METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

BIC PRODUCT DATA EXCELLENCE AWARD (PDEA) REVIEW WORKSHOP – #1

Bowker Offices, 5th Floor, Dorset Rise, London EC4Y 8EN
Wednesday 30th September 2015, 10am–4pm

Present
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Judith Bennett, Oxford University Press
Nabiha Evans, Amazon
Thomas Herbert, Palgrave Macmillan
Alex Ingram, EDItEUR
Karina Luke, BIC
Peter Mathews, Cambridge University Press
Paul Theijs, BooksoniX
Jack Tipping, Bowker (Chair)
Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones
Keith Walters, Bibliographic Data Services
Laura Williams, Penguin Random House
Alfred Willman, Random House Group

Apologies
Jenny Brownley, WHSmith's
Clive Herbert, Nielsen
Kieron Smith, Blackwell's
George Walkley, Hachette

1. **Introduction to the Product Data Excellence Accreditation Review Project**
   KL welcomed the Group to the workshop, thanking them for attending, and read out the apologies. She noted that the purpose of this workshop is to review the current Product Data Excellence Award (PDEA) accreditation scheme to ensure that it remains fit for purpose. She noted that the discussion during this workshop will need to address which types of organisation should be accredited on the scheme and what aspects of their metadata the organisations should be assessed on; including a discussion about whether to incorporate ONIX 3.0 and *Thema* usage into the revision of the scheme.

   KL noted that the PDEA accreditation scheme currently accredits publishers only and for this reason, this particular workshop will focus on the revision of the scheme for publishers with a view to opening up the scheme to other organisation types in future. She explained that there are currently 3 tiers of award available. For further information about the current scheme, please see the following page on the BIC website:
   http://www.bic.org.uk/90/Product-Data-Excellence-Awards/

   KL informed the Group that the PDEA accreditation scheme was last reviewed in 2010 and this review is therefore timely. Once the revision is complete, the scheme will be relaunched and promoted widely. KL expressed her hope that the revised scheme will encourage more organisations to apply for accreditation. JT noted that the PDEA accreditation scheme is free to apply to and organisations do not need to be BIC member organisations in order to apply.

2. **PDEA Summary of Measures: Minimum compliancy and timeliness requirements**
   KL circulated and explained the Summary of Measures grid to the attendees of the

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

workshop. She noted that in order to meet the BIC Basic accreditation level, 60% of all new titles must be fully compliant with the BIC Basic data element set sixteen weeks before publication date; in addition, 80% of all available titles must be fully compliant with the BIC Basic data element set, the cover image / jacket must be supplied by the publication date, and all metadata must be submitted to data agencies. It was noted that ONIX usage is not compulsory in order to gain the BIC Basic award but it is compulsory to obtain a BIC Excellence or BIC Excellence Plus award; this is due to the enhanced data requirement to obtain a higher award than BIC Basic.

KL noted that Digital Ticks – which are awarded for eBook data – can be awarded on top of the PDEA accreditation level obtained, or as an individual award in their own right. She noted that the metadata for eBooks does not need to be produced using ONIX however electronic delivery is compulsory and the BIC Basic requirements for completeness need to be met. The timeliness of eBook data is currently not measured.

- Jacket / Cover Images
  AW observed that he was under the impression cover images need to be supplied 16 weeks before publication date. KL disagreed saying that so long as the jacket image is provided before publication date, that is sufficient for the accreditation scheme. PM agreed with KL. AW and LW questioned if Nielsen's measurements may have changed recently to incorporate jackets into the 16-week timeframe. LW commented that the documentation for the PDEA accreditation scheme does not make the cover image requirements obvious and suggested that this should be rectified in the revised scheme. GW noted that pre-orders require jacket images in order to go on sale, so the earlier a jacket can be supplied, the better.
  ACTION: CH to update the Group on current accreditation scheme requirements for cover images at the next meeting of this Group.

