Subject: What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s?
Posted by Thomas Nygreen JBD on Fri, 28 Dec 2018 22:00:40 GMT

Dear all,

I cannot find any documentation of what should determine which assets that go into which
<assetForIL>. I assume that there is a reason why the schema allows multiple <assetsForIL>s,
but I cannot find that reason in the drafted tutorial or in the forum.

What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s? If we look to the infrastructure domain, the
closest relative to <assetForIL> is <functionalInfrastructure>, which does not multiply. So why not
remove <assetsForILs> and have only one <assetsForIL>?

Best regards,
Thomas Nygreen

Subject: Re: What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s?
Posted by Joerg von Lingen on Sun, 30 Dec 2018 04:26:43 GMT

Hi Thomas,

in the beginning <assetForIL> was single but as it contains engineering data of
interlockings one might consider different phases of evolution during
reconstruction of stations. Although explicit validity times are not yet
implemented this was the rationale for having more than one <assetForIL>.

Best regards,
Joerg v. Lingen

Rollingstock Coordinator

On 28.12.2018 23:00, Thomas Nygreen wrote:
> Dear all,
>
> I cannot find any documentation of what should determine
> which assets that go into which <assetForIL>. I assume that
> there is a reason why the schema allows multiple
> <assetsForIL>s, but I cannot find that reason in the drafted
> tutorial or in the forum.
>
> What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s? If we
> look to the infrastructure domain, the closest relative to
> <assetForIL> is <functionalInfrastructure>, which does not
> multiply. So why not remove <assetsForILs> and have only one
> <assetsForIL>?

>
> Best regards,
> Thomas Nygreen

Subject: Re: What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s?
Posted by Thomas Nygreen JBD on Thu, 03 Jan 2019 18:41:41 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Jörg,

Would this not be the same for all subschemas? At least, both infrastructure and timetables have phases during their planning. Yet, the infrastructure subschema does not have such a grouping of entities. Instead, all functional infrastructure entities are in one view, only grouped into containers by type. I would welcome a coordination of the strategies in the different schemas.

Subject: Re: What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s?
Posted by Joerg von Lingen on Wed, 13 Jan 2021 04:41:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear all,

about two years ago the question for multiple <assetsForIL>s was raised. Subsequently the superior container was removed
for railML3.1. However, in-between the need for having more than one asset list became apperant. So for railMl3.2 the
superior container was re-introduced.

In the definition of the generic types of a specificInfrastructurManager there is the reference to the asset lists
belonging to this infrastructure manager. It is also conceivable to have several asset lists covering different stages
of a project although a status attribute is not yet included.

Finally, it means there can be several asset lists belonging to one infrastructure manager but any asset list belongs
only to a single infrastructure manager.

--
Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Rollingstock Coordinator

Thomas Nygreen wrote on 28.12.2018 23:00:
> Dear all,
>

> I cannot find any documentation of what should determine
> which assets that go into which <assetForIL>. I assume that
> there is a reason why the schema allows multiple
> <assetsForIL>s, but I cannot find that reason in the drafted
> tutorial or in the forum.
>
> What is the rationale for multiple <assetsForIL>s? If we
> look to the infrastructure domain, the closest relative to
> <assetForIL> is <functionalInfrastructure>, which does not
> multiply. So why not remove <assetsForILs> and have only one
> <assetsForIL>?
>
> Best regards,
> Thomas Nygreen
>