
Subject: Re: [railML3] Validities without bitMask
Posted by on Fri, 25 Feb 2022 10:06:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Milan,

we already have a choice between:

<OperatingDayValidity>: without timetable period (TTP), without timetable-period-long bitmask, with one or several weekday-bitmasks,

<BitmaskValidity>: with (obligatory) timetable period, with (obligatory) timetable-period-long bitmask, with (optional) weekday-bitmasks.

I think this is straightforward and consequent. I do not welcome a third, mixed in-between option. If there is a timetable period, it is imho not too much demanded to create the TTP-bitmask only for the export.

- > ...one easily could also take the opposite
- > position and argue that if it is so easy it does not need to
- > be transferred with railML

The point is that the weekday-bitmasks are optional: So, for importers, there would have to be one more "if" fork in the source code. For the exporter which doesn't already have a TTP-bitmask, it is not an "if" to create it.

The TTP-bitmask should be a fixed target point under <BitmaskValidity> for importers. As we say in German: "Kleinvieh macht auch Mist" - let's limit the numbers of "if"s for importers.

Regards, Dirk.