KL asked whether the Summary of Measures grid is useful. PM suggested that the fields stating 'N/A' are misleading since, in some instances, the field is a sub-set or else an element that goes beyond the BIC Basic standard. The Group agreed that 'N/A' should not be included on the grid for the above mentioned instances. They also agreed that the grid is useful, and the amended version should be put on the BIC website for organisations to use.
ACTION: KL to amend the grid removing all fields that read 'N/A'.

3. **BIC Basic Required Information**
   KL outlined the eleven BIC Basic requirements, which are highlighted in red on the following PDF: http://www.bic.org.uk/files/pdfs/100429%20bicbasic%20elements%20FINAL.pdf
   She noted that retail price can be more difficult to provide for eBooks, due to the different locations in which they can be sold. The Group noted their surprise that "author" is not a mandatory field for BIC Basic – though, at any accreditation level that requires ONIX (i.e. Excellence and Excellence Plus), either at least one <Contributor> or a <NoContributor> element is mandatory. It was noted that "author" cannot be made mandatory at any level because some books genuinely are listed without authors. This decision was also due to it

The book industry's supply chain organisation

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

being difficult to say "no contributor" in a flat file which would, in turn, put some organisations at a disadvantage.

ACTION: KL to review the ONIX 3.0 grid to ensure that the above, mandatory element sets are included in the documentation for the BIC Excellence and Excellence Plus awards.

4. **Bibliographic data elements required for ONIX-level accreditation: ONIX release 2**
   KL circulated copies of the following two documents during the workshop, noting that many fields included in the element set are conditional; those highlighted in red are mandatory:
   http://www.bic.org.uk/files/pdfs/100514%20onix%20data%20elements%20for%20release%202.n.pdf
   http://www.bic.org.uk/files/pdfs/100514%20BIC%20ONIX%203.0%20compliance%20data%20elements%20final.pdf
   KL asked whether further information / clarifications are need for this documentation. AI noted that the ONIX Guidelines, which are available on EDItEUR's website, are all-encompassing and can be referred to at any time if uncertainty arises. The Group agreed.

5. **PDEA Digital Tick Award / eBook Data**
   KL asked the Group whether the Digital Tick should still be awarded in the revised scheme. She noted that currently this award differentiates between eBook data and physical book data and questioned whether this is really necessary in today's book industry, since eBooks are merely another format. NE suggested that the differentiation between eBooks and physical book data is not necessary. AI noted that historically the decision to include a Digital Tick has provided organisations with an opportunity to work on their eBook data in a separate way so their accreditation result is not adversely affected by its inclusion. GW suggested that the main aim of the PDEA accreditation scheme is to encourage organisations to submit good metadata. She therefore suggested that *if* the supply chain of eBooks is different to physical books it should remain a separate entity, as a Digital Tick.

   The Group suggested that times have changed since the first application of the digital tick, and that as KL suggests, there may no longer be a need to differentiate between eBook and physical book metadata. They agreed that there are now more organisations than ever that solely sell eBooks. KL suggested that CoreSource or Vearsa could be approached to join the PDEA Accreditation Panel and perhaps assist in the measuring of eBook data going forwards. The Group also discussed the commercial sensitivities surrounding the complexities of eBook metadata with regards to pricing, and with respect specifically to the submission of eBook metadata to data agencies, and the onward distribution by the data agencies of that metadata.

