Dear Stefan,

welcome to the railML forum and thank you for you input.

I don't see any problems in railML 3 implementation of the track element. Here are my arguments:
* In contrast to railML 2, the <track> in railML 3 does not cover the navigation perspective, since this is completely defined in topology domain using <netElement> and <netRelation> elements.
* The definition of a track has been widened: it is no longer only defined as a railway section between two switches / crossings / bufferStop. In Trac ticket #368 [1] a track is defined as "a railway section that can be traversed by a train in a continuous motion", which allows for very short tracks as well as for very long tracks (that may pass several switches...).

Renaming "track" into sth like "usagePattern" does not seem to bring any benefits. On the contrary, I see quite a high potential for conflicts and misunderstandings: in fact, any infrastructure element can have sth like a "usage pattern". I would interpret this in the sense "how sth is used"...

However, names can be discussed, but there is another main issue about your proposal: "renaming" <track> into <usagePattern> cannot be considered as a minor version modification. I am afraid, we are then talking about railML 4 instead of railML 3.2.

What does the community think about the topic?

Best regards
Christian

[1] https://trac.railml.org/ticket/368