Subject: swicthType "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
forseen in IS at all. Do we need this type?

attached a photo of such interlaced switches (
https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Datei:Plektita_trakforko_14.jp eg)
--
Regards,
Jörg von Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator

File Attachments
1) InterlacedSwitch.jpg, downloaded 328 times

Subject: Re: swicthType "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
> 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

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

Subject: Re: swicthType "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
>