   AW suggested that the timeline for supply of eBook metadata and print book metadata differ from one another and while print book metadata is required 16 weeks before publication date, eBook metadata is not needed in the same timeframe since it can be disseminated very quickly from the point at which it is created / before the title goes on pre-order. He noted that it is the publisher's decision whether to make different formats of the same book available for pre-order at the same time or not. PM noted that timeliness has to be a measurable thing in order to award accreditation. GW and NE agreed that it would be beneficial to provide

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

retailers with the metadata for both eBook and print book formats at the same time (16 weeks before publication) to provide customers with a choice at the pre-order stage. LW noted that print book metadata is required at 16 weeks to allow enough time for copies to be sent to retailers however eBook metadata does not need to be supplied so soon. KL asked the Group what the average timescale is for making pre-orders available. NE noted that the timing is often dependent on the profile of the book. The Group suggested that the average buying cycle is usually a month before the publication date, and agreed that the minimum requirement for supplying eBook metadata should therefore be 4 weeks before publication date. LW noted that this minimum requirement will not stop publishers from sending their metadata earlier, should they wish to. PM and KW noted that the ability of Nielsen to be able to measure this new timeframe in addition to the existing timeframe for print books might be difficult but it is should hopefully be achievable. The Group agreed that the Digital Tick should not be a part of the revised scheme and eBook metadata should be incorporated into the body of the scheme alongside print book metadata.

ACTION: CH to investigate how easy it would be to measure timeliness of eBook metadata on a different timeframe to printed book metadata.

6. **New titles fully compliant 16 weeks before publication date & Print On Demand books**
   The Group agreed that providing physical book metadata 16 weeks before publication date is important and this should not be revised in the new scheme. PM agreed, with the exception of Print On Demand (POD) titles – particularly those titles that have been reintroduced in POD format from being previously out of print. GW noted that the BIC POD & Short Run Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) is looking into this matter. She noted that the T&FWG has agreed to recommend that all POD titles' availability codes should be listed as 'IP' as the availability code should not be used to specify the method of manufacture and/or terms of the book. GW agreed with PM that the dissemination of POD feeds should not be held-up / restricted by issues of timeliness since the PDEA Accreditation Panel does not want to penalise POD suppliers for making an out of print book available. The Group agreed that BIC will need to liaise with EDItEUR about ways of identifying POD titles so that they are able to be easily excluded from the 16 week timeline.

   ACTION: KL to liaise with Graham Bell of EDItEUR regarding the options for identifying POD titles for the revised PDEA accreditation scheme.

7. **Organisations types that should be measured on the PDEA accreditation scheme**
   The Group agreed that publishers should remain an organisation type that can apply to the PDEA accreditation scheme. KL noted that eligible publishers for the scheme must publish at least 10 titles per year and the UK must be a significant market for them. JT noted that applicant publishers must also send their feeds to a minimum of three data aggregators in the UK (i.e. Nielsen, Bowker, Bibliographic Data Services (BDS)); these feeds must be sent directly to the UK aggregators, not via their international counterparts. The Group agreed.

   Distributors, aggregators and retailers were discussed as potential applicant organisation types for the revised scheme. The Group suggested that all of these organisation types should be included in the revision of the scheme and KL reminded the Group that this is indeed listed as

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

a deliverable in the Project Brief. NE commented that distributors' feeds tend to have serious errors in them more frequently than other organisation types and gaining accreditation could help to raise awareness about what good metadata feeds should include. She noted that distributors often do not have a way of correcting the metadata they send out. KL noted that BIC will look to create an accreditation scheme for distributors in 2016.

8. **What should be measured on the PDEA accreditation scheme**
    PM commented how the PDEA accreditation scheme is a UK scheme, and noted that organisations incorrectly assume that if a UK price is present the book must be available for sale in the UK, which isn't always the case. LW agreed, suggesting that the PDEA scheme could be opened up to data suppliers outside of the UK. GW noted that the Price & Availability (P&A) Task & Finish Working Group is almost finished reviewing the TRADACOMS code list and are about to begin tackling price. She welcomed feedback from this Group about difficulties experienced regarding price in P&A feeds.

