
Subject: blockPart mission="other:..."

Posted by [Stefan de Konink](#) on Thu, 05 Mar 2020 22:41:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We have been informed that a RailML consumer is not able to handle mission="inspection", instead they request to use a private definition prefixed by "other:". I read RailML mandated to use the predefined enumerations for types that have been defined in the standard, before resorting to alternatives. Would my production interface have certification problems if these common types would not be used?

Subject: Re: blockPart mission="other:..."

Posted by _____ on Mon, 09 Mar 2020 09:25:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Stefan,

I would say it depends on what exactly would be the "other:..." value and what would be semantically behind it.

In general, it is right that using an extension (including "other:...") for something which is already defined in railML is not the meaning of a standard, leads to incompatibility and therefore should not be certified.

However, there may be a reasonable semantic difference between mission="inspection" and what your customer/consumer needs. If so, they should give an explanation why the usage of mission="inspection" would be misleading. railML can naturally not foresee everything which occurs but railML wants to define a standard for compatibility in general.

But in this certain case, since mission="inspection" has no much fixed meaning/definition by railML, I can hardly imagine that.

Best regards,
Dirk.

P.S.: To avoid misunderstandings: This is an opinion of a member who is called "senior" by the railML system (which hurts me a bit); it is no official statement concerning certification, where I have no entitlement.

Subject: Re: blockPart mission="other:..."

Posted by [Milan Wölke](#) on Tue, 10 Mar 2020 14:26:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Stefan and Dirk,

I completely agree with what Dirk said. In general an enumeration should not be extended if there

is a standardized value available already. However in certain cases there may be the need for further distinction. But that would need to be explained. Certification actually checks for issues like this in particular.

Best regards, Milan
