

---

Subject: Re: Infrastructure registers

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 19 Mar 2018 13:51:03 GMT

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

---

Dear all,

the aim of the coordinated collection of registers is to ensure a clear assignment of the corresponding codes. railML.org can notify these corresponding registers on the assistance of the corresponding international, national or company-specific register owners. railML.org cannot and will not check the content of the data structures or concrete contents of the registers. In this respect, railML.org cannot guarantee that the content of the register mentioned is suitable for the purpose of exchange. If you have any questions or requests for changes, please contact the relevant, named register owner [1]. railML.org will be happy to assist you in making contact.

[1] <http://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=Dev:Registers>

Best regards

Christian

Am 27.12.2017 um 14:28 schrieb Dirk Bräuer:

> Dear Christian,

>

>> What do you think about this proposal?

>

> To be honest: Not good. I miss a clear and easy understandable structure. As far as I understand, with your suggestion, one could use the same value for <designator @register=...> in registers for <ocp>s, <line>s and so on. So, someone could write <designator register='DB640'> at a <line> element despite there are no lines listed in DB640. This could not be checked by a validator algorithm. It would not be formally invalid but it would be semantically invalid.

>

> Rather, I would prefer railML being a standard which brings us as most clarity as possible.

>

> With best regards,

> Dirk.

>

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator

railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)

Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911

Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany [www.railml.org](http://www.railml.org)

---