    LW informed the Group that organisations that do not subscribe to Nielsen's enhanced metadata service are unable to provide title descriptions in their metadata. She suggested that, in essence, this means that organisations who do not subscribe to this level of Nielsen service, can only ever hope to gain a BIC Basic level of accreditation. The members of the PDEA Accreditation Panel noted that this issue has not affected an applicant to the scheme as yet however the Group agreed that this could potentially deter smaller publishers from gaining accreditation in future. PM suggested that Bowker and BDS could put together their own checks for the enhanced metadata set for the higher levels of accreditation for those publishers not subscribing to Nielsen's enhanced metadata service. KL noted that this possibility will need to be discussed with Nielsen before it can be agreed upon.
    ACTION: KL to liaise with CH regarding the possibility of Bowker and BDS checking ONIX files for the higher levels of the revised PDEA accreditation scheme.

    LW also noted that publishers should be accredited on the metadata that they send out, not the metadata that is stored / amended by aggregators. PM pointed out that having 3 aggregators on the panel should address this issue. However, KW noted that BDS do not provide measured metadata for the PDEA scheme; this is carried out by Nielsen in goodwill. KL confirmed that the metadata needs to be ingested by Nielsen in order for it to be measured – a commercial relationship between the publisher and Nielsen is needed to achieve this. KW agreed, noting that what Nielsen do to the data is unlikely to affect the organisation's accreditation score. The PDEA Panel members agreed that this issue is historical but there is not yet another organisation that is able to measure publishers' metadata for the BIC Accreditation scheme. KL invited the Group to consider possible alternatives / additions.

    GW suggested that, going forwards and taking into account the fact that it is necessary for organisations to subscribe to Nielsen's enhanced metadata service in order to gain a higher level of award, the PDEA accreditation scheme application process should no longer be referred to as being "free". She suggested that a note should be included in the wording on

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

the BIC website to explain that a relationship with data aggregators is essential for the scheme. The Group suggested that organisations which are not members of Nielsen or other UK aggregators could provide supporting evidence alongside their application, though AW commented that this would not be fair to organisations that do subscribe to Nielsen's enhance metadata service. The Group noted that this has not been an actual issue to date. They agreed that having more aggregators involved in the process would help and suggested that CoreSource and /or Vearsa could tentatively be approached to see whether they would be prepared to measure eBook metadata on this scheme, going forwards. KL suggested that Nielsen could be set up by publishers as a 'customer' to receive a limited eBook metadata set from CoreSource and/or Vearsa that does not include commercially sensitive information. This would mean that Nielsen would be in receipt of the eBook metadata but only on a limited scale and if metadata was disseminated further by Nielsen, commercial sensitive information would not. GW suggested that this should be discussed with Nielsen before a decision is made.

ACTION: CH to provide feedback on the possibility of Nielsen receiving a scaled down eBook metadata set from Coresource / Vearsa / others as a publisher 'customer' at the next meeting of this Group.

ACTION: KL to liaise with CoreSource and/or Vearsa regarding their potential involvement in the PDEA accreditation scheme going forwards.

KL noted that there needs to be more transparency about the 'how' and 'when' of the accreditation scheme. AW agreed, commenting that it feels as if the decision process is done behind closed doors so that the applicant organisation is not involved. KL informed the Group that BIC does indeed write to all organisations whose accreditation is up for renewal to invite comment / feedback about their metadata and any issues that may be ongoing or may affect the result of their accreditation. She suggested that, going forwards, organisation could be invited to attend the section of the PDEA Accreditation Panel meeting in which their application is discussed. She also suggested that organisation's customers could be approached to provide feedback on the applicant organisation's feeds. KW noted that this latter possibility is too subjective and anecdotal. NE also noted that the organisation's customers may be unable to divulge how they arrived at the decision due to data protection. The Group agreed that organisations should be invited to attend their accreditation review, should they wish to.

GW noted that the real issue here is timeliness of metadata, since this is the hardest aspect of the metadata to measure and Nielsen are the only organisation currently recording this data. PM therefore suggested removing timeliness from the PDEA scheme in order to make the results more objective. JB disagreed, noting that many organisations need the deadline of 16 weeks to drive them forwards, and retailers need this information within the 16 week timeframe, as previously agreed. AI agreed, noting that timeliness is wholly relevant to the book industry supply chain.

