My colleagues and me are facing a scenario, where a so called "doubleSwitchCrossing" is in a leter step being linked two single switches inside the "interlocking" (in railML as well as inside the real-live-system).

The difficulty is, that certain individual "designator"-Elements and also the name would also have to be assigned in Infrastructure-node individually.
In the work group for the ETCS-Use case, we elaborated that this special scenario is not covered yet by the current possibilities of modeling inside raiML 3.x.

To comply as much as possible with the already defined approaches in railML 3.2, we think it might help to introduce further optional sub-elements for the case of a "doubelSwitchCrossing" under such conditions.
These would appear only if needed - similar to what is being done with the specific elements "straightBranch" and "turningBranch".

As working title these specific extra branches should be called "switchPartition". Any referencing - e.g. inside "switchesIL" would occur to these sub-nodes.

In this regards it should be discussed, if this approach should also be considered for a singleSwitchCrossing as well - but only with one occurence.

You can find a complete double switch crossing in the attahement.

```
<switchPartition id="swip_13cd" applicationDirection="normal">
 <name name="11" language="NO"/>
 <designator register="infrastructureRegister" entry="switch11entry"/>
 <leftBranch netRelationRef="nr_10388E_0_103C17_1"/>
 <rightBranch netRelationRef="nr_103C17_1_B543_0"/>
</switchPartition>
```

File Attachments
1) 2021-12-06_DoubleSwitchCrossing_vs_2switchesIL_Forum.xml,
downloaded 178 times