

BIC SUPPLY CHAIN EXCELLENCE AWARD (SCEA) ACCREDITATION SCHEME REVIEW TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP – Minutes

Location: GoToMeeting / Conference Call

Date and time: Thursday 21st September 2017, 10am

Minutes taken by: Alaina-Marie Bassett

Present

Alaina-Marie Bassett (AMB)
 Alan Bence, Ingenta (AB)
 John Bell, HarperCollins
 Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)
 Stephen Long, Nielsen

Apologies

Russell Evans, Simon & Schuster
 John Garrould, Bertram Group
 David Hetherington, Klopotek
 Matthew Hogg, Macmillan Distribution
 Chris Jones, Cambridge University Press
 Lada Kriz, Random House
 Karina Luke, BIC
 Jim Reed, Waterstones
 Sophia Sophocleous, BIC

Now resigned from Group

Charly Nobbs, Supply Chain Optimisation
 Alfred Willmann, Random House

1. Welcome to the call and apologies

SE welcomed the Group to the meeting and the apologies were delivered. It was noted that CN of Supply Chain Optimisation has now resigned from this Group. With sadness, SE informed the Group that AW of PRH passed away in September 2017. The Group noted that AW had always been a firm supporter of BIC and the work it does, and will be sorely missed.

2. Competition Law – conduct reminder

The Group was informed about BIC's Competition Law Policy – please click here for more information regarding this policy: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>.

3. Review of minutes and follow-up on actions from the last meeting

The minutes from the last meeting were approved. The actions were discussed as follows:

- Terms of Reference (ToR)
 SE confirmed that the ToR for this Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) was circulated following the last meeting. The Group accepted the ToR without amendments.
- Multiple contributors for the revised SCEA Application Form
 SE confirmed that he has added a note to the draft SCEA questionnaire / application form for future reference, stating that multiple users should be able to contribute to each organisation's application. He noted that sophisticated software may be required to achieve this however. SE and SL noted they continue to liaise offline regarding the SCEA questionnaire / application form and will report back in due course.
 - **ONGOING ACTION:** SE and SL to liaise offline regarding the SCEA application form.
- Digital workflow and product delivery

- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** JB to assist SE in expanding sections D. 'Digital workflow' and E. 'Digital product delivery'.

- SCEA Application Forms for other organisation types
SE noted the similarity between the SCEA application form for Vendors / Service Providers – which was produced following the last meeting – and the Publishers application form. The application forms / questionnaires are designed to cover the same areas of BIC's activities, where appropriate, and ask questions to suit each type of applicant.

4. Review of the project objectives

The Group agreed that the objectives of this project – to review and update the current BIC SCEA Accreditation Scheme – do not need to be discussed further.

5. The SCEA Review Project

- Further representatives for this Project
SE noted the ongoing, poor level of attendance for this T&FWG. The Group agreed that further representatives should be sought.
 - **ACTION:** KL to liaise with the BIC Physical Supply Chain (PSC) Committee again regarding representation on this T&FWG, with a view to obtaining further reps ASAP.
 - **ACTION:** KL to liaise with the members of this Group who have missed 2 or more consecutive meetings regarding their involvement in this project going forwards.
 - **ACTION:** ALL to ensure that if they cannot attend a future meeting of this Group, they arrange for a colleague to attend in their place, as per the ToR document.
- Review of feedback received from SCEA applicant organisations in April 2016
SE noted that Cambridge University Press' (CUP) feedback suggested that there are a number of supply chain topics which are missing from the current SCEA Scheme however he noted that the topics covered must be in scope for BIC / related to BIC standards and best practices and some of the feedback received did not take this into account.
 - ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed, where possible, to take the feedback received to date into account when revising the SCEA Accreditation Scheme.
 - **ACTION:** AMB to remove this item from the agenda for the next meeting.
 - **ACTION:** AMB to encourage CJ to attend future meetings of this T&FWG to ensure CUP's feedback and concerns are addressed by the revision of the SCEA Scheme.
- Consideration of scope for the revised SCEA Accreditation Scheme
SE asked the Group whether the revised BIC SCEA Accreditation Scheme should focus solely on BIC standards and best practice in the book industry supply chain. He noted that there isn't any BIC output for some areas of the current SCEA Scheme presently. SL strongly advised that the BIC SCEA Scheme should continue to address the key areas of the supply chain that are in scope for BIC as the Scheme cannot cover every aspect / area of the supply chain. He suggested that the SCEA Scheme should showcase what can be achieved by using BIC standards, thus encouraging their adoption. SE agreed that

new standards, such as *BIC Realtime* APIs / web services, should form part of the revised SCEA Scheme – although organisations’ responses do not have to be measured / scored until awareness and adoption of each standard has increased with time. It was noted that some standards may not suit individual organisations’ business models, but they will have an opportunity to explain this in the revised SCEA application form. SL noted that BIC and this Group will need to distinguish between mandatory and recommended standards / practices going forwards in order to measure applicant organisations on the SCEA Scheme. The Group agreed that the SCEA Accreditation Scheme should continue to focus on the areas that are most relevant to BIC.