AW and LW suggested that it is not clear what aspects of the metadata are measured on the PDEA accreditation scheme. They also suggested that the reports used by the PDEA Panel

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

appear to be out of sync with those of the publisher. PM and KL disagreed, noting that the organisations' feeds are measured annually, based on 12 months of statistics. He noted that Nielsen provide monthly reports to publishers for them to track their statistics and identify issues as and when they arise. KL noted that particular issues / extenuating circumstances (if communicated to BIC by the publisher) are taken into account during the PDEA Panel meeting and there is a deferral process in place for any situations that arise which are beyond the publishers' control / significantly affect the organisation's application.

The Group agreed that organisations should receive advanced warning about the forthcoming PDEA Panel meeting date and should be invited to attend their accreditation review, should they wish to. The organisation will need to be made aware of their anticipated (but not guaranteed) result ahead of the PDEA Accreditation Panel meeting so that they can decide whether they need to attend. GW agreed but noted that this practice could pose timeliness issues in itself. KL noted that the PDEA Panel will need to be made aware in advance about whether the applicant organisation intends to attend the meeting. KL noted that it will not be essential for organisations to attend the PDEA Panel meeting if they do not wish to do so. KL also pointed out that should organisations wish to attend, they will need to ensure they are available on the date and time that the Panel meets.

NE suggested that an appeal process should be devised for quantitative and qualitative data. She suggested that this process could take the form of a form. The Group suggested that this is not needed since the organisation will have the opportunity to attend the PDEA Panel meeting, should they wish to do so.

9. **ONIX 3.0 and *Thema***
   The Group were asked how the PDEA accreditation scheme can encourage organisations to use / migrate to ONIX 3.0 and *Thema*. KL noted that she has liaised with EDItEUR about this.

   ONIX 3.0
   The twilight period of support for ONIX 2.1 will come to an end on 31st December 2015. KL noted that adding a fourth level of accreditation to the PDEA accreditation scheme to recognise ONIX 3.0 users would therefore be fruitless since it would result in the original three awards becoming outdated over time. She suggested that this Group should agree on a timeline for when the existing top level of accreditation should be for ONIX 3.0 users only.

   JT noted that the PDEA Accreditation Panel has looked into which organisations would be affected by this timeline, should it be put in place. He reported that including ONIX 3.0 as a requirement for the top level award on the PDEA scheme would only affect a handful of organisations – most of which are already working towards their migration to ONIX 3.0. He suggested that the timeline should be a year from now, i.e. organisations that have previously obtained the BIC Excellence Plus award should have migrated to ONIX 3.0 by the end of September 2016 in order to retain that level of accreditation. The Group were not keen on this timeline and noted that organisations should be awarded for using ONIX 3.0 now, not from September 2016 onwards. TH suggested that, since the Digital Tick will be

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

removed from the revised PDEA scheme, a replacement symbol could be included in the logo to demonstrate ONIX 3.0 usage. The Group agreed that ONIX 3.0 Ticks should be awarded to organisations currently using the standard as soon as possible; especially before ONIX 3.0 becomes a requirement of the BIC Excellence Plus award in September 2016 (or 12 months from the announcement and launch of the new accreditation scheme – whichever is the latest).

AI noted that there isn't a high uptake on ONIX 3.0 at present but commented that it seems wrong to accept unsupported versions of ONIX at various levels of the revised PDEA accreditation scheme. The Group agreed but noted that it is important not to penalise organisations who are already providing good metadata but that may not have the capacity to migrate to ONIX 3.0 as yet. The overall aim of the scheme is to encourage the provision and dissemination of good metadata regardless (within reason) of the format, or wrapper, in which it is sent. KL noted it is important that the accreditation scheme strongly support and encourages adoption of the best, most up-to-date standards available but equally it must take care not be seen to dictate what the industry should do. GW asked whether there are requirements that can be added to the BIC Excellence Plus award that only ONIX 3.0 can deliver. AI confirmed that ONIX 3.0 includes advanced content that other versions of ONIX are unable to deliver. It was noted that this Group does not yet have enough first-hand, industry experience of ONIX 3.0 to know what should be included in 3.0 feeds. The Group agreed this needs to be researched further. AI volunteered to investigate which requirements could be mandatory for the data element set and timeliness of ONIX 3.0 usage.

