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