
Subject: switchType IS vs. IL

Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2019 11:16:13 GMT

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

Dear all,

currently we have an attribute switchType in IS and IL which seem to be redundant. For the purpose in IL to distinguish particular relations we have found the following matches to IS making the attribute unnecessary in IL:

simpleSwitch <=> ordinarySwitch/insideCurvedSwitch/outsideCurvedSwitch without relatedMovableElement

simpleSwitch <=> ordinarySwitch/insideCurvedSwitch/outsideCurvedSwitch + relatedMovableElement (derailer)

coupledSwitch <=> ordinarySwitch/insideCurvedSwitch/outsideCurvedSwitch + relatedMovableElement (switch)

doubleSlipSwitch <=> doubleSwitchCrossing

singleSlipSwitch <=> simpleSwitchCrossing

Would you agree to remove the switchType in IL?

--

Regards,

Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

Subject: Re: switchType IS vs. IL

Posted by [Joerg von Lingen](#) on Sat, 26 Jan 2019 04:01:11 GMT

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

@switchType in <switchIL> removed

Joerg von Lingen wrote on 16.01.2019 12:16:

> Dear all,

>

> currently we have an attribute switchType in IS and IL which seem to be redundant. For the purpose in IL to distinguish

> particular relations we have found the following matches to IS making the attribute unnecessary in IL:

>

> simpleSwitch <=> ordinarySwitch/insideCurvedSwitch/outsideCurvedSwitch without relatedMovableElement

> simpleSwitch <=> ordinarySwitch/insideCurvedSwitch/outsideCurvedSwitch + relatedMovableElement (derailer)

> coupledSwitch <=> ordinarySwitch/insideCurvedSwitch/outsideCurvedSwitch + relatedMovableElement (switch)

> doubleSlipSwitch <=> doubleSwitchCrossing

> singleSlipSwitch <=> simpleSwitchCrossing
>
> Would you agree to remove the switchType in IL?
>
