Posted by christian.rahmig on Tue, 20 Mar 2018 14:49:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,

the information that a NetElement is valid (for operation) is currently modelled with the attributes @validFrom and @validTo. A resulting small example looks like this:

<netElement ... validFrom="2018-01-01" validTo="2018-12-31"/>

This implementation of validity times has two drawbacks:
* It is not possible to model other infrastructure states, e.g. "under construction"
* It does not allow to model segmented validity times, e.g. before and after a construction blocking

The second point is really essential. Therefore, I propose to change the RTM modelling in the following way: instead of attributes @validFrom and @validTo, use a repeatable child element <valid> with attributes @from and @to to define the different segments of validity time. The resulting small example may look like this:

<netElement ...>
  <valid from="2018-01-01" to="2018-06-29"/>
  <valid from="2018-07-02" to="2018-12-31"/>
</netElement>

Any feedback is highly appreciated...

Best regards
Christian

--
Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany   www.railml.org

Posted by christian.rahmig on Wed, 04 Jul 2018 04:58:07 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,

although there has not been an answer on that topic so far, we need to

find a solution for the problem, because it is essential for railML 3.1
and related "beta 2" version scheduled for end of August [1].

In particular, I already implemented the required RTM related change in
railML 3.1. The latest version of railML 3.1 is available in the railML3
SVN trunk [2]. An overview of all the changes is provided in [3].

In this overview, replacing validity attributes by new Base class
Validity to allow for multiple validity times is marked as issue number 3.

[1]
 https://www.railml.org/en/public-relations/news/reader/33rd-
railml-conference-and-version-roadmap.html
[2] https://svn.railml.org/railML3/trunk
[3]
 http://forum.railML.org/userfiles/2018-07-02_railml_railml3- induced-changes-to-rtm12.pdf

Best regards
Christian

Am 20.03.2018 um 15:49 schrieb Christian Rahmig:
> Dear all,
>
> the information that a NetElement is valid (for operation) is currently
> modelled with the attributes @validFrom and @validTo. A resulting small
> example looks like this:
>
> <netElement ... validFrom="2018-01-01" validTo="2018-12-31"/>
>
> This implementation of validity times has two drawbacks:
> * It is not possible to model other infrastructure states, e.g. "under
> construction"
> * It does not allow to model segmented validity times, e.g. before and
> after a construction blocking
>
> The second point is really essential. Therefore, I propose to change the
> RTM modelling in the following way: instead of attributes @validFrom and
> @validTo, use a repeatable child element <valid> with attributes @from
> and @to to define the different segments of validity time. The resulting
> small example may look like this:
>
> <netElement ...>
>   <valid from="2018-01-01" to="2018-06-29"/>
>   <valid from="2018-07-02" to="2018-12-31"/>
> </netElement>
>
> Any feedback is highly appreciated...
>

> Best regards
> Christian
>

--
Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911
Altplauen 19h; 01187 Dresden; Germany   www.railml.org

Subject: Re: Validity times
Posted by Airy Magnien on Tue, 04 Sep 2018 09:27:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There is a twofold debate here:
- Whether we are discussing the operational availability of net elements or net entities (recent call
with C. Rahmig rather pointed at the IT object lifecycle management);
- Whether the time intervals should be attributes (current case) or references to time interval
objects (as proposed).
On the first aspect, there is a strong opinion that RTM, being a conceptual model describing the
railway network, should not deal with IT object lifecyle details ; there are by the way many options
to handle IT objects, depending on how much traceability is needed and how archiving is
organized;
On the second aspect, the debate goes on.