

BIC PRODUCT DATA EXCELLENCE AWARD (PDEA) REVIEW WORKSHOP – #3

Bowker Offices, 5th Floor, 3 Dorset Rise, London EC4Y 8EN

Thursday 28th January 2016, 10am–4pm**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
 Graham Bell, EDItEUR
 Judith Bennett, Oxford University Press
 Kat Coveyduck, Virtusales Publishing Solutions
 Nabiha Evans, Amazon
 Clive Herbert, Nielsen
 Thomas Herbert, Palgrave Macmillan
 Alex Ingram, EDItEUR
 Karina Luke, BIC
 Peter Mathews, Cambridge University Press
 Paul Theijs, BooksoniX

Jack Tipping, Bowker (Chair)
 George Walkley, Hachette
 Keith Walters, Bibliographic Data Services
 Laura Williams, Penguin Random House
 Alfred Willman, Random House Group

Apologies

Jenny Brownley, WHSmith's
 John Green, Bertram's
 Kieron Smith, Blackwell's
 Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones

1. Welcome & apologies

KL welcomed the Group, thanking them for attending this third PDEA Review Workshop. The apologies were read out.

2. Review of the minutes and actions from the last workshop

The minutes from the last PDEA Review Workshop, which took place on Thursday 10th December 2015, were approved without corrections. The following actions were discussed:

- Identifying Print On Demand (POD) titles on the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme
 At the last meeting, NE was actioned to liaise with her colleagues at Amazon to ascertain whether there is a need to know how a book is manufactured (outside of Amazon) and report back to the Group. NE was unable to attend this workshop until the afternoon so an update was not provided at this time.

Post-Meeting Update: NE confirmed that Amazon do not need to receive any information about how a book is manufactured (outside of their own POD system). From a retail perspective, Amazon would treat this publisher the same as one who had a print run for their books, as the lead time to order these books would be similar. The only time Amazon would want this information is if Amazon POD was being utilised – though they have internal data sources for this so it isn't an issue.

KL noted that GB has provided feedback (including a definitions grid for Virtual Stock) on the work done to date. KL confirmed that this feedback and grid will be incorporated into the T&FWG's Best Practice Guidelines document for Virtual Stock.

- Data aggregators & measuring ONIX files for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme
 KL informed the Group that she has liaised with CoreSource and Vearsa to ask whether they might be willing to join the PDEA Revision T&FWG and/or the PDEA Accreditation Panel going forwards and whether they would be willing to measure eBook metadata. She reported that CoreSource are interested to learn more about this accreditation scheme and how they can help; a meeting will take place between BIC and CoreSource at London Book Fair 2016 (LBF16) to discuss this matter further. KL also reported that she has not received a response from Vearsa to date but a meeting took place between BIC and Firebrand on Wednesday 27th January 2016 where Firebrand expressed an interest in measuring eBook metadata for the accreditation scheme.
ACTION: KL to liaise with CoreSource at LBF16 and report back to the Group.
ACTION: KL to follow-up with Vearsa and Firebrand regarding the possibility of their joining the PDEA Revision T&FWG and/or the PDEA Accreditation Panel going forwards and measuring eBook metadata for the scheme.

- ONIX 3.0 Badge
 AMB confirmed that all organisations that are currently accredited on the PDEA Accreditation Scheme were approached regarding the new ONIX 3.0 Tick / Badge prior to the PDEA Accreditation Panel meeting, which took place on Thursday 21st January 2016. She reported that nine organisations have since been awarded an ONIX 3.0 Badge; the results from January's Panel meeting will be announced shortly.
Post-Meeting Update: The PDEA results were announced on Friday 5th February 2016. A list of all currently accredited organisations, as of January 2016, can be found here: http://www.bic.org.uk/files/PDEA%20Accredited%20Organisations,%20as%20of%20Jan%202016_FINAL.pdf

- Feedback on this Group's discussion about a suitable timeframe for POD titles
 KL noted that GW of Waterstones could not be present at this workshop so feedback will need to be obtained from her at a later date.
ACTION: GW to send any feedback about the four-week POD timeframe to KL, asap.

Post-Meeting Update: This topic was discussed at the last meeting of the POD & Short Run Task & Finish Working Group on Wednesday 10th February 2016, where the members of the Group expressed concern about submitting POD metadata in a four-week timeframe.
ACTION: KL to include an update on this topic on the agenda for the next meeting.

