

---

Subject: Re: [railML3.1] Modelling of a double slip switch  
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 24 Apr 2020 06:14:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Jörg,

Jörg von Lingen wrote on Fri, 03 April 2020 06:05: Dear all,

there seems to be a general issue when transforming a track plan into railML:

1) For an 'ordinarySwitch' we have in IS the elements 'leftBranch' and 'rightBranch'. Just from the netRelations it seems not really possible to decide which is one of the both branches. How would you solve the issue?

You are right: from topology alone, it is not possible to identify a left or right branch of a switch. But this "gap" is intended, because topology has no layout. Topology purely describes logical connections/relations and navigability of the network. Therefore: the infrastructure element <switchIS> is needed (together with topology) to distinguish left and right branch at a switch.

Jörg von Lingen wrote on Fri, 03 April 2020 06:05: For a 'doubleSwitchCrossing' we have in IS the elements 'straightBranch' and 'turningBranch' but in IL we need to split into two normal switches which again have 'leftBranch' and 'rightBranch'. Could this be solved just from the

topology information? How would you do this trick?

As said before: it is not possible to distinguish between left and right branch just from topology. However, netElements and netRelations describe the topology dimension (navigability...) of a double switch crossing completely. In infrastructure the <switchIS> element builds on top of this topology view summarizing the relations in "straight" and "turning" branches. If - in interlocking - you want to model the double switch crossing with two <switchIL> elements, a different aggregation approach is needed. How this looks in detail, still needs to be analysed and results should be published here in this forum thread.

Best regards  
Christian