designators to railway infrastructure elements, or would you like to have separated codelists?

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/310>

Thank you very much and best regards  
Christian

Am 29.05.2017 um 14:03 schrieb Christian Rahmig:

> Dear Dirk,

>

> Am 18.05.2017 um 15:46 schrieb Dirk Bräuer:

>> [...]

>> From my understanding, the kind of register is (adequately) specified by  
>> the parent element of <designator>. If it is a <designator> of an <ocp>,  
>> the station registers are needed. If it is a <designator> of a different  
>> parent element, a different register is needed.

>>

>> As is can also happen to have different registers as sub-elements of  
>> <infrastructure> in future (such as registers of line numbers), I would  
>> not recommend naming the station lists @infrastructureRegister. I would  
>> name them @ocpRegister. But this would, as I said, be redundant to the  
>> parent's element name.

>

> thank you very much for your feedback. The idea behind was to  
> distinguish between registers of the different railML sub-domains  
> (infrastructure, timetable, etc.). You are absolutely right with your  
> statement that there are different types of infrastructure related  
> registers, e.g. for OCPs and for asset management. Therefore, I suggest  
> to add a new attribute @type in the codelist InfrastructureRegisters.xml  
> (before: Registers.xml). Using this attribute, it shall be possible to  
> distinguish between OCP registers, and other infrastructure registers.

>

> The result in InfrastructureRegisters.xml may look like this:

>

> <register code="DfA">

> <name xml:lang="de-CH">Datenbank Feste Anlagen</name>

> <organization xml:lang="en">Swiss Federal Railways on behalf of  
> Federal Office of Transport</organization>  
> <type>assets</type>  
> </register>  
>  
> <register code="DIDOK">  
> <name xml:lang="en">List of station names</name>  
> <organization xml:lang="en">Swiss Federal Railways on behalf of  
> Federal Office of Transport</organization>  
> <type>ocp</type>  
> </register>  
>  
> <register code="DB640">  
> <name xml:lang="de-AT">Dienstbehelf Nr. 640</name>  
> <organization xml:lang="de-AT">ÖBB</organization>  
> <type>all</type>  
> </register>  
>  
> The question to be answered: what kind of infrastructure related  
> registers have to be specified. For the initial version I suggest the  
> following types:  
> \* asset  
> \* ocp  
> \* networkStatement  
> \* all (?)  
>  
> Any comments etc. 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)

---