- ONIX 3.0 (using the enhanced data set) to become a requirement for BIC Excellence Plus award a year from the launch of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme
 KL noted that the 'Summary of what was agreed at the last PDEA Workshop (#1)' document was amended to reflect this Group's decision to change the deadline (to use the enhanced data set of ONIX 3.0 in order to obtain the highest level of accreditation) to 6-months after the launch of the revised scheme, rather than 12 months. She noted that this document will be discussed under Item 3 of the agenda.

- Thema as a non-mandatory data element on all levels of accreditation
 KL informed the Group that this item was discussed by the UK *Thema* National Group on Wednesday 16th December 2015. The National Group's members confirmed that they will collectively need to agree when the time is right for *Thema* to become a mandatory requirement of the revised PDEA scheme; this recommendation will then be sent to the PDEA Accreditation Panel and Metadata Sub-Committee for their consideration and sign off. GB noted that the decision will need to be announced prior to *Thema* becoming a mandatory requirement and suggested that there is good reason to make *Thema* a mandatory requirement of this PDEA Scheme sooner rather than later.
- P&A feeds in the PDEA Accreditation Scheme
 KL noted that this topic, and CH's feedback on the timescale for this Group's suggested adjustments to be implemented into the PDEA Accreditation Scheme, will be discussed under Item 3 of this agenda (p.5).
- CBMC Codes
 KL informed the Group that she has now liaised with The Publishers Association (PA) regarding CBMC codes. She was informed that The PA will be holding a meeting to discuss CBMC codes on Thursday 18th February 2016 and feedback from this meeting will be forwarded to KL in due course.
ACTION: KL to update the Group on feedback received from The PA at the next meeting.
- BIC Basic & BIC ONIX data element sets
 AI noted that these grids are a work-in-progress due to the nature of the revision being carried out however it is essential to ensure there are no inconsistencies between the grids. He suggested that the ONIX 2.0 column within the grid can be simplified / needs clarification. GB agreed, noting that the relationship between BIC Basic and ONIX 2.0 is an issue that will need to be addressed. The data element sets will be discussed further under Item 8 of this agenda, where the members of this Group will provide feedback on the work done to date.

3. Summary of what was agreed at the last PDEA Review Workshop (#2)

KL circulated a document to the Group, prior to this meeting, which lists what was agreed at the last PDEA Review Workshop. In addition, the summary from the first PDEA Revision Workshop was amended and re-circulated. The Group reviewed these lists during the meeting and the following points were raised for discussion:

- Adult Content Warnings
 KW asked whether publishers should provide an Adult Content Warning even if the (adult) book in question does not contain 'adult content'. LW confirmed this to be the case, noting that there is an ONIX code to express "no adult content". GB explained that retailers have specified that they require this information from publishers. LW noted that there is concern amongst publishers about where to draw the line as to what

constitutes 'adult' content – she noted that many books include themes that could be considered 'adult' by some and the definition is not set in stone.

Taking the publishers' concerns into account, KW asked whether it is necessary to provide an Adult Content Warning for all adult titles; an alternative might be to provide an Adult Content Warning only if the book includes adult material / themes. GB noted that retailers require this information in order to display the book appropriately within their stores; if a Content Warning is not provided then the recipient of the metadata simply doesn't know if the content is or is not innocuous. LW agreed, noting that this practice also give publishers more power in how their books are marketed / displayed.

AW asked when this requirement will be incorporated into the revised PDEA Scheme / when publishers will need to be providing this information. GB commented that this practice will have been incorporated into most publishers' systems already. The Group agreed that providing an Adult Content Warning is conditional since it is only mandatory for (all) adult books. GB noted that if a book needs a Content Warning then it is clearly not a children's book.

- Dissemination of metadata feeds

KL asked the Group whether a question should be introduced into the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme along the lines of: "When and where was your organisation's last metadata file sent?" PM suggested that this would not be an unreasonable question to incorporate into the new Scheme as the PDEA Panel has agreed to inform organisations about the award they are likely to attain before the Panel meeting takes place and this information could help to inform their decision.

KL asked whether organisations that have not sent an update in the past six months should lose their accreditation under the revised PDEA Scheme since the current scheme states that not sending an updated feeds regularly "may negatively impact" their accreditation result. PM suggested that these organisations should be deferred until they have sent out a feed. GB agreed, noting that most organisations (regardless of their size) will need to update their metadata every month or so due to small changes such as updating a 'new' title to 'available'. CH agreed, noting that the status of the book would eventually be incorrect if publishers do not send updates.

