

---

Subject: Suggestion towards the use of "crossing" for bridge, tunnel, level crossing etc. in railML3

Posted by [Torben Brand](#) on Fri, 08 Sep 2017 13:55:03 GMT

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

---

Jernbanedirektoratet and Bane NOR suggest to use a high level approach. Based on the existing modelling in railML that everything modelled is relative/placed under a railway track. We suggest to use the grouping element "crossing". But as the term is taken, and we cannot think of an alternative, we suggest to go one element level lower according to the attribute if an element is above, below or crossing the track at level. We suggest to describe these elements as "overCrossing", "underCrossing" and "levelCrossing".

The elements have a generic attribute @trafficType, describing what type of traffic is crossing the track.

trafficType= "unknown", "road", "pedestrian", "rail", "ship", "metro", "tram", "other;" use terms from Open street map.

The elements have generic attribute @constructionType with their specific values. This next to their specific attributes.

<overCrossing>

constructionType = "unknown", "bridge", "tunnel", "underpass" (subway), "hall", "embankment", "other:"

<underCrossing>

constructionType = "unknown", "tunnel", "bridge", "overpass", "snowshead", "shead", "hall", "cutting", "other:".

Alternative we suggest to use the most common constructionType of the main elements. So instead of

"overCrossing" we use "bridge", instead of "underCrossing" we use "tunnel" and levelCrossing" stays "levelCrossing". But this can generate weird combinations like a tunnel (crossing element) that is a bridge (construction type).

---