Subject: More concise usage of namespaces
Posted by Ferri Leberl on Mon, 15 Jan 2018 15:23:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear All,
The CO:-pseudonamespace is being used inconsistently: On the one hand it is used for the description of elements that don't belong to a subschema. On the other hand, there are several guidelines placed there. At the same time there is a couple of introductory articles with page names starting with Dev:.
By agreement with the railML coordinators I would like to suggest to reserve the Namespaces CO, IS, IL, RS and TT for element descriptions. Articles that do not refer to a single element should in the medium term be moved to the Dev:-space. If a certain Dev:-article refers to a subschema, this connection should be clarified in the text rather than in the title.
The use cases should be moved to a new UC-namespace, essentially switching e.g. IS:UC to UC:IS, as they are too many to push them all into Dev:.
Please, let us know, whether you agree with our proposal or whether you see any drawbacks.
Thank you in advance for your feedback.
Yours,
Mag. Ferri Leberl

Subject: Re: More concise usage of namespaces
Posted by Ferri Leberl on Thu, 01 Feb 2018 17:14:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear All,
As the coordinators approved my suggestions, I have made the suggested changes:
The namespaces CO, IL, IS, RS and TT are now reserved for elements.
All overview articles except for the five introdutions to the subschemas have been moved to the Dev:-space.
For use cases, an UC:-space has been opened:
https://wiki.railml.org/index.php?title=UC
The advantage is, that it will be easier to recognize the function of an article. Especially, the articles that should be moved to the railML3 wiki later is now, with five exceptions, limmited to the Dev:-space.
Yours, Leberl

Subject: Re: More concise usage of namespaces
Posted by Torben Brand on Tue, 11 Dec 2018 11:35:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree to the cleanup.
But i understand Dev: as «development» not as common descriptions/ general guidelines. There are multiple Dev: pages that i see as development suggestions and NOT as comunity consensus. For that purpose the pages make sense

I see the use case for a label for items that span multiple schemas and we also have and need development pages.

We should choose betwen the following model for the page structure:
A. Use «Dev:» as today for everything not an element or use case. But clearly mark the pages as beeing a cross schema description or a development page.

B. Move all «Dev:» pages with development into the Wiki «Discussion» tab pages (which are little used today) and

B1 keep all cross schema description pages in «Dev:»

B3 rename the remaining «Dev:» pages with cross schema description into «Desc:»

C. Split the current Dev: pages into:
1. «Dev:» for development page
2. «Desc:» for «Descriptive page» for pages with a cross schema description.

D. Add a page label «CL:» for «code list» which will become more and more important.

I suggest to go for option B (either B1 or B2) with also D as nice to have.

--
TOBR

Subject: Re: More concise usage of namespaces
Posted by Thomas Nygreen JBD on Fri, 28 Dec 2018 16:45:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Torben Brand wrote on Tue, 11 December 2018 12:35
C. Split the current Dev: pages into:
1. «Dev:» for development page
2. «Desc:» for «Descriptive page» for pages with a cross schema description.

Or: Dev: for development pages and no prefix for ordinary informative pages (as is common practice in mediawikis).

-Thomas