

BIC TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION CLINIC (TIC) MEETING – Minutes

Location: CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE and GoToMeeting / Conference Call

Date and time: Thursday 11th January 2018, 2pm

Minutes written by: Alaina-Marie Bassett

Present

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC

Francis Cave, Consultant (dialled in)

Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)

Angela Kendall, Nielsen (dialled in)

Darren Lussenden, Macmillan Distribution (dialled in)

Peter Morley, Ingenta

Simon Parker, Batch

Steve Roe, Blackwell's

Anil Sreedharan, Wiley (dialled in)

1. Welcome & apologies

SE welcomed the Group to the meeting and the Group introduced themselves for the purpose of the minutes. Some members of the Group (as indicated above) attended this meeting via GoToMeeting / conference calling facilities.

2. Competition Law – conduct reminder

The Group was reminded 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 the minutes and follow up on actions from the last meeting

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved with minor corrections. All actions from the last meeting were discussed under Item 4.

Post-Meeting Update: The amended minutes document was circulated to this Group on Friday 12th January 2018, alongside the actions from this meeting.

4. Current EDI standard issues (TRADACOMS and EDIFACT)

All current EDI standards issues are documented in the Action Grid overleaf; all the actions recorded from this meeting, unless otherwise stated, are as of 11.01.2018.

