
Subject: Re: [railML3] Extension methods
Posted by [Milan Wölke](#) on Thu, 24 Mar 2022 13:31:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Dirk,

Thank you for your response and input on this. Also thanks for your continued support of railML. I agree with you in that the access barrier to railML is getting higher due to the increased complexity of the standard which follows the increasingly complex and diverse requirements railML needs to and aims to fulfill. I also agree that the proposed new way of specifying extensions can be a bit more difficult, especially if one wants to add a rather complex extension, e.g. a custom extended substructure of an existing railML element. Simple extensions such as an added attribute will not be affected by this change. They will actually still work, for those who prefer it that way.

As I wrote before, I do support this change to extending by subclassing of railML elements, like I understand you also do. However, I think you raised a valid point here. Therefore I would propose to write a detailed step by step tutorial, that explains how exactly to go about when creating a complex railML extension. That could be done after the release of railML 3.2 next month. If possible I would like to ask you to volunteer for reviewing such tutorial. Would you be interested in this? Also do you think that the programming of reading/writing programs should also be included in such tutorial for one or two major programming languages?

Best regards, Milan
