

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

**Location:** GoToMeeting / Conference Call

**Date and time:** Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> January 2018, 2pm

**Minutes taken by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett

---

**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett (AMB)

John Bell, HarperCollins

Alan Bence, Ingenta (AB)

Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)

John Garrould, Bertram Group

Matthew Hogg, Macmillan Distribution

Lada Kriz, Penguin Random House

Stephen Long, Nielsen

Karina Luke, BIC

**Apologies**

Russell Evans, Simon & Schuster

David Hetherington, Klopotek

Chris Jones, Cambridge University Press

Jim Reed, Waterstones

**1. Welcome and apologies**

SE welcomed the Group to the meeting and the apologies were delivered.

- **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 Terms of Reference 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 their offline discussion on this topic was concluded and can be removed from Item 3 going forwards.
- Section B: Product Metadata (Publishers, Vendors, Service Providers application forms)  
SE confirmed that BDS's service / system (which organisations supply their metadata to) is called BDSLive.
  - **ACTION:** SE to add BDSLive into the grid in Section B of the SCEA application form.
  - **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** SE to add a definition for both "pre-pub" and "Price & Availability (P&A)" into Section B of the SCEA application form.

JB joined the call.

- Section C: EDI / e-Trading (Publishers, Vendors, Service Providers application forms)

- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** SE to amend the *BIC Realtime* CDF and Financial Document API grids so they are in-line with the amendments which were made to the *BIC Realtime* ordering APIs grid in Section C of the SCEA application form.
  - **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** 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.
- Section I: Additional information and innovation (Publishers, Vendors, Service Providers application forms)
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** SE to add an advisory to the introductory text for Section I to remind applicant organisations not to provide information which is commercially sensitive / not in the public domain.
- BIC standards for digital products
- AMB confirmed that this topic will be added to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC Digital Supply Chain (DSC) Committee. KL asked whether the revised SCEA Scheme is dependent on the creation of these BIC digital standards. JB suggested that the BIC DSC Committee should make this decision during its meeting on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> March 2018. KL reminded the Group that the completion and launch deadline for the revision of the SCEA Scheme is December 2018 at the latest. SE suggested that this deadline provides adequate time to incorporate any new digital standards into the Scheme, including the BIC digital acquisitions Best Practice guidelines document (publishing shortly).
- **ACTION:** AMB to ensure that this item appears high up on the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC DSC Committee (including context of what needs to be agreed).
- Security & Privacy – providing security audit information for the SCEA Scheme
- The Group agreed that it is not appropriate to request information about organisations' security audits on the revised SCEA Scheme due to the implicit risk to security involved. KL asked whether organisations should be asked if they are GDPR compliant. MH commented that it would be very difficult to ascertain whether an organisation is GDPR compliant and the Group agreed that it is not BIC's place to comment on statutory law.
- **ACTION:** AMB to remove this topic from the agendas of the BIC Operational Board and BIC DSC Committee.
- New requirements under consideration for the revised SCEA Scheme
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** SE to add a general question about whether organisations are compliant with WCAG accessibility standards to all relevant SCEA application forms.
- 4. Introduction to the revised SCEA Review Projects Plan and deployment of SurveyMonkey**
- SE reminded the Group that all the SCEA application forms produced to date will need to be transcribed to SurveyMonkey in due course. KL suggested that a note should appear at the top of each application form stating that only one application is to be submitted per organisation. The SCEA application form for Printers, which was circulated on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018, was reviewed and edited on screen during the meeting as follows:

