
Subject: [railML2] extend the elements under <organisationalUnits> with the <designator> element

Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Tue, 30 Jun 2020 11:22:47 GMT

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

Jernbanedirektoratet suggests to extend the elements under <organisationalUnits> (<https://wiki2.railml.org/index.php?title=CO:organizationalUnits>) with the <designator> element in version 2.5.

The reason is many different code lists exists. These overlap and are not consistent. We need to be able to reference to the register used for the entry value.

Note the same organisation can have different entrys in different registers depending on their type of role. For instance an IM can be both an: infrastructure manager, railway undertaking and vehicle owner.

Examples of registers are:

railML codelist for IM

UIC RICS (<https://uic.org/support-activities/it/rics>)

ERA OCR (https://www.era.europa.eu/registers/ocr_en)

ERA TAF/TAP Company code (<https://teleref.era.europa.eu/>)

Vehicle keeper Marking Register (VKM) (https://www.era.europa.eu/registers/vkm_en)

National registers (<https://sjt.no/jernbane/tillatelser/jernbanevirksomheter/>)

Organisational registers

This with reference to topic "Suggested refined definitions and extension to organizationalUnits" (https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=706&goto=2325&#msg_2325)

This is already implemented in railML3.

Subject: Re: [railML2] extend the elements under <organisationalUnits> with the <designator> element

Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 03 Jul 2020 12:55:46 GMT

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

Dear Torben, dear all,

sounds like a good idea to me.

I am wondering if we need to keep the codelist InfrastructureManagers.xml or if we can get rid of it?

Any comments appreciated...

Best regards

Christian

Subject: Re: [railML2] extend the elements under <organisationalUnits> with the <designator> element

Posted by [Thomas Nygreen](#) on Wed, 19 Aug 2020 15:28:20 GMT

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

Dear Torben,

The coordinators discussed this topic in our telco on 26 June and I was given the task to create a Trac ticket and present it in the forum. You can find the Trac ticket at [1], but then I left for the summer and the forum post was postponed. So I thank you for saving me the work :)

One correction, though: this issue also applies to railML 3, as <designator> was not applied to organisational units in railML 3.1.

As Christian writes, we also need feedback from the community on whether we should:

a) Keep the InfrastructureManagers.xml code list as an authoritative reference for @code in <infrastructureManager> (in addition to <designator>)

b) Stop using the code list for future versions and recommend using <designator> instead. @code will still exist in 2.5, but will function like it does on other elements, and no longer be a universal reference.

I prefer b. It saves maintenance, is more consistent with how @code is used elsewhere, and gives consistency between different types of organisational units.

[1] <https://trac.railml.org/ticket/383>

Best regards,

Thomas Nygreen - Common schema coordinator, railML.org
