
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.