- Section B: Product Metadata (Printers application form)  
 KL commented that all SCEA application forms should be specific about the answers that are required (i.e. asking organisations to “give details” is not informative enough about the SCEA Panel’s expectations). The Group agreed that questions about the following topics should be included in this application form: pack sizes; whether weights and dimensions metadata is supplied to publishers and if so, how; and the method used by applicant organisations to ensure the accuracy of the metadata that is supplied.
- Supplying weights and dimensions metadata in ONIX  
 It was suggested that a question regarding whether organisations adhere to the ONIX best practice guidelines for the supply of weights and dimensions, pack sizes, etc. could be included in the Printers’ SCEA application form. It was also suggested that organisations could list the ONIX fields used for supplying metadata to publishers and the frequency with which this information is disseminated. The Group suggested that this last requirement could be too extensive and so it could be difficult to score.  
 ➤ **ACTION:** SE to make the changes / additions to Section B, as described above.
- Trusted Partners  
 It was noted that printers are asked whether they have obtained a Trusted Partner status from publishers as part of the Printers’ SCEA application form; KL and SE agreed that, by mentioning this status, applicant organisations may be encouraged to find out more if they have not attained the status as yet.
- APIs  
 It was suggested that the existing question about *BIC Realtime* should be moved to either Section C: EDI / e-Trading or to its own section at the end of the Printers’ SCEA application form. KL suggested that organisations should provide information regarding the APIs they use (whether they are *BIC Realtime* or proprietary APIs), specifying also the business purpose(s) for each.  
 ➤ **ACTION:** SE to make the changes / additions to Section B, as described above.
- Section C: EDI / e-Trading (Printers application form)  
 SE suggested that tick boxes could be introduced to the first question in this section (for telephone, email, EDI, APIs, etc.) as well as a box for organisations to specify the percentage of usage for each. The Group agreed that obtaining this level of information is sufficient and that further qualifying information is not necessary. KL suggested that “communicate” should be amended to “transact” so the question reads: “how does your organisation typically transact with publishers?”

JG joined the call.

AB reported that the majority of Ingenta’s EDI communications are received via email or File Transfer Protocol (FTP) however EDI via VAN and AS2 are still in use. The Group

## PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN

@BIC1UK

[www.bic.org.uk](http://www.bic.org.uk)

[info@bic.org.uk](mailto:info@bic.org.uk)

agreed that “telephone” should be removed from the list and that “email” should be amended to “non-EDI / non-structural email”. It was also agreed that the following question should be removed from the application form: “approximately what percentage of your communications with publishers are electronic?”

➤ **ACTION:** SE to make the changes / additions to Section C, as described above.

- Printer Despatch Advice (PDA) messages (Printers application form)

It was agreed that rather than naming organisations, the total number of organisations should be specified instead plus the percentage of despatch information being sent. SE noted that use of the PDA standard (which was updated in 2012) should be promoted by the revised SCEA Scheme.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to make the changes / additions to Section C, as described above.

- Benefits and use of standards (Printers application form)

It was agreed that question 18 (“What are the benefits of communicating with publishers / distributors electronically and are there any major issues which prevent improvements in this area?”) should be split into two. Relating to question 19 (“In your view, does BIC have a role to play in this area or do you feel that this is already covered by other organisations?”), KL suggested that applicant organisations should instead be asked whether they use any EDI standards which are not BIC-approved standards, and if so, which non-BIC standards they use.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to make the changes / additions to Section C, as described above.

SL informed the Group that he experienced some difficulties when filling out the SCEA application form for Service Providers and Vendors. He agreed to liaise offline with SE to provide his feedback. SL left the call.

➤ **ACTION:** SL to liaise with SE offline regarding his feedback.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to send a revised SCEA application form for Service Providers / Vendors based on SL’s feedback, to AMB for circulation to this Group prior to the next meeting.

- Section D: Digital Workflow & Digital Product Delivery (Printers application form)

SE noted that this section should include questions relating to Print On Demand (POD) and the supply of digital products. The Group agreed that this section of the SCEA application form for Printers should be reviewed by the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee, with a view to establishing (via email) which digital areas, if any, it would like BIC to evaluate for printers. It was agreed that, unless a suitable need for this section can be identified, it will be removed from the Printers’ SCEA application form.

➤ **ACTION:** KL to liaise with the BIC DSC Committee regarding the SCEA application form for Printers, as detailed above.

