
Subject: Re: roles

Posted by [Andreas Tanner](#) on Tue, 12 Feb 2013 12:01:25 GMT

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

Am 12.02.2013 12:04, schrieb Susanne Wunsch:

> Hi Andreas,
>

>> 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.

>
> I see, we talk about different "vehicle operators". I try to clarify my
> point of view. Please, correct me, if I mix other contract bindings
> here.

>
> * The "vehicle operator" in the Rollingstock sub-schema should be the
> company that is the "owner" of the vehicle.

>
> * The "vehicle operator" in the Timetable sub-schema may be the company
> that provides the transport service with the vehicle.

>
> Such a use case with different wagons and locos did happen at the
> beginning of this timetable period in December 2012:

>
> RE4 of the ODEG: [1]

>
> The wagons and loco of this "fixed formation" had different "vehicle
> owners", but are operated by one "vehicle operator" for this service.

>

Indeed the real world provides a nice example. I suggested [2] the
vehicleOperator as an equivalent to the IVU subcontractor
(Fremdunternehmer), so the binding would be to the timetable subschema.

[2] [news://news.railml.org:119/k7t9ju\\$cbe\\$1@sifa.ivi.fhg.de](news://news.railml.org:119/k7t9jucbe1@sifa.ivi.fhg.de)

The usage in the rolling stock schema also makes sense to me.

Best, Andreas.