GB suggested the PDEA Panel may need to look at each organisation's metadata to ascertain whether their feed should have been updated in order to then defer them. CH suggested that the size of a publisher / the amount of books they publish will affect the likelihood of updates and this will be taken into account for the purpose of the organisation's review. KL reminded the Group that publishers which are accredited on the PDEA Scheme must publish at least 10 books per year in order to be eligible to gain an award.

PM suggested that the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should recommend that publishers must send an update once a month; though he noted there may be reasons (which the

Panel will need to consider) as to why an organisation might not send a feed on a monthly basis. The Group agreed.

- Notice period for ONIX 3.0 usage to be compulsory at the highest level of accreditation
At the last meeting, the Group agreed that in order for any organisation to attain the highest level of accreditation on this Scheme (BIC Excellence Plus) they must be using ONIX 3.0's enhanced data element set within six months from the launch of the revised PDEA Scheme; this ONIX 3.0 enhanced feed must be submitted to at least one recognised, UK data aggregator. The Group suggested that it may be possible to reduce the six-month notice period since the new stipulation may not affect the top-tier organisations by the time the revised PDEA scheme launches. KL noted that the comparative work being carried out for ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0 will help to inform this decision.

KL reminded the Group that ONIX 3.0 Badges are being awarded to organisations that are sending at least one ONIX 3.0 feed to a recognised UK data aggregator. She noted that, for the purpose of this award, use of the ONIX 3.0 enhanced data element set is not required.

- Pooling measured metadata for eBooks
KL asked whether there is a minimum amount of (measured) metadata that will need to be pooled for the purposes of this accreditation, and whether a list of approved measurers should be produced. GB suggested that a list of recognised aggregators (all of which should be able to measure metadata) would be beneficial. CH noted that a defined method for measuring the metadata (with defined metrics) is essential to ensure that each aggregator is working from the same page / measuring to the same scale. He suggested that a sub-group will need to investigate how to implement the measuring process after this Group has decided what should be measured. The Group therefore agreed that a list of BIC-approved measurers is needed and in order for this list to be arrived at, BIC should vet the aggregators to ensure they have understood and are using the metrics of the Scheme.

ACTION: KL to produce a list of BIC-approved measurers in time for the launch of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.

- Guidelines / clarity needed with regards to Price & Availability (P&A) feeds
CH noted that the prioritisation of third party P&A metadata, for the purposes of the PDEA accreditation scheme, could prove to be complicated to assess / measure. PM noted that the preferred feed could differ depending on whether the book is pre-publication or post publication date – he asked if the data aggregators would be able to switch from one feed to another, when required. AW noted that there will not be a cut-off date that works for every organisation – even Penguin UK and The Random House Group differ in their timeframe of trusted sources.

KL asked whether this requirement should be removed from the Scheme, taking the above discussion into account. The Group agreed that P&A feeds should be measured on

the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. PM suggested that, in order to specify their preference of feeds, publishers should clearly state on the PDEA Accreditation application form which source of P&A information is to be trusted and agree with their data aggregator as to when the feed should move from one source to the other and at what time in the feed's life cycle this should occur. PM noted that if the source is incorrect for the purposes of the PDEA accreditation Scheme then it will also be incorrect for the recipients of the metadata. The Group agreed that this decision and the articulation of their preferences should remain the responsibility of the publisher.

- Cover images

GB suggested that the timeliness of cover images should mirror the timeframe for each format type, i.e. they should be submitted a minimum of 16 weeks prior to publication date for physical books, 4 weeks prior to publication date for eBooks, and 4 weeks prior to publication date for POD titles regardless of delivery method. The Group agreed.

ACTION: KL to ensure that the documentation for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme states that cover images must be supplied within the same timeframe as the rest of the metadata for the format of the book.

The Group discussed whether "image last updated" should be included as a requirement for the BIC Basic award. AI noted that this requirement is currently listed in the BIC Basic grid but is not mandatory at present. GB commented that the inclusion of this requirement will be of most value to organisations that provide basic metadata, i.e. via a spreadsheet. He suggested that this requirement should be recommended at the very least, if not mandatory. PM disagreed, noting that the bar to attain the basic level of accreditation should not be set impossibly high so as to not discourage smaller organisations from applying. He suggested that this information may be too difficult for some smaller organisations to supply. The Group agreed that "image last updated" should be 'strongly recommended'.

