

---

Subject: Re: roles

Posted by [Andreas Tanner](#) on Tue, 12 Feb 2013 09:49:07 GMT

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

---

Hi Susanne,  
thanks for the implementation!

>  
> 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".  
>

+1 for infrastructureManager and vehicleManufacturer. Regarding the  
vehicleOperator, I would think that binding to trainPart should be  
possible for the case that at a certain planning stage, formations are  
abstract but the assignment to the operator is already known.

Best, Andreas.

---