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>4.1 Electronic Code Lists (ECL) Raised by PM, Ingenta Date raised 31.01.2013</p>	<p>This item was originally raised by PM, who asked if it might be possible to publish code lists for EDIFACT and TRADACOMS in an electronic (text file) format. An authoritative list of code lists was subsequently produced by Celia Burton (CB) for TRADACOMS in 2014 however it was agreed that BIC should ensure that this document is up-to-date prior to its publication.</p> <p>Following the previous meeting of this Clinic, SE reported that in December 2017 BIC published an updated TRADACOMS Code List PDF on the BIC website (Version 10), which can be found here: http://www.bic.org.uk/files/pdfs/EDI%20Tradacoms%20Guidelines%20Code%20List%20Version%2010,%20December%202017_FINAL.pdf. This includes the revised TRADACOMS List 54 document, which was recently produced by the BIC Price & Availability (P&A) Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG). The Group was notified about this document's publication on Monday 18th December 2017. SE agreed to update the TRADACOMS Electronic Code List (ECL) text file to reflect these changes.</p> <p>SE reported that a draft, ECL document for TRADACOMS and EDIFACT respectively has now been produced (the TRADACOMS ECL was produced previously but the EDIFACT ECL was produced following the previous meeting of this Group); both documents were shown on screen during the meeting. SE noted that the structure of the two ECLs are sufficiently different to suggest separate publication rather than as a combined document as was originally envisaged. The Group agreed that the two electronic code lists should remain separate from one another as they will be easier to maintain in this way. SE agreed to send the ECL documents to FC and PM initially for their review, prior to the documents being circulated more widely. SR suggested that a header should be added to the ECL documents which will detail the version number and date of each standard that the document relates to. The Group agreed that these documents should be circulated to the TIC ASAP with a view to their being signed off at the next meeting.</p>	<p>SE to review both the draft code list documents ASAP, adding a header which details the version number / date of the standard documents that each relate to.</p> <p>SE to send the draft electronic code list documents to FC and PM for their review.</p> <p>Once feedback is received from FC and PM, AMB to circulate the electronic code list documents to the TIC for their review.</p> <p>ALL to provide feedback on the documents to SE and AMB prior to the next meeting, with a view to the docs being signed off at the next meeting.</p>	<p>SE</p> <p>SE, FC + PM</p> <p>AMB</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>4.2 VAT Country Codes Date raised Prior to 31.01.2013</p>	<p>EDI messages developed before the VRN (VAT Registration Number) was made an international code (by the addition of a two character country code) may hold the VRN in a numerical only field. To add say, GB, to the front of a VRN, two changes were needed: 1) The field must be alphanumeric and 2) it needed to be large enough to accommodate the extra two characters. At previous Clinic meetings, SE was tasked to investigate and suggest how these changes should be made. Changes have since been agreed by the membership of this Clinic. TRADACOMS changes can be published by BIC but EDIFACT changes must be referred to / approved by EDItEUR.</p> <p>AMB confirmed that she is in the process of liaising with EDItEUR in order to obtain a copy of the EDIFACT standard document and gain permission to create a 'UK version' of the document which will incorporate all the changes made to the standard since Issue 1.1 into the body of the document itself; currently this information is located in an auxiliary document which can be found on the EDItEUR website, here: http://www.editeur.org/files/EDIfact%20eancom%20pdfs/EDIfact%20trade%20book%20supply/170110%20EDItEUR%20Trade%20EDI%20changes.pdf. SE noted that at present there isn't a functioning EDIFACT Steering Group to approach regarding the amendment of the international documentation so the production of a UK version may be the only viable option; the Group had raised concerns previously that new users may not be aware of the existence of the auxiliary document which lists all the changes to the EDIFACT guidelines and may be unaware of the changes made to the standards since Issue 1.1 for this reason. SE noted that a review of the EDIFACT standard may be required in future to ensure that all of the information is accessible to new users and includes all necessary changes, i.e. it is better to have an up-to-date set of guidelines for users to refer to, rather than an out of date set with an accompanying list of changes which are hard to understand without the full context of the guidelines.</p>	<p>AMB to continue to liaise with EDItEUR about the production of a UK EDIFACT standard doc and report back ASAP.</p> <p>SE to produce the UK EDIFACT standard document, including this Group's changes & examples, ASAP sending it to AMB (for submission to EDItEUR, prior to wider circulation / publication).