

---

Subject: Aspects of timetable 3.0

Posted by [Burkhard Franke](#) on Thu, 16 Oct 2014 17:26:31 GMT

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

---

some reminder of the discussion at the railML-conference in Paris:  
getting rid of optional elements.

Problem: the railML standard features a lot of flexibility, as it covers a wide range of use-cases. That's basically fine, but it makes it hard to write import interfaces and to validate files as you never know what to expect...

The idea to ease this problem is to predefine "use-cases".

Favourite example of my colleague Bernhard are the timetable and operating periods. It is required to have them, everything else is optional...

The "use-case"-approach defines several sets of mandatory and optional data:

use-case 0: no information on an operating period (for schematic/long-term planning)

use-case 1: startDate and bitmask mandatory, bitmask covers seven days to specify a sample week (to define operating patterns in a schematic timetable), no holidays, deviances or offsets

use-case 2: real timetable: start date, bitmask, holidays, ... and all the complex stuff with deviances, specialServices ...

use-case n: user-defined description of a timetable/operating period based on the klingon calendar ;-)

The use-cases can also be applied to other elements, for instance it could ease the discussion on vehicle data in the timetable (uc0 - no vehicle information; uc1 - only sample vehicles; uc2 - detailed technical data ;...)

This approach (maybe the term "use-case" is not the best) will limit flexibility or rather guides the flexibility in an orderly manner. This is meant to help create a better structured railML-timetable in a 3.x version.

Comments welcome

---

Subject: Re: Aspects of timetable 3.0

Posted by [Christian Rahmig](#) on Wed, 12 Nov 2014 17:57:11 GMT

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

---

Dear Burkhard,

Am 16.10.2014 19:26, schrieb Burkhard Franke:

> [...]  
 >  
 > Problem: the railML standard features a lot of flexibility, as it covers  
 > a wide range of use-cases. That's basically fine, but it makes it hard  
 > to write import interfaces and to validate files as you never know what  
 > to expect...  
 > The idea to ease this problem is to predefine "use-cases".  
 >  
 > Favourite example of my colleague Bernhard are the timetable and  
 > operating periods. It is required to have them, everything else is  
 > optional...  
 >  
 > The "use-case"-approach defines several sets of mandatory and optional  
 > data:  
 > use-case 0: no information on an operating period (for  
 > schematic/long-term planning)  
 > use-case 1: startDate and bitmask mandatory, bitmask covers seven days  
 > to specify a sample week (to define operating patterns in a schematic  
 > timetable), no holidays, deviances or offsets  
 > use-case 2: real timetable: start date, bitmask, holidays, ... and all  
 > the complex stuff with deviances, specialServices ...  
 > use-case n: user-defined description of a timetable/operating period  
 > based on the klingon calendar ;-)

thank you very much for your suggestion of the "use case approach",  
 which perfectly fits to the ongoing development in the infrastructure  
 schema:

Following the definition of the UIC RailTopoModel, which will be the  
 basis for the new railML 3 infrastructure schema (cf. [1]), we are  
 currently collecting use cases for infrastructure data exchange with  
 railML. The aim is to get an overview about all applications using (or  
 generating) railway infrastructure data and their resulting requirements  
 on the content and the structure of the data and the connected  
 processes. Therefore, your examples like "long-term TT planning" and  
 "real-time TT" fit very good into this use case concept.

In order to collect the different infrastructure data use cases, we  
 designed a short questionnaire to be filled by the relevant users. The  
 form includes

- \* a short description of the application,
- \* a list of relevant data flows and interfaces,
- \* a statement about the interference with other railML schemes, and
- \* a characterization of the data regarding certain aspects (update,  
 complexity, focus and elements).

I suggest to start such a survey also among the TT users and collect  
 their (timetable data) use cases. The idea behind this survey is to

identify the use cases that shall be considered with priority in the process of developing the new railML 3 schema.

Any comments and questions appreciated...

[1] <http://railml.org//index.php/railml3-development.html>

Best regards

--

Christian Rahmig  
railML.infrastructure coordinator

---

---

Subject: Re: Aspects of timetable 3.0

Posted by [Joachim Rubröder railML](#) on Wed, 03 Dec 2014 07:51:03 GMT

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

---

Dear Burkhard,  
thanks for your input.

I open a track ticket #256 for this topic.  
<https://trac.railml.org/ticket/256>

Kind regards,  
Joachim

--

----- posted via PHP Headliner -----

---