
Subject: Re: roles

Posted by [Andreas Tanner](#) on Mon, 12 Nov 2012 10:20:12 GMT

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

> My proposal:

>

> New container element in the "Common part" <companies> with specified
> child elements that may be referred from within the <trainPart>.

>

> <railml>

> <metadata> ...

> <companies>

> <vehicleOperator id="vo1" name="" startDate="" endDate=""/>

> <vehicleManufacturer id="vm1" name=""/>

> <infrastructureManager id="im1" name=""/>

> <railwayUndertaking id="ru1" name=""/>

> <concessionaire id="cc1" name=""/>

> <contractor id="cr1" name="" role="catering" subLevel="1"/>

> <otherCompany id="" name=""/>

> </companies>

> ...

> <timetable...>

> ...

> <trainPart...>

> ...

> <companyBinding>

> <railwayUndertaking ref="ru1"/>

> <contractor ref="cr1"/>

> </companyBinding>

> </trainPart>

> ...

> </timetable>

> </railml>

>

> Any comments appreciated.

>

Thanks for this proposal, it looks good. I would not use the term "company", though, as often, organizational units (within some company, or public authority) are meant. So I would prefer <organizationalUnit>, <otherOrganizationalUnit>, etc.

I'm not sure whether we really need a hierarchical model of roles. I would be happy if only the <otherCompany> gets a role - attribute and leave the contractor without.

I'm also not sure about the dates. If these dates are anchored in the common part, I would understand that the /licence/ or similar of those units is restricted. But probably, what one wants to restrict is the

/binding/. So I would move the restriction to that location.

Best, Andreas.

> Kind regards...

> Susanne

>