</p>	<p>AMB</p> <p>SE</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>4.3 HTML code embedded in text</p>	<p>JM originally raised this issue, noting that HTML code is being embedded in ONIX feeds – both in and out of C-data sections – and cannot be validated as a result. In response, BIC held a workshop on this topic in April 2017 which was facilitated by EDItEUR, and the following document was produced by EDItEUR: Embedding HTML Mark-Up in ONIX document, http://www.editeur.org/files/ONIX%203/APPNOTE%20HTML%20markup%20in%20ONIX.pdf.</p>	<p>CARRIED OVER FROM 22.06.2017: GL to report back on Nielsen's use of the EDItEUR doc, ASAP.</p>	<p>GL</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>Raised by JM, Gazelle Date raised 15.01.2015</p>	<p>SE noted that GL could not attend this meeting so his action, relating to Nielsen's use of EDItEUR's document (above), should be carried over. FC reported that EDItEUR will not be able to produce the proposed tool (which will test whether organisations' use of HTML validates before their feeds are sent out) quickly however he agreed to provide updates on this topic at forthcoming meetings of this Clinic to keep the Group informed about any progress that is made.</p>	<p>ONGOING ACTION SINCE 14.09.2017: FC to provide an update on the proposed EDItEUR validation tool at the next meeting.</p>	<p>FC</p>	
<p>4.4 Order Rejection Code for eBook Orders Raised by GB, Bertram's Date raised 05.11.2015</p>	<p>George Bogdanovich (GB) noted in 2015 that an availability code to highlight when an order has been rejected due to its format, i.e. an eBook, did not exist. In response this Group supplied feedback on the revision of the TRADACOMS Code List 54 document to the BIC P&A T&FWG for this issue. SE confirmed that this Group's feedback on this topic was incorporated into the recent revision of TRADACOMS List 54 (see Version 10 of the BIC TRADACOMS Code List document (Item 4.1, above)). As such, code RF (refer to other publisher or distributor) was included in availability status code section of List 54 for P&A feeds from distributors (see pages 18-26) and code EX (digital product ordered) and RF were included in the availability status code section for order acknowledgments (pages 26-39). NB: code EX was imported from EDIFACT to meet the need to <u>respond to</u> orders for eBooks and downloadable audiobooks. The Group confirmed that they are happy with this solution.</p>	<p>Remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4.5 Both SAN & GLN used in Returns Messages Raised by SP, Batch Date raised 30.04.2015</p>	<p>SP informed the Group in 2015 that SANs should, ideally, not be mandatory for head office / branch identification; instead he suggested that it should also be possible to identify a branch by using the NAD-BY segment in the RETAN and RETINS messages. The Group later agreed that only a single identifier needs to be provided in returns messages and SE amended the documentation for Returns Messages to this effect; this document was signed off (via email) by the BIC TIC following its meeting on Thursday 22nd June 2017. SE confirmed that he will locate and provide a copy of the most recent Returns Messages document (with all the changes incorporated) to AMB, ASAP.</p>	<p>CARRIED OVER SINCE 14.09.2017: SE to send the latest version of this doc to AMB, ASAP so it can be added to the BIC website. AMB to circulate the link.</p>	<p>SE + AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>4.6 Serialized Shipping Container Codes (SSCC) Raised by PM, Ingenta Date raised 09.03.2017</p>	<p>PM reported in March 2017 that some retailers were planning to implement SSCC – an 18-digit number used to identify logistics units for electronic commerce transactions. He asked how / whether distributors were preparing for this possibility. The Clinic discussed this topic and identified that smaller suppliers might have problems implementing SSCC without help. This topic was subsequently discussed by the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee in June 2017, where it was agreed that SSCC is out of scope for BIC due to the topic being commercially sensitive. Instead, several useful web resources were provided in the previous minutes to help users to implement SSCC.</p> <p>PM reported that Amazon will ask for SSCC usage from all its new trading partners going forwards. SE suggested that this Group could review the documentation already in existence for SSCC (links for which were provided in the minutes from the last meeting) to see whether they meet organisations' requirements, however DL confirmed that Amazon already provides suitable guidance on its requirements / expectations to trading partners. SE noted that BIC may therefore choose to advise organisations to simply liaise directly with Amazon or other hubs to receive this information. SE noted that smaller organisations may struggle to cope with SSCC since many cannot afford a system that will handle SSCC in the way that larger organisations can. He noted that the workload (i.e. recording all the orders, shipments, etc.) can be very manual for this reason. In addition, all organisation using SSCC must join GS1 to purchase SSCC prefixes. AMB suggested that, since this topic is out of scope for BIC (due to the commercial elements involved), it may be appropriate to raise this issue for the attention of the Independent Publisher's Guild (IPG) who may wish to advise small to medium organisations supplying these hubs. SE noted that SSCC is linked to EDI's Advance Shipping Notification (ASN) number since an ASN must be provided in SSCC and vice versa.</p>	<p>AMB to inform the IPG about this issue.</p> <p>Remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p> <p>AMB</p>	<p>Out of scope</p>
