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This meeting was held in UN Palais des Nations, Geneva, 12th September 2011.

1. Meeting objectives
The principle objective of the meeting was to develop the cooperation between the two committees and to investigate further the possibilities of cooperation for the mutual benefit of both committees and their client systems.

In order to encourage open debate and information sharing, the meeting did not hold a formal agenda. A list of participants can be obtained from the JWG RID secretariat. Attendance varied through the day but averaged 25-30 attendees.

2. Format
The meeting was chaired by Dr Williams, Chairman of CEN TC278 WG15. He had been requested to make a keynote presentation on the progress of eCall and HGV eCall data concept, opportunities for harmonisation with RID, and an open debate on cooperation between the committees. He and called for any others to make presentations or summarise submitted papers. Presentations made were:

- eCall progress and HGV eCall/Data Harmonisation
- HeERO project progress
- Netherlands position paper on RID Decision Proposal
- France position paper on HGV Data requirements
- EC Paper on HGV electronic data
- UIC Paper on paperless HGV documentation.

For detail of these presentations/papers please see RID circulated documents.

Each subject was presented and openly debated in a constructive forum.

3. Outcomes/Action Points
JWG RID had met with WG15 in July, and many of their requests for the composition of data concepts had been accepted and integrated into the proposed eCall HGV data concept TR.WG15 had made best efforts, given the limitations of the technology, to incorporate RIDs wish list in the current version of its deliverable. By far the most significant its the provision of a URL to where the full load characterisation data is available. As vehicles often currently have a contact phone number displayed, and this is often contacted by the emergency services, the HGV eCall data concept also makes provision to include this. RID noted that a telephone contact number was not part of its provisions and needed to make further consideration of the
appropriateness of this. RID pointed out that it was of prime importance that abbreviated information provided should not under any circumstances increase the risk to emergency responders. However the efforts of WG15 to align and harmonise was noted and appreciated, and it is important for the two groups to continue to work more closely together in the interests of harmonisation. As a result of the discussions there were clear outcomes and action points for both committees to enable them to move forward together.

These were explained.

- It was agreed that the most important data concept was an IPv6 internet URL link to where the completely characterised data of the load is available. If this is provided no other data is required.
- Harmonising data does not tie you to using the same medium to transmit the message
- The HGV Data Concept is a ‘complex’ structure comprising more limited concepts/data elements
- We should limit our work at this stage to harmonise these ‘elements’.
  - Thus whenever ADR goods are described we agree that we use the format of the UN ADR code (and make a common definition of this in ASN.1)
  - Whenever we want to identify the product (non ADR) we agree that we use the format of the UN SPC code (and make a common definition of this in ASN.1)
  - Whenever we want to identify the packaging type……etc.etc……
- The groups need to develop a paper on steps needed to further this cooperation and harmonisation (BW to draft a position paper)
- There was interest to consider a more flexible HGV data concept (or multiple variants ) where different use cases could be supported-in some cases with many ADRs with little or no support data, in other situations with very limited number of ADRs but with more detail. BW to take this back to WG15 for further consideration as to the practicability and possibilities.
- What is needed by RID is to accurately characterise ADR goods: currently it is felt that – ADR code, weight/volume, packaging type and possibly ‘special provision code’ is enough to provide a link to a unique type identification
- There was a discussion as to whether the ADR code or a unique unambiguous (one time) sequential issue number (not spreadsheet row number) is a more appropriate identifier. WG15 can accommodate either. RID to consider and decide on their preference.
- UIC considered that a consignment note ("contrat de transport international ferroviaire des marchandises") was key information was essential information (paper 19)
- There is a question of the content difference between the CIM and the ‘Single Administrative Document’ that accompanies road transport- BW and UIC to investigate
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- UIC explained their experience of rolling out the CIM – there is a problem to ensure that a CIM generated from different actors in the chain are consistent.
- RID need to decide the importance of the EC label and whether this is key data for its own electronic data concepts, and if it considers it important for eCall HGV data concept
- It was recognised and accepted that there is a difference between the CIM Transport document and an emergency message
- It was recognised and accepted that there is a difference between the ADR ‘Dangerous goods transport document(s) and related information’ (5.4.1) and a CIN transport document or SAD
- It was recognised that ADR ‘Dangerous goods transport document(s)’ are more comprehensive than can be accommodated within the limited data eCall data concept
- The growing significance of UBL data concepts in UBL (Universal Business Language) from OASIS in freight transport, particularly international freight transport, and its upgrade from v2.0 to v2.1 which now has a significant number of transport related data concepts defined. This is a double edged sword. On the one hand, if the data concepts are the same, as UBL has defined them fully in XML and ASN.1, it may save a considerable amount of work. If they have been defined without adoption of UNECE data definitions there is a significant problem, which JWG-RID need to formally point out in writing during the current final comment period. The meeting was reminded of the UN-ECE regulation requirement that ‘electronic data shall be consistent with existing UN-ECE regulations’. RID to investigate and take action if appropriate. BW to provide links to UBL.
- It was felt highly desirable that the two committees (RID & WG15) and their chairs should continue to cooperate, closely, with each invited to each others meetings, and a close relationship maintained.
- It was suggested that JWG RID should also work closely with the development of ISO 15638 (Telematics Applications for Regulated Vehicles), where the ADR data requirements can be exchanged between vehicles and relevant parties, without the data limitations of eCall, and may be used in both emergency and routine operations and administrative management.
- No current requirements for decision at RID are identified, other than the support of the cooperation

Bob Williams
Meeting Chair
ANNEX 1

Some conclusions from joint meeting CEN UN working group on telematics, 12 sept 2011 re data requirements:

In case of an emergency the information need varies in time.
First of all you want to know:
   1. Notification there has been an accident: location, time, vehicle type, license plate, owner.
      than:
   2. Is the vehicle carrying dangerous goods? y/n
   3. Is it a tanker? y/n

A. In case of data in the message itself:
1. What are the dangerous goods know and are they thought to be all the goods:
   UN number/ highest hazard identification code from packaging code/ quantity
   UN 1234 Gevi31 based upon packaging code II 2 ton
   UN 1235 Gevi31 based upon packaging code II 3 ton
   UN 1236 Gevi31 based upon packaging code II 3 ton
   UN 1237 Gevi31 based upon packaging code II 2 ton
   UN 1231 Gevi unknown packaging code unknown 2 ton
   According to the vehicle information this could be all the dangerous goods onboard
   Beware this list might not be complete or updated always take precautions.

2. Minimum requirement to deal with these goods:
   Toxic stay up wind
   Fire water not allowed
   If in contact
   If breathed in

3. Contact telephone number available: +32 1234567891

B. In case of using a external data source
1. Full details of the dangerous goods transport document as prescribed in the ADR
2. Full details of the consignment note
3. Minimum requirement to deal with these goods:
   Toxic stay up wind
   Fire water not allowed
   If in contact
   If breathed in
4. Contact telephone number available: +32 1234567891
   Beware this information might not be complete or updated always take precautions.

C. In case of the use of a new way of coding the ADR list
1. UN number/ packaging code/ labels/ etc./
2. Minimum requirement to deal with these goods:
   Toxic stay up wind
   Fire water not allowed
   If in contact
   If breathed in
3. Contact telephone number available: +32 1234567891
   Beware this information might not be complete or updated always take precautions.