ACTION: AI to look into mandatory elements and timeliness of ONIX 3.0 usage and report back to this Group at the next workshop.

Regarding ONIX 3.0 Ticks, the Group noted that the awarding of this new symbol could cause discontent amongst organisations since applications are reviewed on a yearly basis, at four points throughout the year. This means that some publishers will have to wait until September 2016 to receive an ONIX 3.0 Tick. AB suggested that all currently accredited organisations could be awarded an ONIX 3.0 Tick (providing they are using 3.0) in January 2016. KL agreed, suggesting that the organisations will need to liaise with BIC to inform them that ONIX 3.0 is in use in their organisation, and this will need to be further backed up by 1 of the 3 data aggregators in the UK (Nielsen, BDS and Bowker). GW suggested that the ONIX 3.0 Tick should only be awarded to organisations that have gained either the BIC Excellence or BIC Excellence Plus award. The Group agreed. KL asked if the ONIX 3.0 tick should be awarded to organisations simply sending ONIX 3.0, or to those organisation sending ONIX 3.0 and also using the required additional fields / blocks. If the latter, then this Group will need to wait until it has agreed what those compulsory additional fields should be, as per the work being done by AI (see above). The Group agreed the requirement for this temporary ONIX 3.0 Tick was simply that ONIX 3.0 was being used by the publisher and that an ONIX 3.0 file was being sent to at least one data aggregator.

ACTION: AB to ensure that <u>all</u> currently accredited organisations are approached before January's PDEA Accreditation Panel meeting to let them know about the ONIX 3.0 Tick and to ask whether the organisations are using ONIX 3.0.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

ACTION: PDEA Accreditation Panel members to award ONIX 3.0 Ticks to the compliant organisations in January 2016.

The Group agreed that the ONIX 3.0 Tick will hopefully encourage organisations to migrate to ONIX 3.0, and will afford organisations the time to achieve this before it is embedded into the requirements of the accreditation levels themselves. KL noted that ONIX 3.0 usage is difficult to measure until it is more widely used. NE noted that organisations will only migrate when they become aware of an active commercial benefit. She suggested that this Group should promote awareness about those benefits to encourage migration.

The Group discussed which organisations should be eligible to achieve an ONIX 3.0 Tick. They agreed that organisations that gain either the BIC Excellence or BIC Excellence Plus award will be eligible to obtain an ONIX 3.0 Tick, providing that they supply ONIX 3.0 feeds to at least one of the following data agencies: Nielsen, BDS, Bowker. The Group also agreed that, in order to gain the ONIX3.0 Tick, the organisations must simply be supplying their feed using ONIX 3.0, i.e. they do not need to include enhanced data to obtain the ONIX 3.0 Tick. GW agreed with this decision, noting that this Group has not yet identified the enhanced element data set for ONIX 3.0 and the creation of this requirement document may take a little time. AI noted that the main addition in ONIX 3.0 is keywords but agreed that this will take time to discuss.

The Group agreed that, in time (i.e. one year from the announcement / launch of the revised accreditation scheme), ONIX 3.0 usage will become a BIC Excellence Plus requirement. They also agreed that organisations need to be educated about *why* they should be using both ONIX 3.0 and *Thema*.

