
Subject: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 13:08:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hallo,

as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of rollingstock scheme is 0.93 with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch. However, it is still possible to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:

1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

 |
 -- formations --- formation <= train related

or

2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

 |
 -- formation <= train related

Please give me your opinions.

Best,
Joerg von Lingen

Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by [Matthias Hengartner](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 13:17:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,

I'd prefer not to have <formations> as another direct child-element of the <railml> root element. So I'm in favour of the second option.

But what about separating vehicle and train related data by means of two new container elements? I mean something like this:

railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- rs <= vehicle related

 |
 -- formations --- formation <= train related

The naming of these container elements (<vehicles> and <formations>) would have to be discussed probably (or shall we rename <rs> to <vehicle>?)

This version would be similar as we have it in the infrastructure (container elements lines, tracks, operationControlPoints, etc.)

Other opinions?

Best regards,
Matthias Hengartner

"Joerg von Lingen" <jvl@bahntechnik.de> wrote in message
news:GlwwHj9GEHA.1168@sifa...
> Hallo,
>
> as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of
rollingstock scheme is 0.93
> with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch.
However, it is still possible
> to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:
> 1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related
> |
> -- formations --- formation <= train related
> *or*
> 2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related
> |
> -- formation <= train related
>
> Please give me your opinions.
>
> Best,
> Joerg von Lingen

Subject: Re: Version 0.93 - request for comment
Posted by [Joachim.Rubröder](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 06:37:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello,
I agree that the schema should branch below the rollingstock element,
like in the infrastructure. And to rename the somehow cryptic <rs> to
<vehicle> would also be more railML like. So I will also vote for:

```
railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- vehicle    <= vehicle related
      |
      -- formations --- formation <= train related
```

best regards,
Joachim Rubröder

Matthias Hengartner schrieb:
> Hello,

>

> I'd prefer not to have <formations> as another direct child-element of the
 > <railml> root element. So I'm in favour of the second option.

>

> But what about separating vehicle and train related data by means of two new
 > container elements? I mean something like this:

>

```

  > railml --- rollingstock --- vehicles --- rs      <= vehicle related
  >           |
  >           -- formations --- formation    <= train related
  >
```

> The naming of these container elements (<vehicles> and <formations>) would
 > have to be discussed probably (or shall we rename <rs> to <vehicle>?)

>

> This version would be similar as we have it in the infrastructure (container
 > elements lines, tracks, operationControlPoints, etc.)

>

>

> Other opinions?

>

> Best regards,
 > Matthias Hengartner

>

>

>

>

> "Joerg von Lingen" <jvl@bahntechnik.de> wrote in message
 > news:GlwwHj9GEHA.1168@sifa...

>

>> Hallo,

>>

>> as briefly described during meeting in Brunswick the latest version of
 >

> rollingstock scheme is 0.93

>

>> with the major addition of train related data in <formation> branch.

>

> However, it is still possible

>

>> to discuss the best "mounting point" of this branch:

>> 1. railml --- rollingstock --- rs <= vehicle related

```

  >>           |
  >>           -- formations --- formation <= train related
  >> *or*
  >> 2. railml --- rollingstock --- rs      <= vehicle related
  >>           |
  >>           -- formation <= train related
  >>
```

>> Please give me your opinions.

>>

>> Best,

>> Joerg von Lingen

>

>

>