ACTION: AI to ensure that 'image last updated' is listed as strongly recommended on the BIC Basic data element set grid.

KW asked whether the submission of holding images is accepted on the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. The Group agreed that they are not acceptable, (holding images in this context include logos, standard / stock images and blank images). CH noted that covers which are a work-in-progress are acceptable and are far more useful than standard / blank images.

ACTION: AI to ensure that the use of holding images is expressively not recommended in the BIC Basic and BIC ONIX data element set grids.

LW noted that publishers often have access to promotional images for their books prior to cover images. She asked whether the use of promotional images would be acceptable if a cover image is not yet available, noting that the promo images are as provisional as an early jacket cover image might be. She commented that the promotional image will provide an authentic visual for the product that would not be possible if a cover has not

yet been produced. KW commented that a note about holding images needs to be added into the revised PDEA accreditation Scheme to clarify this matter and inform publishers about what is and what is not acceptable.

KL noted that the cover image provided by publishers needs to be meaningful to the consumer. GB agreed, noting that the publisher needs to state (within their metadata) that the promotional image is not the cover image but can be used in place of a cover image until the cover itself is available. KW noted that, in order for promotional images to be used by retailers / seen by consumers, retailers will need to have the ability to use / search for other images, outside of the cover image field. KL noted that the revised PDEA Scheme should state that it is best practice to include a cover image at the earliest opportunity (and within the format type's timeframe for timeliness); she noted that the image should be specific to the book.

ACTION: KL to provide a note of best practice in the documentation for the revised PDEA Scheme regarding what constitutes an acceptable/ unacceptable cover image.

KW asked what the difference is between CMYK and RGB cover images. AI informed him that RGB colour profiles are for online use while CMYK is used for printed materials. AMB noted that it is very easy for designers to convert images from one colour spectrum to another, so this will not be an issue for most design departments.

LW commented that minimum dimensions for cover images also need to be specified. AI noted that recommended dimensions were included in the BIC Basic grid previously however these could be an issue for books that are especially long / wide. He noted that some online retailers, such as Apple and Amazon, specify that the images supplied to them should be a minimum of 2000 pixels on the longest dimension; however EDItEUR recommends 240 pixels on the shortest dimension (which is too small for online retailers' requirements). AI suggested that the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should be informed by the metadata recipients' requirements. KL asked whether the submission of larger images should be recommended for this reason. AI noted that this in turn poses a different problem – whether organisations have enough space to store images with a large file size. GB suggested that 2MB should be the maximum file size accepted. He noted that guidance is already available for this.

GB noted that it may be useful for publishers to supply promotional images for their books, so long as the publisher makes it clear to recipients that the image is not the cover image itself. He suggested specifying the book industry's preferences in order, as follows: Specific product / cover image > 3D cover image > promotional image. He also suggested that these images should be expressed using ONIX List 158, i.e. 1 > 3 > 7. The Group agreed.

ACTION: AI to include this Group's recommendations for cover images into the BIC Basic data element set grid: Specific cover image > 3D cover image > Promotional image.

AI commented that organisations should be advised not to simply enlarge a small image to the specified / required size since this will provide poor quality images. He suggested

that images should be supplied at a minimum of 1500 pixels on the longest dimension. GB and AI agreed to capture this information into a paragraph separately.

ACTION: GB and AI to produce a paragraph to outline the recommendations of this Group for cover image dimensions and colour profiles.

- Print On Demand (POD)

CH commented that there has to be a way to identify whether a book is POD in order for books to be measured under the specified timeliness timeframe, i.e. four weeks prior to publication date. KL agreed but noted that availability codes should not be used to express the method of manufacture of a book. GB noted that the POD & Short Run Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) has conflicting requirements in this respect and needs to agree what should be prioritised.

ACTION: AMB to include an item on the agenda for the next meeting of the POD & Short Run T&FWG (Wednesday 10th February 2016) regarding the measurement of POD titles.

ACTION: KL to update the Group on this T&FWG's progress at the next meeting.

