

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

9 September 2011

Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Geneva, 13-23 September 2011

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

Reports of informal working groups

Comments on the report of the eighth session INF 7

Transmitted by the Government of France

1. At the end of the last session from the telematics Working group the french expert made some proposal on how to complement the studies that have been conducted up to now especially in Germany. (See paragraph 34):

“34. Using the presentation in Annex IX, the representative of France informed participants of the follow-up project that would be carried out his country. France offered to carry out work in the following areas:

– Modelling the position data.

– Produce an index of the use cases to be investigated. Particular attention should be given to the various participants and their tasks.

– Produce a list of common topics where there could be cooperation with other projects (e.g. SCUTUM, eCall, Eureka).

– Try to find a solution to integrate all these projects in order to achieve a global architecture.”

2. Paragraph 35 gives a quite negative answer to some points especially those related to the development and modelling of use cases. See paragraph 35:

35. Participants at the working group appeared to be sceptical of the value of such a research project. The chairman pointed out that the use cases had already been considered in the columns highlighted in blue in the right-hand side of the “Who does what” table. However, the working group agreed that among the existing systems, those most suitable for telematics applications stipulated by the working group for use in the carriage of dangerous goods had to be identified.

3. In our view this relates to a misunderstanding in particular of what is meant by “use case”. It is regrettable that time was too short at the end of the meeting to clarify this point. Especially the statement saying that the use cases are already dealt with in the right part of the table appear to be wrong.

4. Therefore the expert from France would like to, clarify what is meant at this point.

5. The work produced by Germany has provided in particular:

- Data dictionary expressed for software implementations

- UML model for the data using class

- Some elementary use cases as first example

6. A use case diagram in the Unified Modeling Language (UML) is a type of behavioural diagram defined by and created from a Use-case analysis. Its purpose is to present a graphical overview of the functionality provided by a system in terms of actors, their goals (represented as use cases), and any dependencies between those use cases. This has a precise technical meaning and is different from what can be understood in colloquial language.

7. Although the table prepared by the working group provides for a list of data it has been necessary to conduct a rather long work to define models for each data. The same way the possible uses listed in the table need some modelling under UML procedures.

8. The modelling of use cases would allow:

- Continue the UML modelling in a consistent way

- Describe the behavioural aspects in order to help the developers to share the same view and ease the development of interoperable systems

- Make it easier for the DG experts to evaluate the different cases in order to help the management of the communication in the further developments

9. Specifically on this point concerning use cases the joint meeting is invited to take note of this clarification and reconsider the way this proposal is seen.

10. More generally, the French expert made this proposal for future work at in an open minded way looking for feedback on how to adjust it. This also is not very precise in the report. Additionally we are at a point where the situation changes rapidly and new projects related to our work are developed in parallel (for example Ecall which is discussed in the joint CEN joint meeting working group on Monday). The expert from France still has some budget s that can be allocated to follow up work. The joint meeting is invited to give some advice on the directions suggested under paragraph 34 of the report in INF 7.

11. Some clear statements would be helpful in order to justify future budgeting.
