Dear Heidrun,

the topic you raised is not that simple as it seems in the beginning.

The biggest issue I see in the incomplete modelling approach from infrastructure perspective: In the example you provided the exact location of the level crossing remains unclear when only looking at infrastructure domain. The connection between the infrastructure element "levelCrossingIS" and the topologic railway network is provided only with the interlocking element "levelCrossingIL". This "detour" is not good thinking of use cases that include only infrastructure and disregard interlocking.

Therefore, I strongly recommend to use one (or more) linear location(s) to link the <levelCrossingIS> with the underlaying topology built by NetElements.

Regarding the new track type "levelCrossingTrack" you were proposing: Having linked the <levelCrossingIS> with the <netElement> instances covered, there is no need to tag a track as being a "level crossing track", because the information is implicitly given in the linking. As written in the wiki documentation [1] the attribute <track>@type is used to describe the general functionality of the track. The existing values "mainTrack", "secondaryTrack", "sidingTrack" and "connectingTrack" are complementary, whereas a "level crossing track" is basically a combination of one of the mentioned track types with a level crossing. Therefore, I don't like to integrate "level crossing track" into the <track>@type enumeration.

So, what does the community think about this topic?

[1] https://wiki3.railml.org/wiki/IS:track

Best regards
Christian