PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

BIC SUPPLY CHAIN EXCELLENCE AWARD (SCEA) ACCREDITATION SCHEME REVIEW TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP – Minutes
Location: GoToMeeting / Conference Call
Date and time: Tuesday 5th December 2017, 2pm
Minutes taken by: Alaina-Marie Bassett

Present	Apologies
Alaina-Marie Bassett (AMB)	Russell Evans, Simon & Schuster
John Bell, HarperCollins	David Hetherington, Klopotek
Alan Bence, Ingenta (AB)	Matthew Hogg, Macmillan Distribution
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)	Chris Jones, Cambridge University Press
John Garrould, Bertram Group	Jim Reed, Waterstones
Lada Kriz, Penguin Random House	Sophia Sophocleous, BIC
Stephen Long, Nielsen	
Karina Luke, BIC	

1. **Welcome to the call and apologies**
   SE welcomed the Group to the meeting and the apologies were delivered.
   ➢ **ONGOING 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.

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 and the actions were discussed as follows:
   - Multiple contributors for the revised SCEA Application Form
     SE and SL confirmed that they continue to liaise offline regarding the SCEA application form.
     ➢ **ONGOING ACTION:** SE and SL to liaise offline regarding the SCEA application form.

   - Digital workflow and product delivery
     SE noted that this Group will review the BIC Digital Supply Chain (DSC) Committee's feedback on the SCEA application form under Item 4 (below).

   - Further representatives for this Project
     KL confirmed that this item was discussed at the most recent meeting of the BIC Physical Supply Chain (PSC) Committee (Thursday 16th November 2017). Further representatives have not yet been identified. She noted that Blackwell's is interested in participating however a suitable representative will need to be identified.

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

- SCEA application form for Printers and SCEA Benefits document
A draft SCEA application form for Printers was circulated to this Group for its review on Monday 27th November 2017 alongside the draft SCEA Benefits document.

- SCEA application form:

  - Section C: EDI / e-Trading
  AMB confirmed that "security and privacy" was added to the most recent agendas of the BIC DSC and PSC Committees. The Group was informed that a question regarding the dissemination of insecure EDI / e-trading message formats should be added to Section C of the SCEA application form going forwards.

  - Section F: Digital Printing, Print On Demand (POD), Ultra Short Run Printing; Section G: Rights and royalties; and Section H: Data sharing
  SE confirmed that he has now removed the above sections of the SCEA application form according to the feedback received at the last meeting of this Group.

  - Section I: Additional information and innovation
    - ➢ **ACTION CARRIED OVER**: SE to add an advisory to the introductory text for this section to remind applicant organisations that they should not provide information which is commercially sensitive / not in the public domain.

4. **Review of the respective Publishers and Vendors / Service Providers SCEA application forms**
SE noted that a header, specifying the type of organisation that the form is intended for, needs to be added. He also reminded the Group that the SCEA application forms are now intended to collect information purely for accreditation purposes, not for data gathering; if required, separate surveys will be produced in due course to address other areas of interest, but not for accreditation purposes.

- ❖ **DECISION**: The terms used in the SCEA application form, such as "to what extent", should be quantified (i.e. given examples), in order to provide organisations with a measure to gauge themselves by.

  KL noted that this will help to ensure that applicant organisations understand the purpose of each question and what is expected of them when completing the form.

- Section B: Product metadata
It was agreed that a column, providing a URL for each of the standards referenced, should be added to the grid in Section B. In addition, options for "direct ONIX feed to data aggregators" and "direct ONIX feed to wholesalers" should be included in the grid. KL noted that organisations should be encouraged to provide information for all of the standards that apply to them, by stating Yes (Y) or No (N) in the relevant row(s) of the grid.

The book industry's supply chain organisation

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

➢ **ACTION**: SE to liaise with BDS to ascertain the name of its service / system to which organisations supply their metadata. SE to add this name to the grid in Section B of the application form.

➢ **ACTION**: SE to add a definition for both "pre-pub" and "Price & Availability (P&A)" into Section B.

The Group discussed the contents of the Product Metadata grid and their ranking in relation to the scoring mechanism. SE noted that each standard listed has a different purpose which is relevant to the book industry supply chain and the more standards / systems an organisation uses, the better. JB noted that this Group will need to ensure that the scoring mechanism takes multiple responses into account.

- ONIX 3.0
  Regarding the standards grid in Section B, JG suggested that organisations should be asked whether they are implementing ONIX 3.0 or 3.0.4 and JB suggested a question relating to "non-standard personalised price feeds". The Group agreed that organisations should be asked to specify the most recent version of ONIX that they support; however, if they state ONIX 2.1, the Group agreed that the organisation should be marked down. It was also agreed that applicants should specify the latest ONIX Code List currently in use within their organisation. LK noted that some organisations may supply their metadata using a spreadsheet due to their customers being unable to consume the information in another way (i.e. libraries), he suggested that they should not be penalised in this instance. The Group agreed.

- Section C: EDI / e-Trading
  SE noted that is it easier to quantify messages, such as EDN, which receive responses but less straight forward for all other messages. KL suggested requesting both the volume and percentage of the systems / formats used. The Group agreed to delete the question relating to non-electronic, non-automated messages from the application forms.

  AB joined the call.

- *BIC Realtime*: Ordering APIs
  The Group agreed that applicant organisations should be asked whether they intend to implement *BIC Realtime* APIs into their respective systems within the next 12 months; SE added this question to the SCEA application form. It was agreed that a table should be included to allow organisations to state whether they would be hosting or consuming the API(s). KL and JG agreed that organisations which state that they are using other book industry APIs should be asked to provide further details, including the name of the API and the organisation's reasons for using it as opposed to a standard *BIC Realtime* API.