- SCEA questionnaires / application forms

SE noted that a lot of content has been added into the publishers’ SCEA application form due to its revision which may need to be refined going forwards. SL and SE agreed that a statement regarding why organisations should apply for BIC accreditation on the SCEA Scheme should be added to the application forms going forwards. SL noted that Nielsen may be willing to incentivise engagement with the Scheme and that this should be discussed too in due course. SE displayed the current publishers’ SCEA application form on screen during the meeting and the following points were made:

- Section B: Product Metadata

SE noted that ISBN-10s are still in use within the book industry supply chain despite the introduction of ISBN-13s in 2007. He asked whether ISBN-10 should be included in the revised SCEA Accreditation Scheme. SL suggested that organisations should be asked if they comply with the ISBN-13 standard and if not, what the barriers to doing so are. JB suggested that the SCEA Scheme should explicitly encourage organisations to use ISBN-13s. SE suggested that BIC should provide feedback on organisations’ applications, outlining any areas of concern that are apparent from their application; SL suggested that this feedback should be provided regardless of whether the applicant organisation achieves an award on the SCEA Scheme or not.

The Group agreed that the treatment of ONIX 2.1 on the revised SCEA Scheme should be treated in a similar way to ISBN-10 (since the sunset date has long since passed) – organisations should therefore be encouraged to migrate to ONIX 3.0 if they have not already done so. SE suggested that the inclusion of BISAC codes in the standards grid for Section B may not be necessary in future, once *Thema* is more widely adopted. SL suggested that Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) and BIC Discount Group Codes (DGCs) could be removed from the grid. JB suggested restructuring this section of the SCEA application form to reduce the size of the grid, i.e. including Subject Classification standards (BIC, BISAC, *Thema*) in a grid to themselves, etc.

SE noted that the most important question for applicant organisations in relation to *BIC Realtime* APIs is whether they are using APIs at all (including non-standard APIs). He noted that data aggregators will be asked about the hosting of APIs in their

respective SCEA application form. SL suggested that product metadata and transactional metadata need to be differentiated between on the SCEA application form.

- Section C: EDI / e-Trading

SE noted that on previous iterations of the SCEA Accreditation Scheme, applicant organisations have been scored on their volume of EDI usage / the number of organisations that they trade with using EDI. SL added Advanced Shipping Notification (ASN) and Electronic Delivery Note (EDN) to Question 1, during the meeting. SL noted that organisations' compliance / non-compliance with the EDI standard should be validated on the SCEA Scheme to substantiate both; he suggested however that BIC should tread carefully when rewarding non-standard practices. SE noted that if a non-standard practice is used between two organisations, the focus (in terms of scoring for the SCEA Scheme) should be on the level of automation achieved. SL agreed.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that applicant organisations should not be penalised for the use of non-standard EDI practices on the revised SCEA Scheme.

SE suggested that this Group should define what is meant by electronic trading to avoid misinterpretation. He also noted that there are many variables that could be included in Question 1, e.g. AS2, ASNI, EDItX, FTP, VAN, X12, XML, etc. SE noted that use of these standards is recommended but not mandatory, so their use should not be measured on the SCEA Scheme for the time being. As the purpose of the SCEA Scheme is acknowledging / rewarding organisations that comply with BIC standards, JB suggested that the standards (above) may fall outside the scope of the revised BIC SCEA Scheme. He noted that it is not the purpose of the SCEA Scheme and/or its application forms to gather information. It was suggested however that the use of insecure message formats should be monitored by the revised SCEA Scheme.

- **ACTION:** AMB to add "security and privacy" to the agenda for the next meetings of the BIC PSC and Digital Supply Chain (DSC) Committees to ascertain to what extent organisations are sending insecure EDI / e-trading message formats.

SE noted that applicant organisations are asked in the current version of the revised SCEA application form whether they host or use ordering APIs. SE and JB agreed that applicants should also be asked if they use any other methods / non-standard practices to do similar jobs. SE noted that Section C, Question 5 includes questions about the Industry Returns Initiative (IRI) rulebook and Batch returns.