Thema
NE noted that *Thema* is crucial to Amazon's plans over the next 18 months. AW suggested that the award / symbols to acknowledge ONIX 3.0 and *Thema* usage should not be combined; if this Group subsequently decides to acknowledge *Thema* usage too. The Group suggested that *Thema* should not be included as an additional logo. Instead, they suggested that documentation for the PDEA accreditation scheme should be amended to include *Thema* and BIC Subject Classification as requirements. They suggested that the weighting of the wording will be an important and the emphasis should be on *Thema*.

The Group recommended that *Thema* usage should, for the time being, be a non-mandatory requirement for the PDEA scheme, with a view to making it mandatory over the next 3-5 years or so.

10. **Who should eBook data be supplied to?**
KL noted that the incorporation of eBook metadata within the main body of the data being measured on the PDEA scheme will affect the specification that all metadata should be supplied to the main three aggregators that sit on the PDEA Accreditation Panel. GW agreed, noting that eBook data only needs to be supplied to those that intend to sell the books. KW

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

noted that aggregators would argue against the suggestion that eBook metadata should only be sent to those selling it, but he noted that if publishers are not required to send the metadata to Nielsen then it should be the same rule for Bowker and BDS too. He commented that it is the responsibility of the publisher to decide to whom the metadata should be sent.

KL suggested that the dissemination of eBook metadata (for publishers producing eBooks) to aggregators could be listed as desirable but not essential on the revised scheme. TH noted that the timeliness of eBook metadata can only be measured if the data is disseminated to aggregators, and if those aggregators can apply a time-stamp. AW commented that the main concern should be ensuring that consumers are able to find the book they are looking for, and the metadata has therefore reached the right retailers. After further discussion, the Group agreed that eBook metadata should be sent to at least one data aggregator in order to be accredited, so their eBook metadata is measureable. GW noted that this decision affirms the need to approach CoreSource about joining the PDEA Accreditation Panel.

With this decision in mind, PM noted that Nielsen will need to report on 3 different timeliness requirements for print books, eBooks and POD titles respectively. KL noted that all of the results for each format type will be merged to gain the applicant organisation's overall result.

11. **The PDEA Accreditation deferral process**
    The Group agreed that this process will need to be reimagined but agreed to discuss this at length during the next workshop.

12. **Percentages included on the BIC PDEA Accreditation Scheme Summary of Measures grid**
    KL asked the Group whether the percentages included on this grid need to be revised for the new scheme. The Group agreed that the percentages are appropriate and do not need to be revised. GW noted that they provide an allowance for any issues that arise due to acquisitions / POD / other circumstances. AI suggested that if change is needed then he would be more inclined to make changes to the data element sets rather than the percentages.

13. **BIC data element sets**
    KL asked the Group whether both the BIC Basic and Enhanced BIC ONIX data element sets should be discussed further. The Group agreed that they should.

    BIC Basic Data Elements
    KL reminded the Group that author cannot be included in the mandatory requirements for this data element set. She also noted that the Group has agreed that *Thema* usage should be listed as desirable but not essential / mandatory. GW noted that, due to online retailers, the description field is needed more than ever before. NE also suggested that BISAC codes, keywords and age ranges are important fields to Amazon for facilitate sales. KL noted that,

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

since the PDEA accreditation scheme is a UK scheme, references to US codes should not be made. AW noted that this is a reason to promote and encourage the use of *Thema*.

AI suggested that keywords should not be included in the requirements for the PDEA BIC Basic award, but could be included in the requirements for both the BIC Excellence and BIC Excellence Plus awards. GW suggested the same for age ranges too since they are more ONIX-centric. KL asked the Group whether the non-mandatory fields should be listed for the BIC Basic data element set. GW noted that this decision will be depend on whether the document is about promoting good basic metadata or illustrating what will help organisations to gain accreditation. KW suggested that the whole list encourages organisations to provide more data than they might if only the mandatory fields were included in the document.

