BIC PRODUCT DATA EXCELLENCE AWARD (PDEA) ACCREDITATION SCHEME REVIEW TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP – Minutes
Bowker Offices, 5th Floor, 3 Dorset Rise, London EC4Y 8EN
Wednesday 3rd December 2014, 2pm

Present
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Judith Bennett, Oxford University Press
Thomas Herbert, Palgrave Macmillan
Karina Luke, BIC
Peter Mathews, Cambridge University Press (Deputy)
Laura Payne, Penguin Random House
Jack Tipping, Bowker UK (Chair?)
Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones
Alfred Willmann, Penguin Random House

Apologies
Clive Herbert, Nielsen
Simon Pallant, Gardners
Keith Walters, Bibliographic Data Systems

1. Introductions and apologies
KL welcomed the Group to this inaugural meeting and thanked them for volunteering their time for this Project.

2. Election of Project Leader and Deputy
KL suggested that this Group should go through the Project Brief before asking for volunteers for the Project Leader role. She noted that the Project Leader will ensure that this Project runs to task and to the specified timeline detailed in the Project Brief.

After discussing the Project Brief at length (see below for details), KL asked if there were any volunteers for the Project Leader role. JT questioned whether a data aggregator like himself could or should be the Chair. The Group agreed that there isn’t a conflict of interest here. In light of this conclusion, JT volunteered to be the Chair, providing CH of Nielsen is fine with this. KL noted that the alternative would be getting a consultant in to take on this role. The Group agreed that this alternative should only be considered if the scope of role becomes too much for JT or the Nielsen would rather a data aggregator was not the Chair.

ACTION: AB to discuss the matter of JT being the Chair with CH and report back to the Group asap.

PM volunteered to be the Deputy Chair of this T&FWG, noting that he was involved in this task previously. The Group agreed that PM would be a good match for this role, and that his unique perspective on the task at hand would be very useful for this Project.
3. Purpose of this Task & Finish Working Group

KL informed the Group that the purpose of this Project is to bring the Product Data Excellence Award (PDEA) accreditation scheme up-to-date to reflect the book industry as it currently stands. She noted that this scheme will be extended to include any organisation that is involved with metadata in the book industry. She commented that this Group should be looking to include other data aggregators/recipient as well as Nielsen for the measurement of data. GW noted that Print On Demand (POD) and digital books have come a long way since the original scheme’s inception and this needs to be reflected in the new scheme too.

The Group agreed that the purpose, background, and project definition of this Project Brief were all comprehensive and self-explanatory.

KL noted that this Group will need to carefully consider who to include on the new accreditation panel once the revised scheme is formed. She suggested that only accredited organisations should sit on the panel since it may be inappropriate for an organisation who is not accredited to be judging others. The Group agreed. GW noted that retailers and recipients of data are also currently present on the panel since receiving good metadata is so much in their businesses’ interests.

LP suggested that the accreditation scheme and review process needs to be more conversational so that organisations can review and agree upon the acceptable terms / requirements of the accreditation process. She noted that some organisations have conflicting instructions from in-house colleagues that result in issues with the organisation’s accreditation.

JB commented that some organisations do not have delivery mechanisms that enable them to send data in the accredited format – or don’t have an existing infrastructure to aid them in supplying good data – questioned whether the scheme should consider an enabling process to help these organisations. The Group noted that this will be included in the scheme. KL commented that this Group needs to look at the book industry in its entirety so that every organisation can apply and become accredited; she noted that it’s a useful tool for any organisation to assess their metadata, which is in turn an intrinsic part of the modern book industry and sales. She noted that, despite the fact this scheme will be aimed at everyone, this does not mean that gaining accreditation will be easy. AW noted that the fields that the accreditation scheme is scored on will need to be discussed at length.

- 3.1 Project Deliverables
KL noted that this scheme will need to be tested before it can be launched for public consumption.

- 3.4 Interfaces
The Group agreed that BISG’s Data Accreditation scheme should be looked at to see if commonality can be achieved, where / if possible.
- **4. Outline Business / Industry Case**
  The Group agreed that the business case for this Project stands for itself as written in the Project Brief. They noted that this scheme will need to be kept relevant otherwise it will become obsolete.

- **6. Acceptance Criteria**
  The Group agreed that the acceptance criteria as per the Project Brief are suitable for this project.

**3.1 Review of dates and schedule of Project**
KL noted that there currently isn’t a timeline for this Project. She suggested that the timeline is for this Group to decide. The Group agreed that two years will be adequate time to fulfil this Project (though they suggested that there is a possibility that the Project may draw to a close ahead of schedule). PM noted that there should be updates and releases, regarding the work done by this T&FWG, along the way. KL agreed and stated there will be monthly progress reports posted to the BIC website by the Project Lead.

**3.2 Reminder of Terms of Reference for BIC Task & Finish Working Groups**
KL noted that the Terms of Reference document was circulated to the Group prior to the meeting. She asked for any questions or comments about this document. There were none.

**4. Agree first actions and owners, with reference to the Project Brief**
The Group agreed that the first action for this Group should be an in-depth discussion on what is being measured for the accreditation and how it will be measured. AW suggested that the organisations from each sector should talk amongst themselves to ascertain their requirements. Before doing this, PM suggested that this Group should agree upon their criteria and what they are hoping to achieve. The Group agreed that the main point is ensuring that the accreditation process is neutral and measurable and relevant. GW suggested that some fields in the current scheme may need to be deprecated due to their being irrelevant now.