- *BIC Realtime*: Consumer Direct Fulfilment (CDF) and Financial Document (FD) APIs
  - ➢ **ACTION**: SE to amend the *BIC Realtime* CDF and FD API grids so they are in-line with the amendments which were made to the *BIC Realtime* ordering APIs grid.

- *BIC Realtime*: Returns APIs
  - ➢ **ACTION**: SE to add a question underneath the *BIC Realtime* returns grid to ask organisations if they intend to implement returns APIs in the next 12 months.

- Transactional metadata
  SL suggested that the systems and services used to disseminate transactional metadata (i.e. PubEasy, Nielsen Book, etc.) should be moved from Section B of the SCEA application form to Section C to avoid confusion. SE noted however that although these systems / services appear in both sections, they relate to differing processes – both of which are relevant to the SCEA Scheme.

- Section D: Digital
  SE noted that the latest version of the SCEA application form for Publishers incorporates the feedback received to date from the BIC DSC Committee and that this section now includes an introductory paragraph. The Group suggested either including a question in the SCEA application form pertaining to organisation's handling of sales data or asking whether the format used is compliant with trading partners' requirements so that it can be ingested without manual intervention. It was agreed that organisations should not be penalised due to their trading partners' requirements.

  KL and JB suggested specifying EDItX as the recommended standard for digital product sales reporting.

  SL left the meeting.

  ❖ **DECISION**: The Group agreed to include a question in the SCEA application form about applicant organisations' awareness of the EDItX standard; if the organisation states that it is aware of EDItX, a conditional question should be asked to ascertain if the organisation is using EDItX and if not, the reason(s) for this.

- ISBN per format
  The Group agreed that the responses to this question need to be quantifiable. JB raised concerns about the term "format" and it was suggested that either "digital format" should be used or examples of the possible formats (i.e. EPUB, kindle, etc.) should be provided. It was also suggested that "standard convention" should be amended to "recommended industry best practice". If applicant organisations indicate that they do not assign a unique ISBN per digital format, a box should be provided for the organisation to explain its reasons for this.

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

JB questioned whether it is necessary to ask organisations to state the percentage of their digital metadata that is sent to Nielsen, BDS and Bowker when eBook platforms often do not receive the metadata from data aggregators. He suggested that this information is less valuable for digital products than physical products. The Group agreed that this question should be removed for the SCEA application form.

- BIC standards for digital products
  JB noted that further standards / best practice guideline documents for the digital supply chain will need to be agreed by the BIC DSC Committee, in order for the revised SCEA Accreditation Scheme to refer to them and then measure applicants against them in due course. KL noted that the reference to the BIC Product Metadata Excellence Award (PDEA) Accreditation Scheme's Digital Tick needs to be removed from the SCEA application forms. She suggested that a question regarding applicant organisations' awareness of / compliance with BIC's forthcoming digital acquisitions and divestments best practice document should be added.
  ➢ **ACTION**: AMB to add "creation of standards / best practices for the digital supply chain" to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC DSC Committee.

- Section E: Additional Information and Innovation
  SE informed the Group that a question regarding applicant organisations' security and privacy workflows has now been added into the SCEA application forms. JG raised concerns about this question noting that organisations will not be able to say too much on this topic for security reasons. AB noted that organisations will have to be complaint with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) by Friday 25th May 2018, when GDPR comes into legislation. JB suggested that HTTPS should be referred to in this section and that best practice guidelines in relation to security and privacy will need to be published by BIC before asking applicant organisations if they are compliant.
  ➢ **ACTION**: AMB to add "security and privacy – should organisations provide information about their security audits as part of the BIC SCEA Accreditation Scheme?" to the agenda for the next meeting of both the BIC DSC and PSC Committees, and the BIC Operational Board.

- Training
  SE reported that 2 new questions have been included in this sub-section regarding keeping up-to-date with best practice / technologies and providing training to colleagues.

SE thanked the Group for its feedback and noted that the scoring mechanism for the revised SCEA Accreditation Scheme will need to be agreed in due course.
➢ **ACTION**: SE to amend and tidy up all SCEA application forms according to all feedback received during this meeting, sending the revised versions to AMB for circulation, ASAP.
➢ **ACTION**: ALL to review the revised application forms and provide feedback on them prior to the next meeting.

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

5. **New requirements under consideration for the revised SCEA Scheme**
SE noted that some of the new requirements listed on the agenda for this item have now been addressed and should therefore be removed. The Group agreed that environmental concerns are out of scope for BIC, however they suggested that a general question relating to organisations' compliancy with W3C's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) should be asked.
   - ➤ **ACTION**: SE to add a general question about whether organisations are compliant with WCAG accessibility standards to all relevant SCEA application forms.
   - ➤ **ACTION**: AMB to remove *BIC Realtime*, EDItX and Industry Returns Initiative (IRI) from the "new requirements" item on the agenda for this Group going forwards.

6. **Timing – project end and the launch of the revised SCEA Accreditation Scheme**
KL reminded the Group that, in-line with BIC's 2018 Strategy, the revision and relaunch of the SCEA Accreditation Scheme needs to be completed by December 2018. She noted that all remaining items on the agenda for this Group will be discussed at the next meeting.
   - ➤ **ACTION**: AMB to ensure the review of the Publishers, Vendors / Service Providers and Printers questionnaires remains on the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.
   - ➤ **ACTION**: ALL to attend the next meeting of this Group in order to sign off the application forms produced to date.

7. **Next steps**
   - ➤ **ACTION**: ALL to provide feedback on the benefits document (which was circulated to this group on Monday 27th November 2017) to SE, KL and AMB by **Monday 8th January 2018.**

8. **A.O.B.**
The Group did not have anything further to report.

9. **Date of next meeting**
Tuesday 30th January 2018.