

---

Subject: Re: [railML3] Request for extension of the 'crossing' infrastructure element  
Posted by [christian.rahmig](#) on Fri, 03 Jul 2020 11:04:34 GMT

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

---

Dear Fabiana,

Fabiana Diotallevi wrote on Fri, 26 June 2020 15:46

...

The <external> tags contain the references to the netRelations that correspond to the straight branches of the crossing.

Do you think that this approach is correct?

that's an interesting approach you present, which shows that the railML schema syntax provides a lot of flexibility. However, this flexibility needs to be limited by semantic constraints, and from my perspective, we should define such constraints for your model approach :-)

These are my arguments against your approach:

1. The element <external> was discussed as an element for file external linking, e.g. to be used when cutting the infrastructure into several pieces for different railML files (see forum discussion <https://www.railml.org/forum/index.php?t=msg&th=657&start=0&> and Trac ticket #363)

2. The above mentioned discussion in the forum concluded with the opinion that this <external> element is not needed as its functionality can be realized with existing elements/parameters of id and designator. Therefore, element <external> shall be marked deprecated for future railML 3.x versions.

3. Linking of NetElements (and NetRelations) is the task of topology in order to form a consistent and navigable railway network based on a graph. Therefore, the proposed solution formulated in Trac ticket #380 aims at implementing the missing link between <crossing> and underlying topology without re-definition of topological relations on higher infrastructure levels.

What do you think, Fabiana, does the proposed solution in Trac ticket #380 fulfil your needs?

Best regards  
Christian