Joerg von Lingen <coord@rollingstock.railml.org> writes:

> basically I don't see a problem to have one type <role> for this.
> However, we have to bear in mind that this type must have all the
> particular attributes required for each role, e.g. startDate+endDate for
> "Operator" but not necessarily for "Manufacturer".

Thank you Jörg, for pointing this out.

This more general approach (a new 'role' element) leads us to loose the
control of the context-specific content (specific attributes).

We would have to ensure that the 'infrastructureManager' is only used
inside the IS-sub-schema and so on. That's not possible with XML Schema
1.0 syntax. We would need additional constraints, e.g. Schematron rules.

My first thought was to enrich the roles by contact data. But maybe it's
too much detail, that's actually already captured otherwise.

Andreas, you would like to have some "role catalogue" outside the
sub-schema for collecting all roles, wouldn't you? How about using XSL
or XQuery for such a task with the knowledge of each possible occurence
in the sub-schemas?

Aahh ... I saw, you bound two roles to the 'trainPart' element. That's
really a good point. Let's look, if there are more than one possible
role across the schemas. If there are problems (like the attribute in
<trainPart>) let's file a ticket about it and change it in the near
future.

Hope it helps.

Kind regards...
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common