
Subject: Re: roles

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Tue, 12 Feb 2013 09:16:05 GMT

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

Hi Joachim, Andreas and others,

coord@timetable.railml.org (Joachim Rubroeder) writes:

> let me summarize the current discussion.

Thanks for summarizing the already long thread. :-)

> You are suggesting a subelement below <trainPart>:

>

> <timetable...>

> ..

> <trainPart...>

> ..

> <organizationalUnitBinding>

> <railwayUndertaking ref="ru1"/>

> <contractor ref="cr1"/>

> <concessionaire ref="cc1"/>

> <vehicleOperator ref="vo1"/>

> <operator ref="op1"/>

> <infrastructureManager ref="im1"/>

> <other:somethingElse ref="se1"/>

> </organizationalUnitBinding>

> </trainPart>

> ..

> </timetable>

> </railml>

One question, that came to my mind regarding this list is:

Do we really need an "infrastructureManager", a "vehicleManufacturer" and a "vehicleOperator" binding in a "trainPart" as just implemented [1] and partly proposed by myself [2]?

I mean - no.

* The "infrastructureManager" binding should be defined in the Infrastructure sub-schema for each "track" and/or "line".

It anyway may differ for one "trainPart".

* The "vehicleManufacturer" and "vehicleOperator" binding should be defined in the Rollingstock sub-schema for each "vehicle".

It anyway may differ for one "trainPart".

That would leave the following contract bindings for the "trainPart":

- * customer
- * railwayUndertaking
- * operationalUndertaking
- * concessionaire
- * contractor (general usage)
- * any (extensions)

Any comments appreciated.

[1] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/changeset/543>

[2] <http://trac.assembla.com/railML/ticket/178#comment:4>

Kind regards...

Susanne

--

Susanne Wunsch

Schema Coordinator: railML.common
