

Dear community,
dear Torben,

in my eyes your suggestion makes sense. Bound a data field like status to the vehicle so that you can check whether it is one current in use or it is only an idea or whatever. Maybe it should be checked before whether all entries of the infrastructure field could be taken one by one.

Best regards.

Carsten Weber
Bahnberatung Carsten Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit

iRFP e.K.
Institut für Regional- und Fernverkehrsplanung
Hochschulstraße 45
01069 Dresden

Am 11.11.2020 um 10:57 schrieb Torben Brand:

- > Dear railML-community,
- >
- > We have had a previous mishap where the wrong vehicle (and
- > formation that is built on the vehicle) was used for runtime
- > calculations. This as the same vehicle was in several
- > versions in the same database/railML exchange file. The
- > different versions were due to different states of the
- > vehicle. In an early stage the vehicle was conceptual with
- > "glossy marketing paper" values from the vendor. At a later
- > stage the vehicle was planned and the values dropped/got
- > more realistic. Finally, when the vehicle was in operation
- > the values were investigated and found to be even lower.
- > To mitigate this source of potential error and to transmit
- > more information in railML should we consider adding a
- > construct like <states> under infrastructure (example:
- > <https://wiki2.railml.org/wiki/IS:state>) in rolling stock?
- > Or do you suggest it's enough to demand from the user to
- > transmit information outside railML of which correct vehicle
- > to be used, to describe the vehicle further in the
- > human-readable @description attribute or to purge the
- > dataset transmitted on the desired state of vehicles (for
- > instance only operational vehicles in data set)?
- >

- > What does the community think? Any feedback is highly
 - > appreciated.
 - >
 - > Kind regards
 - >
 - >
 - > Torben Brand
 - > Jernbanedirektoratet
-