



Contract Number 235542

## RACE networkRFID

FP7 Thematic Network  
ICT-PSP: a European concerted effort on RFID

### D4.1.2 – WP4 Common terminologies report

Due date of deliverable: 28-02-2010 (M12)  
Actual submission date: 15-02-2010

Start date of project: March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2009

Duration: 36 months  
Version: 1

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: ETSI

<b>Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013)</b>		
<b>Dissemination Level</b>		
<b>PU</b>	Public	<b>PU</b>
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
<b>RE</b>	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
<b>CO</b>	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

# TABLE of CONTENTS

<i>Introduction</i>	3
<i>Progress</i>	4
<i>Deliverables</i>	4
<i>Planned Activities to M24</i>	5
<i>Appendix A)</i>	6

## Introduction

The challenge of common terminology is one faced by many organizations from those trying to make use of it through those trying to create standards. It is particularly prevalent where there are significant and rapid advances in technology development or its adoption and, RFID is no exception. Duplication of terms can cause considerable confusion and make RFID seem more complicated than it needs to be. In the worst cases it can delay adoption or impede progress towards the development of solutions or standards.

This deliverable sets out to eliminate the confusion of duplicated terms. Where possible it will work towards diminishing duplication. Duplication can exist where one term has multiple meanings but also where there are several terms for the same meaning. The former challenge is easier to accommodate in the structure developed by RACE networkRFID WP4. The multiple meanings are grouped sequentially with repeated listing of the shared term. Where there are multiple terms for the referencing the same or similar explanations then a note will be added in the comments field to allow the user to be aware of this form of duplication. This may be viewed as supporting multiple definitions but the fact is that ignoring such duplication risks undermining the quality of RACE networkRFID WP4 deliverables and diminishing its potential influence to assist broader and faster technology adoption.

<b>Deliverable number: D4.1.2</b>							
<b>Deliverable title: WP4 Common terminologies report</b>							
Dissemination level (i): P				Nature of the Deliverable (ii): R			
Month of Delivery: M12, 24, 36							
Participant no. contributing to the deliverable	5	2	3	7	9	11	13
Participant short name	ETSI	GS1	FHG IML	IBER LOG	AIDC	ELTRUN-AUEB	ISMB
Participant no. contributing to the deliverable	14	15	16	17	18	20	21
Participant short name	UNIMAN	ADO	ITT	TECNALIA-RBTK	VTT	RAND EUROPE	SINTEF
Participant no. contributing to the deliverable	22	25					
Participant short name	RFID NORDIC	INTER NET					
Deliverable description and objectives to be achieved (iii): To improve the communication, a glossary of RFID related terms used by the Thematic Network stakeholders will be created and maintained. A consensus based Thematic Network set of definitions of terms will be produced in a public report published every year.							
Role of the different participants in the production of the deliverable (iv): ETSI, with the support of other participants, will collect and compile the RFID glossaries of terms used by the Thematic Network stakeholders and help to find harmonised definitions.							

## Progress

Common terminology has been the focus of WP4 activities during Q4, 2009. The participation and quality of contributions has seen encouraging progress to the M12 deliverable of a preliminary extensive list of WP4 mutually agreed common terms and definitions. Key contributors have been ETSI, BIBA, RFID Nordic, RAND Europe, Sintef, GS1, ISMB, Learning Well, RFID Sec, AIDC Centre for Wales, CNRFID and Ardaco.

The WP4 group have provided support not only through their valued direct contributions to terminology and definition but also in terms of agreeing the framework for gathering together, discussing, refining and consolidating the findings. The mutually agreed approach is list all terms and definitions received. All terms are listed and given a preliminary categorization.

The categorization is used to differentiate terms between those that are:

- RFID system related
- Industry sector specific
- Software/Middleware/Information system (including network)
- Other

Provision has been made for further classifications should “other” end up with too many entries. The classification was added in order to assist the common terminology user navigate to areas of specific interest. The classification follows a similar approach adopted by the GRIFS standards database <http://grifs-project.eu/db/>.

Following the columns for classification and term there are three columns where information related to the term can be entered. The first column is the “description”, the second “additional information” and, the third “comments”. The reason for this hierarchy of information is to allow the user to have the briefest of adequate descriptions followed by a much richer explanation of the term. The comments column provides an opportunity to describe related information such as terminology conflicts or notes on planned actions such as new or ongoing developments related to the term or its definition e.g. a new standard, etc..

All definitions are captured even where these are not the same or in worse cases conflict. Each term is discussed by the group before being edited. This is a lengthy and time consuming process but it does provide full traceability, inclusion and the resulting consensus is motivating to everyone involved. Terms which have been deleted have been removed with the mutual consent of the WP4 group. The majority of these terms refer to product names or company references and were deemed to be too specific to be included within “common terminology”.

## Deliverables

The M12 deliverables are outlined in appendix A). Before this list of definitions are published on the RACE networkRFID Web page or Web page link there are a number of additional steps planned. The first of these steps is to complete the preliminary review, which is roughly 50% complete as at mid February 2010. The second step is to inform the RACE networkRFID Board of the deliverables. This step is planned to be completed by the next MB face-to-face meeting in March 2010. The final step planned is to publish the preliminary list of terms, their associated descriptions and categorization.

## **Planned Activities to M24**

The following are the planned activities between M12 (March 2010) and M24.

Communication and ratification of the M12 deliverables by:

- RACE networkRFID MB (Management Board)
- RACE networkRFID GA (General Assembly)
- Only terms not queried or still work-in-progress will be published

Feedback from organizations or groups outside of RACE networkRFID:

- ETSI TC M2M/TC ERM TG34/TC TISPAN WG7/TC ITS
- CEN TC 225
- CEN WS DPP
- CENLEC (TC 106x and TC 111x are to be confirmed)
- ITU-T bringing in more terms related to WSN and ITU-T JCA-NID
- ISO/IEC JTC1 SC31
- AIMglobal
- NFC Forum

Additional terms with focus on industry sectors with established growing or emerging RFID adoptions:

- WCO
- IATA
- UPU/IPC
- ODETTE

Develop outline model for post M36 maintenance:

- Governance model
- Organization
- Financing

## **Appendix A)**

Tables to be added. Tables currently 74 pages long.