
Subject: tVersionNumber

Posted by [Joachim Rubröder railML](#) on Thu, 20 Mar 2008 19:39:37 GMT

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

Hi Susanne,

a new Version "1.1.1" would be fine, but tVersionNumber is defined as decimal (x.yy). Shall we switch to string with pattern xx.yy.zz ?

Kind regards,
Joachim Rubröder

Subject: Re: tVersionNumber

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Mon, 09 Jun 2008 09:01:53 GMT

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

coord@timetable.railML.org wrote:

> Hi Susanne,
> a new Version "1.1.1" would be fine, but tVersionNumber is defined as
> decimal (x.yy). Shall we switch to string with pattern xx.yy.zz ?
>
> Kind regards,
> Joachim Rubröder

Maybe or not.

We should distinguish between "release version" and "developer version".

If some release version needs correction, some three part version number should be helpful. (Your offer: xx.yy.zz)

In October, 2007 we released railML 1.1. That means all schemas got release version number 1.1.

So next release version should also cover all sub-schemas:

- * in case of corrections with next minor version 1.1.1,
- * in case of minor changes with 1.2
- * in case of restructuring with 2.0

Changes in "rollingstock"-schema shows need for 1.1.1

If nobody disagrees, I would help with new type for "tVersionNumber" in "genericRailML.xsd".

For developer version we should find another way, tagging it!

I would prefer some version control tool like CVS or Subversion.

In order to operate until this question is solved, we can use simple counting appending to file name (e. g. "timetable_1.1-R1.xsd") and uploading to "genesis site".

Feel free to comment.

Kind regards,
Susanne

--

Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common

Subject: Re: tVersionNumber

Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Thu, 12 Jun 2008 09:04:27 GMT

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

Susanne Wunsch wrote:

> coord@timetable.railML.org wrote:

>

>> a new Version "1.1.1" would be fine, but tVersionNumber is defined as

>> decimal (x.yy). Shall we switch to string with pattern xx.yy.zz ?

>

> If some release version needs correction, some three part version number
> should be helpful. (Your offer: xx.yy.zz)

>

> Changes in "rollingstock"-schema shows need for 1.1.1

>

> If nobody disagrees, I would help with new type for "tVersionNumber" in
> "genericRailML.xsd".

>

My offer would be following:

```
<xsd:simpleType name="tVersionNumber">  
  <xsd:restriction base="xsd:string">  
    <xsd:pattern value="[1-9][0-9]?\.([0-9][1-9][0-9])(\.[1-9][0-9]?)" />  
  </xsd:restriction>  
</xsd:simpleType>
```

That allows version numbers like:

first part: 1.0 10.0 99.0

second part: 1.0 1.9 1.10 1.99

third part: 1.0.1 10.0.10 1.0.99

It doesn't match following strings:

0 no comment
1 use 1.0 instead
1.00 use 1.0 instead
1.0.0 use 1.0 instead
1.01 use 1.1 instead
1.0.01 use 1.0.1 instead

I hope, it might be understood. Anything else, I can help with less theoretical examples.

Feel free to discuss.

Do we really need it???

If nobody disagrees, I upload the code in "common-genesis".
(http://www.railml.org/en/development/common_genesis.html)

Kind regards,
Susanne

--
Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common

Subject: Re: tVersionNumber
Posted by [Susanne Wunsch railML](#) on Wed, 02 Jul 2008 20:06:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Susanne Wunsch wrote:

> Susanne Wunsch wrote:

>

>> coord@timetable.railML.org wrote:

>>

>>> a new Version "1.1.1" would be fine, but tVersionNumber is defined as

>>> decimal (x.yy). Shall we switch to string with pattern xx.yy.zz ?

> If nobody disagrees, I upload the code in "common-genesis".

> (http://www.railml.org/en/development/common_genesis.html)

Done. (Nobody sent a follow up.)

State of file "genericRailML.xsd" is beta for next release version.

Download (developer page):

<http://www.railml.org/en/development/common_genesis.html>

Kind regards ...
Susanne

--

Susanne Wunsch
Schema Coordinator: railML.common
