

---

Subject: Re: [railML3] Request for extension of the 'crossing' infrastructure element  
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 29 May 2020 11:20:24 GMT

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

---

Dear Heidrun,

thank you for your feedback on railML 3.1 implementation. The issue you raised is very relevant.

Current implementation in railML 3.1 does not contain child elements for the various branches of a crossing. However, since <crossing> is (like any other functional infrastructure element) extendable, you are free to create such child elements for branches. From side of railML.org we may think about adding these missing child elements for release with railML 3.2, especially if further partners from the community share your opinion. Therefore, my question to the railML community: Do you have a need for modelling branches at crossings?

For the background discussion: there are different answers to the question whether a crossing (not a switch crossing!) can be considered as a topology relevant element. Some say "yes", because there is a (physical) connection of rails based on different NetElements and some say "no", because there is no "topological choice" at a crossing (you may only go one way and have no chance to choose a branch). Any comments on this (rather philosophical) discussion are highly appreciated, too.

Best regards  
Christian

---