

---

Subject: Version 0.93 - request for comment  
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 13:08:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment  
Posted by [Matthias Hengartner](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 13:17:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment  
Posted by [Joachim.Rubröder](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 06:37:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

>

>

>

---