<p>4.7 Mixed-Rate VAT Products in TRADACOMS (ILD segment)</p>	<p>This item was raised in March 2017 by SP, who informed the Group that Batch and Cambridge University Press had been experiencing issues with mixed-rate VAT products in TRADACOMS; in particular, some of the orders received contained more than one VAT rate in the necessary three invoice lines (when only a single VAT rate should be entered). The Group previously amended the guidance provided in the EDI TRADACOMS document to address this issue.</p>	<p>SE to send the final EDI TRADACOMS Invoice doc to AMB, so it can be added to the BIC website.</p>	<p>SE + AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>Raised by SP, Batch Date raised 09.03.2017</p>	<p>SE confirmed that he will locate and provide a copy of the most recent EDI TRADACOMS Invoice document (with all the changes incorporated) to AMB, ASAP. <i>Post-Meeting Update: The revised EDI TRADACOMS Invoice File document can be found on the BIC website, here: http://www.bic.org.uk/files/EDI%20Tradacoms%20Guidelines%20The%20Invoice%20(Trade),%20January%202018_FINAL.pdf</i></p>	<p>AMB to circulate the link and remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	
<p>4.8 Duplication of invoices and DNA RTX codes 978 and 979 Raised by PM, Ingenta Date raised 09.03.2017</p>	<p>PM informed the Group in March 2017 that some distributors supplied the same invoices via both EDI and Batch. (This usually occurs when changing from one method to the other). Obviously both EDI files should be identical but it was discovered that there were differences in the two files.</p> <p>Following the previous meeting of this Group, PM produced a draft guidance document for this issue which was circulated on Monday 16th October 2017 for the Group’s review. Limited feedback was received in response. PM noted that regardless of the invoice format, the information provided on all invoices must match exactly. However, Ingenta identified an issue in March 2017 that shows how differing information / fields are being provided by some suppliers to their customers via Batch and EDI. SP and PM agreed that this is a historical issue which was identified by chance. PM noted that <u>both</u> DNA RTX codes 978 and 979 MUST be provided to resolve this issue. He noted that invoice codes supplied by distributors enable booksellers to filter the invoices and, for example, avoid loading duplicate or correction invoices.</p> <p>SP reported that Batch has also identified a discrepancy between / issue with the information provided on paper and EDI invoices. SR noted that Blackwell’s rejects any invoices that do not match each other exactly. PM confirmed that consistency is the key to resolving both these issues.</p> <p>The Group suggested that a note explaining best practice for invoices (including the implications of bad practice) could be added to the EDI standard document. They agreed that the information provided on an invoice should always match the legal copy of the invoice. PM noted however that providing codes 978 and 979 is already listed as being mandatory in the guidelines document. The Group agreed that further feedback on this issue is required from the members of this Clinic.</p>	<p>ALL to provide feedback on this issue and how best practice can be achieved (i.e. ensuring that all information on multiple invoices matches the legal copy – which is already mandatory in the standard) to SE, PM and AMB.</p>	<p>ALL</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>4.9 New issue: Paperless invoice issues Raised by BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee Date raised 11.01.2018</p>	<p>Many large distributors no longer provide paper copies of invoices in their deliveries; instead they provide a post-pick invoice (electronically) after the delivery has taken place; as such the invoice number is not always provided on the delivery note. This is having a negative impact on retailers because the goods-in processes may require staff to check on receipt the invoice information such as price and discount and this is not available in these cases.</p> <p>SP reported that Batch allows organisations to enter the delivery number into an online search tool in order to look up the invoice number. SR also noted that some distributors provide portals which allow their customers to download this information. The Group agreed that in order to benefit from Batch's service or the distributor's online portal, the DELN segment in EDI (which is a mandatory field in TRADACOMS) must be populated with the delivery note number. The key point is that if distributors are not going to provide the invoice data on paper in the box, they must provide booksellers with a simple alternative way of accessing this data. SP informed the Group that HarperCollins Publishers has two delivery note numbers: a delivery reference number and a delivery group reference number (i.e. for a series of linked deliveries). As such, each invoice raised by HarperCollins includes both of these delivery numbers. SP reported that HarperCollins and Batch now intend to pilot the inclusion of the delivery group reference number in the suppliers' order number in the order and delivery references (ODD) segment. He suggested that if this pilot is successful, other organisations may choose to do the same going forwards.