Subject: circulations should be optional
Posted by Andreas Tanner on Wed, 02 Jan 2013 09:29:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear group,
currently blocks can be defined only when also at least one circulation
is present: the type rRostering has mandatory child elements blockParts,
blocks and circulations. We use blocks to describe vehicle duties within
a day, and circulations to concatenate them within a multiple day schedule.
Now we have a case where there are no circulations present (as they are
defined only in a later planning stage). I think this should be valid,
and therefore I propose to relax the standard in that point. One way
would be to allow a <blocks> element directly below the <timetable>. I
think this would be more correctly model the situation than just to
allow rosterings without circulations because without circulations,
assigning a block to a rostering would be somewhat arbitrary.

So my suggestion is: insert <blocks> with minOccurs=0 into the sequence
of the <timetable> element.

Best, Andreas.

Subject: Re: circulations should be optional
Posted by Joachim Rubröder railML   on Tue, 12 Feb 2013 15:55:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Andreas,

there seem to be no objections against this issue. I therefore opened a
ticket:
https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/221

But for an implementation in version 2.2, I definitely prefer the solution
with optional <circulations>. Your suggestion with additional <blocks>
below <timetable> would result in two different possible locations which
is not desirable

Kind regards,
Joachim

Joachim Rubröder
Schema Coordinator: railML.timetable

--

Subject: Re: circulations should be optional
Posted by Andreas Tanner on Wed, 13 Feb 2013 07:37:59 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thanks a lot. Optional circulations within a rostering would be helpful.
The rest should be discussed at the upcoming conference.
--Andreas.

Am 12.02.2013 16:55, schrieb Joachim Rubroeder:
> Dear Andreas,
>
> there seem to be no objections against this issue. I therefore opened a
> ticket:
> https://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/221
>
> But for an implementation in version 2.2, I definitely prefer the solution
> with optional <circulations>. Your suggestion with additional <blocks>
> below <timetable> would result in two different possible locations which
> is not desirable
>
> Kind regards,
> Joachim
>
> -----------------------------------
> Joachim Rubröder
> Schema Coordinator: railML.timetable
>
>

Subject: Re: circulations should be optional
Posted by   on Tue, 12 Mar 2013 17:25:08 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Andreas and Joachim,

I also see no objections against optional circulations (i. e. rosterings
with blocks but without circulations) and would prefer this against
additional blocks at <timetable> but outside <rosterings>. Concerning the
latter, it seams to me that we could skip that redundancy.

Best regards,
Dirk.