
Subject: [railML3] Revision of rulebook
Posted by [Georg Boasson](#) on Tue, 19 Dec 2023 11:37:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The rulebook which is the referenced register in <typeDesignator> may be updated with new revisions. A new revision of the rulebook may change the content or meaning of an entry and therefore a reference to the revision of the rulebook is necessary.

The @revision attribute may be an optional text-string in addition to the attributes: rulebook, entry, and description.

Proposed additional attribute for <typeDesignator>:

revision: The revision of the rulebook (optional; xs:string)

An extension of the @rulecode attribute might be considered for railML2.

Subject: Re: [railML3] Revision of rulebook
Posted by [Thomas Nygreen](#) on Fri, 22 Dec 2023 15:46:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Georg,

Normally, such changes are avoided in rulebooks, as they can cause safety-critical confusion. If there are significant changes, it may be more relevant to consider it a new rulebook, with a different code. Do you have any relevant examples?

Best regards,
Thomas

Subject: Re: [railML3] Revision of rulebook
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 05 Jan 2024 12:44:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Georg,

I agree with Thomas that major changes in the meaning of a rulebook entry should not occur without a changed rulebook register name.

However, the topic of versions, revisions etc. of registers and external documents will become relevant at other situations, too. Therefore, a general approach on how the schema can deal with these revisions and versions of external resources (not only in infrastructure, but maybe also in rollingstock or timetable) may be useful for future railML versions.

Any ideas or comments from the community?

Best regards
Christian