- Section D: Digital workflow

SE noted that there are very few existing standards for the digital supply chain at present. JB noted that sales reporting standards are key to the digital section of the SCEA Scheme. SE suggested that applicant organisations should be asked about their ability to receive / send EDItX sales reports. JB also suggested the inclusion of the CSV file standard which is used by the Book Industry Study Group (BISG). SE noted that Section G of the revised SCEA application form currently includes reference to

sales reporting – the Group agreed to move this question to Section D; SE made this change during the meeting.

SE suggested that a question relating to organisations’ supply of digital product metadata to data aggregators should be included in the revised SCEA Scheme. AMB noted that some publishers do not want to supply metadata for their digital products to data aggregators at present, while others do not disseminate price information for their digital products to any organisation that is not directly involved in their sale. JB suggested that the SCEA Accreditation Scheme should encourage organisations to supply eBook metadata to aggregators, treating the metadata in the same way as print books. The Group agreed.

SE suggested that it may be difficult to score / measure applicant organisations in this section of the revised SCEA Scheme. He noted that BIC cannot tell organisations how to carry out their business in relation to digital products however it can guide them to the areas they might want to consider for the good of the supply chain. JB noted that it is now possible to supply enhanced metadata, including information about a digital product’s accessibility features, in EPUB3 and ONIX. He suggested that organisations should be encouraged to supply this information in line with the W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). JB noted that, as its new Chair, he will ensure that the BIC DSC Committee provides advisories on relevant best practices to support the revised SCEA Scheme going forwards.

- Section F: Digital Printing, Print On Demand (POD), Ultra Short Run Printing
SE noted that there aren’t currently any BIC standards / best practice guidelines for this area. He suggested that BIC could endorse external standards for the purpose of the revised SCEA Scheme.
 - ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that a separate SCEA application form should be produced for printers going forwards.
 - **ACTION:** SE to remove this section from the publishers’ SCEA application form.
 - **ACTION:** AMB to add “standards for printers” to the BIC PSC Committee agenda.
- Section G: Rights and royalties
SE, JB and SL agreed that rights (excluding territorial sales rights), royalties and copyright permissions are out of scope for the revised SCEA Scheme. JB noted that organisations are not currently supporting best practice for territorial sales rights in metadata but should be encouraged to do so by the SCEA Accreditation Scheme.
 - **ACTION:** SE to remove all references to royalties and permissions from Section G.
- Section H: Data sharing
SL questioned the relevance of this section to the revised SCEA Scheme, noting that it addresses the dissemination of miscellaneous metadata which could potentially involve commercials. SE noted that while there isn’t a specific BIC standard for data

sharing, tips are included in various best practice guideline documents. SE suggested that a survey should be produced to capture information about current data sharing practices rather than including it in the revised SCEA Scheme.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to remove this section from SCEA application forms.

- Section I: Additional information and innovation

SE noted that applicant organisations should not provide information in this section which is commercially sensitive / not in the public domain. The Group agreed that a note to this effect should be included in this section as well as in the introductory blurb for the SCEA application form.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to add an advisory to the introductory blurb for this section, as above.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to amend both the Publishers' and Vendor & Service Providers' SCEA application forms according to the feedback received during this meeting and send the revised versions to AMB for circulation, ASAP.

➤ **ACTION:** Once circulated, ALL to provide feedback on SE's revised SCEA application forms prior to the next meeting.

6. Purpose of the next meeting

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to add a review of the Publishers and Vendors / Service Providers SCEA application forms (including their introductory text) to the agenda for the next meeting.

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to add a discussion about the Distributors SCEA application form to the agenda for the next meeting of this Group in order to decide what should be included.

➤ **ACTION:** ALL to attend the next meeting of this Group in order to sign off the Publishers and Vendors / Service Providers SCEA application forms.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to produce a draft SCEA Benefits document to explain why organisations should apply to the revised Scheme, i.e. the benefits to both their organisation and the supply chain as a whole. SE to send this document to AMB for circulation, ASAP.

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to add a review of the benefits document to the agenda for the next meeting.

Regarding the revision of the SCEA Scheme's scoring mechanism, SL noted that organisations should be able to display their progress year on year. SE noted that previous SCEA Scheme was flawed as it could be swayed by an organisation understating / overstating its progress.

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to add "agreeing scoring for the revised SCEA Scheme" to the agenda for the next meeting.

7. A.O.B.

None.

8. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 5th December 2017.