- eBooks

KL asked the Group whether there is a possibility that publishers might submit an ONIX 2.1 and an ONIX 3.0 feed to different aggregators respectively for the same eBook; this will cause issues when measuring the eBook for the purposes of this Scheme. She noted that this matter will need to be discussed at a subsequent meeting of this Group.

ACTION: KL to add an item to the agenda of the next meeting of this Group for this issue to be discussed.

LW also noted that providing a GBP price (which is a mandatory requirement of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme) for an eBook that is only sold outside of the UK will prove to be confusing to publishers and/or unnecessary. The Group agreed, suggesting that the BIC Basic element grid should state that GBP is only mandatory if the book is available for sale in the UK.

ACTION: AI to ensure that the BIC Basic data element set reflects that GBP is only mandatory if the book is available for sale in the UK.

4. Measuring eBooks

KL reminded the Group that eBook metadata must be submitted a minimum of 4 weeks prior to publication date. She noted that this Group will need to discuss how eBook feeds will be measured under the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. At a previous workshop, this Group suggested that publishers could provide data aggregators (for the purpose of this Scheme) with a reduced data set (i.e. with commercially sensitive data removed). KL asked if the Group has any alternative solutions that should be considered. PM noted that there are two phases to this discussion: 1) which aspects of eBook metadata should be measured and 2) how should it be measured and which organisations should do the measuring.

PM noted that this Group will need to define what variables should be included in eBook metadata for a feed to be measured appropriately. As an example, he informed the Group

that Cambridge University Press currently provides an individual ISBN for each of their products (including customer-specific eBooks). He asked whether organisations, for the purpose of this Scheme, should be listing all ISBNs that are related to each of their eBooks or whether only the ISBN for the most generally-available product should be included. KL noted that this decision will need to take export-only eBooks into account too. AW and GB noted that this information could therefore be confidential for some publishers.

AW commented that retailers will not be able to sell a retailer-exclusive eBook if the metadata provided is incomplete; for this reason publishers are certain to send all relevant information to the retailer to secure sales. He suggested that it is therefore unnecessary to send the metadata for products of this nature to aggregators for the purpose of this Scheme. LW agreed, noting that this information should be closed between the publisher and retailer. KW disagreed, noting that metadata which is only disseminated to one source will be harder for end-users to locate and may in turn affect the sales of that book. However, if aggregators are provided with a reduced set of data, KW argued that they will be able to advise where the book can be purchased, etc. AW agreed this would be beneficial but again asked whether it is necessary for these books to be measured under the revised PDEA Scheme.

NE of Amazon entered the room, joining the discussion of the PDEA Review Group.

The Group noted that they receive (to date) sub-standard eBook metadata that could be bettered. AI commented that the purpose of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme is to support and encourage the use of standards. He noted that what this Group is proposing may not be best practice at present but possibly should be going forwards. GB agreed, noting that having the ability to link products that are not available to those which are available is important and intrinsically dependent on the quality of metadata provided. KW advised that some smaller publishers do not know enough about metadata best practices while some metadata recipients have to ingest metadata and re-purpose it for their own system – both of these practices can cause inconsistencies / misinterpretation of the metadata.

The Group agreed that industry guidelines are the only way to aid organisations and ensure that the data they provide/are provided with is standardised; which will benefit all involved. They also agreed that eBook data should be measured for the purpose of this accreditation scheme. They suggested that there are fewer differences between eBooks and physical books than most think however the following additions should be included in the metadata provided for eBooks: file type; DRM; and software requirements / device(s).

PM asked whether publishers should include their retailer-exclusive eBooks in the metadata that is supplied to data aggregators, questioning in particular whether these titles are in scope of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. GB noted that retailers need to know about all of the products available for each title in order to provide good customer service however KW and KL commented that the PDEA Accreditation Panel members can only measure the metadata that they are provided with. LW noted that she cannot see why publishers should send metadata to recipients that are unable to use it / sell the product. CH noted that the

feed would be supplied purely for discoverability purposes and the feed sent to aggregators would not need to contain any commercially sensitive information for this reason.

JB noted that discoverability is not an issue for Oxford University Press at present, as their books are being found through the right channels, though GW informed the Group that Hachette would see value in sending a restricted data set of their metadata to aggregators. He agreed that distribution and price information should be controlled by the publisher and should not be included in the data set however. LW suggested that these titles are out of scope of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme and that any request to submit this information to data aggregators would not be signed off by Penguin UK. She noted that there are myriad ISBNs / products for each eBook and the inclusion of retailer-exclusive products would be difficult to explain to data recipients.

