## Subject: Re: [railML3] Request for extension of the 'crossing' infrastructure element

Posted by Jörg von Lingen   on Sat, 30 May 2020 07:05:58 GMT

Hi,

just a remark on the issue:

An interlocking always needs to set a particular (virtual) position to a crossing in order to clearly define the path. This is needed even if the trackwork outside does not move at all, i.e. no physical switching of the crossing. But that is why the counterpart in IL subschema is named <movableCrossing>.

Best regards,
Joerg v. Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator
Am 29.05.2020 um 13:20 schrieb Christian Rahmig:
> 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.