

Hello,

- > If we have a <track> (Track1, see below) with any <crossing> (+), there are
- > 2 <connection>-elements, one "incoming" and connected with Track2, the
- > other "outgoing" and connected with Track3. So it doesn't matter if it's a
- > single/double crossing switch or a simple crossing.

For interlocking, switches, derailleurs (A derailer is a switch with the diverging track ending in the ballast.) and crossings are regarded as one element, whereas single crossing switches (German: EKW), double crossing switches (German: DKW) and three way switches consist of 2 two elements.

Thus, when modelling route interlocking, we have to refer to:

- connectionID for single and double crossing switches and three way switches
- elementID for simple crossings and derailleurs
- connectionID or elementID for single switches

This is a bit confusing, especially as most elements have both, an elementID and one or more connectionID's. I think, there should be a clearer reference attribute.

Another problem ist that in the special case, where a <trackBegin>/<trackEnd> is in a crossing switch, there would be no use for the third connectionID.

Therefore, I suggest to give single and double crossing switches and three way switches no "elementID", but an "elementGroupID", an "elementID1" (for the "lower" part in direction of internal milage of the main track) and an "elementID2" (for the "upper" part). What do you think about this?

Regards.

--

Dipl.-Ing. Gregor Theeg
wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter
Professur für Verkehrssicherungstechnik
der TU Dresden

Tel.: +49 / 351 / 463 36542
Fax: +49 / 351 / 463 36644
<http://vsite.tu-dresden.de>