Subject: train uniqueness constraint II
Posted by Andreas Tanner on Wed, 26 Jun 2013 08:10:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear group,

once more, we have a problem with the uniqueness constraint for <train>
elements

"The compound of the attributes trainNumber, additionalTrainNumber and
scope has to be unique for all <train> elements. If some of these
attributes is absent the others have to be unique. The code attribute is
used for some unique string identifying the train regardless of the
unique attribute triple."

We would like to transmit the same train twice: once in processStatus
planned, once in state _changed_. I think this should be allowed, so I
would ask the specification text to be changed to

"The compound of the attributes trainNumber, additionalTrainNumber,
scope and processStatus ....

Best,
--Andreas.

Subject: Re: train uniqueness constraint II
Posted by   on Fri, 19 Jul 2013 15:55:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Andreas and all others,

I understand the wish to transmit the same train for several process
status. From the first view, there should be no objection against
extending the primary key of <trains> with the attribute processStatus.

First - by the way - it is already possible to do what you need: Add the
train twice, one with processStatus=planned, the other with
processStatus=changed; give one the additionalTrainNumber=1 and the oder
additionalTrainNumber=2, both with scope=primary. Simply select the next
available additionalTrainNumber if you want to add a new "version" of a
train.

However, there is a need to move the attribute processStatus from <train>
either to <trainPartSequence> or <trainPart>: A train can be "ordered" at
one section and "changed" or anything else at another section. This
normally happens with trains operating via several IMs.

So if possibly processStatus has moved to <trainPartSequence> in a future version, it would not be available for the primary key anymore.

There are several possible options for that, e. g.:

a) To extend the primary key of <train> with processStatus and additionally to introduce a new processStatus at either <trainPartSequence> or <trainPart>. This would fulfill all needs but it may be treated as too complicated: There may be conflicts between the concurring processStatus.

b) To move the processStatus to either <trainPartSequence> or <trainPart>, leave the primary key of <trains> as it is (w/o processStatus) and use the attribute additionalTrainNumber (with scope=primary) to distinguish between the status you wanted.

Dear Joachim as the coordinator - what do you think? Please note that from now on we have two wishes in this thread: (1) the possible extension of the primary key with processStatus and (2) to move or reintroduce processStatus to <trainPartSequence> or <trainPart>.

With best regards,
Dirk.

Am 26.06.2013, 10:10 Uhr, schrieb Andreas Tanner <ata@ivu.de>:

> Dear group,
>
> once more, we have a problem with the uniqueness constraint for <train>
> elements
>
> "The compound of the attributes trainNumber, additionalTrainNumber and
> scope has to be unique for all <train> elements. If some of these
> attributes is absent the others have to be unique. The code attribute is
> used for some unique string identifying the train regardless of the
> unique attribute triple."
>
> We would like to transmit the same train twice: once in processStatus
> _planned_, once in state _changed_. I think this should be allowed, so I
> would ask the specification text to be changed to
>
> "The compound of the attributes trainNumber, additionalTrainNumber,
> scope and processStatus ...."
>
> Best,
> --Andreas.