PM suggested carrying out a survey. He noted that this survey could be a way of getting more organisations involved in, and aware of, BIC accreditation. He also noted that, if there were reasons why organisations did not apply before, this survey could help this Group resolve those issues. GW suggested approaching The Booksellers Association and The Publishers Association to take a look at the survey before it is released so that they can give an overview of the book industry’s requirements. The Group also suggested that the survey should include a question similar to: “If you have not applied for BIC accreditation in the past, please tell us why”.

**ACTION:** KL to write a survey for the requirements of this accreditation scheme and circulate to the Group for comment.

**ACTION:** JT to circulate the survey, once it is finalised, to the BA and PA for their input.

GW and LP noted that more involvement from retailers would help to identify new fields of importance, i.e.: fields that need to be populated but currently are not. PM agreed but noted that
there is likely to be a divergence between the requirements of large and small organisations. KL noted that this Group does not want to penalise organisations that are providing good data but in small volumes or not via ONIX. LP agreed but suggested that the BIC Basic level of data is now too minimalistic. She suggested that these basic fields need to be updated / added to.

AW commented that BIC needs to ensure that this scheme is neutral and has an independent viewpoint. KL noted that opening up all the measurements involved and inviting feedback will facilitate this effort. The Group agreed that Nielsen should not be the only data aggregator providing the statistics for this accreditation scheme.

**ACTION:** AB to contact other data aggregators to encourage their involvement in this scheme.

PM suggested that organisations could be accredited based on an example file (as per the BISG scheme). GW noted that these example files would need to be taken on an unspecified day so that the results cannot be fabricated. LP noted that it isn’t fair to judge an organisation based on a file that the organisation may or may not have send out; she noted it could be an incomplete record.

GW noted that custom packs are an ongoing issue for retailers. She commented that publishers don’t always tell retailers about the packs, then – when the retailer discovers one – the retailers manually add the books into their system (unaware that they are sold only in packs) and consequently the information is sent out in a way the publisher did not intend it to be. KL commented that this issue could be a part of the aggregator’s accreditation scheme. The Group agreed that custom pack records need to be released with a label which states: “do not use for accreditation purposes” or something similar so that these records can be removed from the statistics that are used for accreditation. AW noted that it is in everyone’s interests to show suppliers that a record is incomplete – it also shows that the record is not incomplete by mistake. The Group agreed, noting that the ISBN / record will be released anyway as part of the overall, and inevitable metadata supply chain, so the publisher should have control of this process and their titles’ metadata. GW noted that this issue may crossover with the work done by the Price & Availability Task & Finish Working Group. She suggested that there may be an availability code that notifies recipients that an ISBN is not available to trade customers. She also noted that Price & Availability falls under the jurisdiction of the Supply Chain Accreditation Scheme rather than The Product Data Excellence Award (PDEA) Accreditation Scheme and questioned whether it should be included in this (PDEA) accreditation scheme. LP commented that publisher status should not be linked to availability. PM suggested that this Group should discuss this matter with Nielsen to see if they can set up a hierarchy which can help to structure this sort of pack. He suggested that, if the authority sends an update for their record that information can then be used to show availability without needing to update the file again.

KL questioned whether two surveys should be written – one for accredited organisations and one for everyone else. The Group agreed that the survey should be sent out to all but there may be questioned that accredited organisations can skip.
- **First Actions:**
  1. Each sector to liaise and discuss their requirements; what works / what doesn’t.
  2. Survey to be written by KL and sent out en masse to BIC members and non-members mailing lists.
  3. ALL to agree the criteria for the scheme in order to objectively measure the data collected.

**ACTION:** JT and KL to put together a Project Plan / timeframe.

**ACTION:** AB to circulate the current scoring mechanism to the Group from the BIC website.

PM noted that he believes the current scheme is too difficult to apply for. LP agreed, noting that the Best Practice Guidelines aren’t overly clear either and could be made more user-friendly. The Group agreed, noting that organisations may not realise that they are already doing enough to be accredited. The Group also considered the fact that the current scheme is only for publishers and organisations will continue to think this is the case with the new scheme; they will need to be informed that the revised scheme will aid the entire book industry to send metadata to more organisations without any issues arising. They agreed that advertising this fact is paramount to the scheme’s success. LP noted that retailer endorsement is also fundamental to the scheme success and take-up. TH was tasked with finding a way to get endorsements from retailers; asking them what they want to see and whether they would endorse the scheme.

**ACTION:** TH to think about how to get endorsements from retailers / users to encourage organisations to apply for accreditation.

AW suggested approaching The British Library for a neutral perspective on metadata since they receive a copy of every book produced.

**ACTION:** KL to discuss gaining this perspective from The British Library with Neil Wilson.

**ACTION:** LP to speak to Kobo to ask them to endorse the scheme and become engaged with the project in some way (though they would need to join BIC to be able to take an active part in this T&FWG).

5. **A.O.B.**

GW suggested that this Group may have some crossover with both the Acquisitions & Divestments Task & Finish Working Group and the Price & Availability Task & Finish Working Group. She suggested that the points raised at these groups should be addressed for the supplier’s accreditation scheme.

6. **Date of next meeting**

   Tuesday 24th February 2015.