AB and JB suggested that this section may not be necessary in the SCEA application form for Printers. SE agreed, noting that there are not any BIC standards for digital printing / supply of products to base Section D on at present.

JG left the call.

- Section E: Miscellaneous (Printers application form)  
SE noted that this section is an opportunity for applicant organisations to specify whether they assist BIC in its work, i.e. by participating on a BIC Committee or Task & Finish Working Group, attend BIC training courses, etc. The Group had nothing to add here.
- **ACTION:** KL to circulate the revised SCEA application form for Printers to SE for further amendment (as described in the actions above), ASAP.

#### 5. Review of the SCEA Accreditation Scheme's Benefits document

SE reported that feedback on this document has been received from SL and JB, to date. JB suggested moving the "what the SCEA accreditation says about your organisation" section to the top of the SCEA Benefits document to provide this information early on in the document. The Group agreed that this document should be recirculated for further feedback and sign off. SE requested that any changes be made directly into the document using tracked changes (rather than simply adding comments).

- **ACTION:** SE to liaise with SL offline regarding his feedback on this document, with a view to agreeing on some examples which can be used in the document itself.
- **ACTION:** SE to revise the benefits document, including SL's examples, and send the amended document to AMB by Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 for circulation to this Group.
- **ACTION:** ALL to provide feedback on or else approve the revised benefits document (via email) by Friday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2018.

*Post-Meeting Update: The revised benefits document was circulated to this Group on Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 for comment.*

#### 6. Carrying over awards on the current BIC SCEA Accreditation Scheme for 2018

SE reminded the Group that the awards on the current SCEA Accreditation Scheme were carried over for 2017/18 to ensure that organisations retained their accreditation whilst the Scheme undergoes its revision. AMB noted that SCEAs are currently all awarded on an annual cycle so if the SCEAs were to be carried over again for 2018/19, they would expire in April 2019.

- Applications to the revised SCEA Accreditation Scheme  
SE noted that, prior to its launch in December 2018, this Panel will pilot the revised SCEA Scheme ensuring that the organisations represented on the SCEA Panel are accredited and that the application process is without issue prior to accepting external applications. KL noted that applications to the revised Scheme will be accepted and reviewed on a quarterly basis (although the award for each organisation will be reviewed annually). SE noted that, this new application process must be handled with care, so that competitors do not feel disadvantaged, e.g. if a BIC member previously accredited cannot apply to the new scheme whilst a competing organisation gets accredited ahead of them. AMB suggested that organisations could be approached to apply in batches by organisation type to ensure they are given the opportunity to gain accreditation at the same time as their

## PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN

@BIC1UK

[www.bic.org.uk](http://www.bic.org.uk)

[info@bic.org.uk](mailto:info@bic.org.uk)

competitors; any organisation that does not apply by the specified deadline can then apply for any subsequent, quarterly Panel meeting thereafter. KL suggested that any agreed application deadlines / phasing in of the revised SCEA Scheme should be made very public on the BIC website to ensure transparency.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that, once the revised SCEA Scheme has launched, applications on the current / original SCEA Scheme should not be accepted.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that organisations should be approached directly to apply to the revised SCEA Scheme, in batches of organisation types.

JB and KL noted that carrying over the awards on the current SCEA Accreditation Scheme for 2018/19 for a second time would undermine it. JB commented however that organisations will need to be informed about this Group's decision (i.e. not carrying over the awards) so they know what to say to their trading partners, if asked. KL agreed that a communication will need to be issued to ensure that currently accredited organisations are well informed.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that, due to the forthcoming launch of the revised SCEA Scheme, the awards on the current SCEA Scheme should not be carried over for 2018/19.

KL noted that the BIC website will need to be updated to reflect the decision (above).

- **ACTION:** KL to provide some text for the BIC website, ASAP.
- **ACTION:** AMB to add the agreed text to the BIC website, ASAP.

### 7. A.O.B.

- **ACTION:** AMB to ensure that the items which were not covered during this meeting remain on the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.

### 8. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2018.