

---

Subject: Rollingstock - modelling patterns  
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Tue, 20 Nov 2018 03:54:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear all,

in the misc-forum we have discussed about modelling patterns which shall apply for railML3 development. In the current RS schema there is one main conflict with the set rules - model hierarchy.

- 1) What do you think about hierarchy issue concerning a perspective RS in railML3?
- 2) Shall the modelling split into vehicle components (independent of vehicle) in order to achieve a rather flat hierarchy?
- 3) What would you see in RS as "view", "container", "object" and "part"?

Refer also [https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=573&goto=2014&#msg\\_2014](https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=573&goto=2014&#msg_2014)

Regards,  
Jörg v.Lingen - Rollingstock coordinator

---

---

Subject: Re: Rollingstock - modelling patterns  
Posted by on Thu, 22 Nov 2018 09:23:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Jörg,

- > 1) What do you think about hierarchy issue concerning a perspective RS in railML3?

I think a flat hierarchy is not more practical especially in a very 'technical' context. I already have often the problem of needing to 'jump' very often in the railML files (when reading manually) to resolve references. Sometimes I loose overview...

So, I would prefer the rather deep but contextual hierarchy we already have.

Additionally, when I made the suggestion of a possible generic model for future <TT> (with a very flat hierarchy), it was widely refused because of too less structure. So, I am probably (obviously) not the only one with this opinion.

Best regards,  
Dirk.

---

---

Subject: Re: Rollingstock - modelling patterns  
Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Thu, 22 Nov 2018 12:30:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thanks Dirk for your input. I fully agree.

Regards,  
Jörg v.Lingen - Rollingstock coordinator

Dirk Bräuer wrote on 22.11.2018 10:23:

> Dear Jörg,

>

>> 1) What do you think about hierarchy issue concerning a perspective RS in railML3?

>

> I think a flat hierarchy is not more practical especially in a very 'technical' context. I already have often the problem of needing to 'jump' very often in the railML files (when reading manually) to resolve references. Sometimes I loose overview...

>

> So, I would prefer the rather deep but contextual hierarchy we already have.

>

> Additionally, when I made the suggestion of a possible generic model for future <TT> (with a very flat hierarchy), it was widely refused because of too less structure. So, I am probably (obviously) not the only one with this opinion.

>

> Best regards,

> Dirk.

>

---