</p>	<p>AMB to report back to the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee regarding the tools available to address this issue.</p> <p>SP to provide an update on the pilot being carried out by HarperCollins and Batch at the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p> <p>SP</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>4.10 New issue: Sundry charges on an EDI invoice Raised by SP, Batch Date raised 11.01.2018</p>	<p>SP informed the Group that one supplier is invoicing a supplementary carriage charge as a product. The TRADACOMS guidelines specify that there is a code for this (Z13) and a place for it, ILD SPRO. This is already clearly specified in the guidelines and suppliers should avoid using Z13 anywhere else. It is true that this field was previously used for ISBN10 but it is now reserved for these supplementary charge codes. This is an issue because organisations cannot accept / ingest this information from the Product Code field.</p> <p>SP noted that the TRADACOMS Invoice documentation states this information clearly and agreed to liaise with the organisation directly about best practice.</p>	<p>SP to liaise with the supplier that has been populating the Product Code field with Z13.</p> <p>Remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>4.11 New issue: Multiple VAT rates in invoice / credit notes</p> <p>Raised by AS, Wiley</p> <p>Date raised 11.01.2018</p>	<p>AS noted that Wiley currently has to deal with an indeterminate number of differing VAT rates for its EDI invoice messages and asked the Group how this information should be sent in both TRADACOMS and EDIFACT.</p> <p>SE noted that this topic was raised at the TIC previously. He advised that, although it is possible to have more than one VAT rate in the UK (i.e. zero % and the 20% standard rate), a third VAT rate (i.e. the VAT rate of the customer's country for a digital product) should not apply in this case. Using the recipient's country's VAT rate only applies to consumers (not organisations) in that country and it is unlikely that Wiley would be exchanging EDI messages with consumers. If the customer is a company then it is likely to be VAT registered and BIC's understanding is that this would mean that the UK VAT rates would apply.</p> <p>AS requested information about mixed rate products and packs. PM noted that it is possible for 3 VAT rates to be applicable for a single product, e.g. in Ireland, the VAT rate for maps is 9% – so Irish distributors of products containing maps could have 3 lines: 1 for zero rated, 1 for standard and 1 for maps. He noted however that organisations' systems should include the third / extra invoice line and provide a total at the bottom of the invoice raised. In the UK, at present, only standard and zero rates are in force for books. Mixed rate VAT is caused by a combination of a book and a non-book product.</p>	<p>Remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4.12 New issue: Multiple VAT numbers in invoice / credit notes</p> <p>Raised by AS, Wiley</p> <p>Date raised 11.01.2018</p>	<p>AS informed the Group that some of Wiley's digital products are owned by a different organisation that has its own VAT number. However, Wiley receives consolidated orders for multiple products which belong to both organisations. He noted that, whilst raising the invoice, the VAT number of Wiley's partner organisation is printed underneath the relevant products on that invoice. He asked whether it is possible to send the VAT number of the other organisation's products separately via the EDI message. SR noted that Wiley should not invoice its customers for products that it does not own. Therefore, each invoice should contain only one VAT number: Wiley's. SE explained that as the agent of a product, Wiley's VAT number will be applicable. He noted that best practice in this area involves working within the guidelines from HMRC.</p>	<p>Remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p>4.13 New issue: Delivery charges Raised by AS, Wiley Date raised 11.01.2018</p>	<p>AS informed the Group that Wiley’s warehouse has its own VAT number (as it is a separate entity). When a shipping charge is applicable to the warehouse’s orders, it is charged for via EDI, however AS noted that it isn’t possible to also include the warehouses’ VAT number on the single invoice raised. He asked where this information should be provided in the EDI message. SE informed AS that in his opinion, it would be better to have Wiley charge for both products and shipping (using its own VAT number) and that an inter-company charge for the shipping between Wiley and the warehouse could then be made. This would preclude the need for multiple VAT numbers on a single invoice. Alternatively, the warehouse could invoice separately for the shipping charge, however, this may be difficult for a bookseller to reconcile a stand-alone shipping charge from a different entity with the shipment of books invoiced by Wiley. BIC’s advice would be to contact HMRC about the best way to deal with this issue.</p>	<p>Remove this item from the grid/agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4.14 Potential new issues to be addressed</p>	<p>The Group did not have any other new issues to report. SE noted that any matters that do arise between now and the next meeting of this Group should be brought to BIC’s attention prior to the next meeting date.</p>	<p>ALL to send details of any new issues to SE and AMB prior to the next meeting of this Group.</p>	<p>ALL</p>	

