
Subject: swiType "interlacedSwitch" in IL
Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Wed, 16 Jan 2019 11:21:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

in the IL schema we have currently the possibility to mark a switch as type "interlacedSwitch" with relation to another switch because they both might have a dependency for interlocking operation. This particular type is currently not foreseen in IS at all. Do we need this type?

attached a photo of such interlaced switches (
https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Datei:Plektita_trakforke_14.jp eg)

--

Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

File Attachments

1) [InterlacedSwitch.jpg](#), downloaded 379 times

Subject: Re: swiType "interlacedSwitch" in IL
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Mon, 28 Jan 2019 10:10:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Jörg,
dear all,

Am 16.01.2019 um 12:21 schrieb Joerg von Lingen:

> [...]
> in the IL schema we have currently the possibility to mark a switch as type "interlacedSwitch" with relation to another
> switch because they both might have a dependency for interlocking operation. This particular type is currently not
> foreseen in IS at all. Do we need this type?
> [...]

it seems that there is no need for the "interlaced switch" at the moment. Thus, I recommend to skip this topic for railML 3.1.

Best regards
Christian

--

Christian Rahmig - Infrastructure scheme coordinator
railML.org (Registry of Associations: VR 5750)
Phone Coordinator: +49 173 2714509; railML.org: +49 351 47582911

Subject: Re: swithType "interlacedSwitch" in IL
Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Tue, 29 Jan 2019 04:52:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

switchType in IL plus the possible value "interlacedSwitch" is deleted

Regards,

Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

Christian Rahmig wrote on 28.01.2019 11:10:

> Dear Jörg,

> dear all,

>

> Am 16.01.2019 um 12:21 schrieb Joerg von Lingen:

>> [...]

>> in the IL schema we have currently the possibility to mark a switch as type "interlacedSwitch" with relation to another

>> switch because they both might have a dependency for interlocking operation. This particular type is currently not

>> forseen in IS at all. Do we need this type?

>> [...]

>

> it seems that there is no need for the "interlaced switch" at the moment. Thus, I recommend to skip this topic for railML 3.1.

>

> Best regards

> Christian

>