LW noted her surprise that description is not a mandatory field for BIC Basic and suggested that it should be in the revised PDEA scheme. GW noted that in order for description to be a mandatory requirement, it will need to be measurable by Nielsen. TH reminded the Group that Nielsen do not hold descriptions for titles belonging to organisations which do not subscribe to Nielsen's enhanced metadata service, and the PDEA scheme specifies that all three aggregators must be in receipt of the data in order to gain accreditation.

KL questioned whether a character limit should be set for description (both short and long copy). JT commented that he has not experienced issues with the length of blurb that is provided by publishers. The Group agreed to add description to the mandatory field without setting a character limit.

JT suggested that Table of Contents could be made a mandatory requirement. GW agreed that this field would be valuable to retailers but noted that it cannot be included as a mandatory field since it is not appropriate for all books – only academic titles.

AI suggested replacing 'EAN-13' with 'GTIN-13' in the dependencies column of the BIC Basic requirements table in accordance with current terminology. GW suggested that the product identifier should be edited to read: ISBN-13. It was noted that all ISBNs should be 13-digits in length since the 10-digit version has been obsolete for 8 years.

LW suggested amending 'Series' to 'Collection' in order to familiarise organisations with this term early on. KL agreed that terminology should remain consistent throughout the PDEA accreditation scheme. GW agreed but suggested that BIC should also ensure that the scheme is accessible to organisations that do not use ONIX. The Group agreed to state 'Series / Collection' in the revised PDEA documentation.

Enhanced ONIX Data Elements
PM suggested that this Group should look at the ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0 release documents after this workshop, and send any feedback / suggestions directly to BIC prior to the next meeting. The Group agreed.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

ACTION: ALL to read through the circulated ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0 release documents and send any feedback/suggestions for amendments/deletions to BIC prior to the next meeting but especially before Friday 4th December 2015.

NE noted that the inclusion of age range (reading age) in this data element set would be advantageous to retailers. GW and NE suggested that the <AudienceRange> composite could be mandatory in the revised scheme, replacing 'audience'. NE noted that Amazon now has a search bar that sorts titles by age range so titles from publishers that do not provide this information will be excluded from this type of search. She commented that Amazon is working with children's publishers to find the best way of supplying this information. KL asked whether the information is supplied using the <AudienceRange> composite. NE agreed to investigate how this information is supplied to Amazon. AW suggested that the Best Practice Guidelines for audience range may need to be revised to match what the revised scheme states, once this has been agreed upon.

ACTION: NE to liaise with her colleagues at Amazon to ascertain how age range information is supplied to them.

14. **Price & Availability (P&A)**

AW commented that feeds supplied by distributors can often be corrupt and/or out of sync and therefore require manual intervention. GW noted that this issue is out of scope for the PDEA Accreditation Review Task & Finish Working Group however it will be explored further by BIC's P&A Task & Finish Working Group. She noted that if publishers cannot change the publication date with distributors then this information has to be included in the P&A feed instead. TH and LW suggested that P&A should not be included in the requirements for the revised PDEA accreditation scheme.

KL asked whether it would be possible for Nielsen to strip P&A feeds from their statistics. She noted that this Group will need to ascertain how P&A will fit into the accreditation scheme if it is not a requirement / measurable entity of the scheme. AW suggested that the PDEA accreditation scheme should provide guidelines for where/how P&A should be listed. He noted that publishers should have the final say regarding the publication date of their titles, not distributors. GW questioned whether it would be possible to ask Nielsen not to send P&A feeds so that publishers can do this themselves. She noted that, in this instance, its inclusion could not be measured.

KL noted that, in the interest of being transparent, this Group will need to provide a recommendation for P&A. She suggested that Nielsen should be invited to clarify this matter / provide suggestions for inclusion / exclusion of P&A feeds in the revised PDEA scheme.

15. **Date of the next workshop**

The Group agreed that holding another workshop to continue discussions about the revision of the PDEA accreditation scheme would be beneficial. This next workshop will take place on Thursday 10th December 2015.