5. BIC Realtime APIs / web services

SE noted that the governance of the *BIC Realtime* standard now lies with this Clinic. As such, organisations will be able to raise any issues experienced with their implementations and/or any requirements for further functionality with this Clinic going forwards. AMB informed the Group that the *BIC Realtime* PlugFest will not be taking place on Tuesday 16th January 2018 as previously advertised due to identifying a suitable venue and sponsor for the event; it is hoped however that this event will take place in March 2018 instead.

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to provide further information about the date of the forthcoming *BIC Realtime* PlugFest as soon as it becomes available.

- Devising a 'Plan B' for the *BIC Realtime* implementation directory / capabilities grid

SE noted that this Group will need to identify a way to gather and display information pertaining to organisations' implementations of *BIC Realtime* APIs going forwards.

➤ **ACTION:** ALL to consider how this Clinic can gather and display information about organisations' usage of *BIC Realtime* APIs going forwards, i.e. SurveyMonkey, Wiki, Google Docs, etc., with a view to this topic being discussed fully at the next meeting.

6. Report from the Library Technical Implementation Clinic (LTIC)

SE noted that the most recent meeting of the BIC LTIC took place on Wednesday 19th July 2017. The LTIC's forthcoming meeting will take place on Thursday 18th January 2018 and an update on that meeting will be provided thereafter. The latest set of minutes from the LTIC can be found on the BIC website here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/121/Libraries-Committee/>

7. Watching Brief on the Price & Availability (P&A) Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG)

See Item 4.1 and 4.4, above. The next meeting of the P&A T&FWG will take place on Wednesday 14th February 2018 where a workshop will take place to identify industry requirements for pricing (including personal pricing). Members of this Clinic are welcome to attend this workshop, for further information email: info@bic.org.uk

The latest minutes from the P&A T&FWG can be found on the BIC website, here:

<http://www.bic.org.uk/118/Physical-Supply-Chain-Committee/>

8. ONIX / EDItX XML / Web Services

- ONIX

FC reported that ONIX Codelist Issue 39 (which was ratified at the International Steering Committee meeting at Frankfurt Book Fair 2017 (FBF17)) has now been published; Issue 40 will be released in January 2018. ONIX 3.0.4 was also ratified at FBF17 and has since been released; EDItEUR's ONIX 3.0.4 specification and Implementation and Best Practice Guide documents can be found here: <http://www.editeur.org/93/Release-3.0-Downloads/#Specification>

- EDItX

FC noted that EDItEUR is now focusing on sales and invoice reporting in EDItX, with

TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION CLINIC

@BIC1UK

www.bic.org.uk

info@bic.org.uk

digital requirements (including eBook libraries) to be incorporated going forwards. FC confirmed that should any developments arise that may affect the *BIC Realtime* standard, he will be sure to inform this Group.

- Library Web Services

The Group did not have anything to report regarding library web services. The next meeting of the BIC Library Web Services T&FWG will take place on Thursday 15th February 2018.

9. Actions for Training, Events & Communication (TEC) Committee

AMB confirmed that the BIC TEC Committee is still in the process of discussing a webpage for updates from the BIC TIC and LTIC; this webpage will be developed in due course.

10. A.O.B.

The Group did not have any other business to report.

11. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 24th April 2018.

BIC website address: <http://www.bic.org.uk/>

BIC EDI listserv: http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/BIC_ECOMMERCE_IMPLEMENTATION_GROUP/

BIC training courses: <http://www.bic.org.uk/93/All-Courses/>

BIC is very active on twitter so, if you use twitter, you may want to follow BIC and keep up with BIC announcements, activities and events via twitter: @bic1UK

As always, any comments / corrections, etc. should be sent by email to both alaina-marie@bic.org.uk & simon.edwards@dial.pipex.com