KL suggested that a possible solution might be for the PDEA Accreditation Panel to liaise with the recipients (i.e. the likes of Ingram, Vearsa, etc.) of each publisher's metadata and ask them to measure it, informing BIC about only the result (so the metadata is not passed on to other organisations). LW confirmed that this method of measuring would be preferred by Penguin but noted that publishers supply their metadata in differing ways and each recipient also tweaks / re-purposes the metadata for their own use.

GB commented that organisations should not be accredited for a reduced percentage of their books or their eBooks that happen to have good metadata; he noted that the feed provided (and therefore measured) needs to reflect the organisation's whole product list. KL suggested that each publisher should be given the choice about which organisations measure their eBook metadata. CH agreed that this practice would make the PDEA Scheme more robust. KL noted that BIC categorically cannot advise / tell publishers where to send their metadata.

AW asked what is gained by measuring eBook metadata. He noted that measuring physical books' metadata has a purpose as it informs distribution, shipping, etc. but, in comparison, eBooks can be made available straight away. KW noted that organisations that are new to the book industry need to be aware that there is a standard for submitting this information. LW agreed but noted that different recipients require different information. GB noted that the core set of information included in publishers' metadata must therefore cover all eventualities / requirements. He noted that the difficulty will be measuring this metadata and who should perform the measuring.

GB suggested that more concrete proposals are needed in order for this Group to make an educated decision. He suggested that the Group needs to know which organisations are willing and able to measure eBook metadata but, before this can be confirmed, the Group will need to agree what parts of the metadata should be measured. The Group agreed, noting that each organisation may be accredited by a few combined scores.

KL noted that, at a previous PDEA Review Workshop, this Group decided to deprecate the Digital Tick award; she asked whether this decision will now need to be reversed. NE

suggested that this would not be necessary, noting that the purpose of obtaining scores from eBook “measurers” is to ensure that organisations which submit their metadata to any organisation that is not a UK Data Aggregator are not penalised. LW noted that the standard of metadata for eBooks is higher than that of physical books, she suggested for this reason that an organisation that has more eBooks could gain a higher award as a result of the Digital Tick being deprecated – though GB noted that the reverse could also be true for organisations that have more physical books than eBooks.

KL called an end to the conversation, suggesting that a sub-group should address this topic in future. GB commented that the sub-group will need to keep the following principles in mind: 1) that the full product list will need to be measured, and 2) that there is a difference between eBooks’ and physical books’ timeliness. LW suggested that the BIC Digital Supply Chain should be asked to provide feedback on this topic. GB suggested that this conversation could take place via email instead of waiting for the Committee’s next meeting, which will take place on Thursday 19th May 2016. He noted that other aggregators will also need to be involved in this discussion before it can progress. He suggested that, if further aggregators cannot be found, measuring eBooks may be an impossibility; he suggested that they could, however, be measured on a legal deposit level but this could have associated costs.

ACTION: KL to approach both the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee and other aggregators to provide feedback or become involved in the forthcoming sub-group / discussion about measuring eBooks.

5. Export-only titles

KL suggested that this item should be discussed at the next workshop.

ACTION: KL to include ‘export-only titles’ on the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.

6. Description data element

KL noted that description is not a mandatory requirement for BIC Basic at present but asked whether it should be mandatory on the revised PDEA Scheme. She asked whether this decision might affect smaller organisations detrimentally. CH noted that, to his knowledge, smaller organisations tend to provide a description for their books however he reminded the Group that Nielsen has two levels of service – one which is paid for, the other free. He noted that Nielsen’s free service does not accept / store descriptions.

NE suggested that description should nonetheless be a mandatory requirement going forwards since its absence affects search engine optimisation, sales and availability. PM asked NE whether Amazon includes books that do not have a description on its website. NE confirmed that these books are listed on Amazon regardless of whether they have a description or not. PM therefore advised that the description field should not be mandatory but rather highly recommended. He explained that Nielsen is currently the only aggregator that is able to measure metadata for the purpose of the PDEA Scheme and, as a result, this Review Group cannot know which organisations might be affected, and to what extent, by the decision to make description mandatory. PM asked whether Nielsen might be able to apply discretion, for the purposes of this accreditation scheme, to organisations that have

sent a description in their feed (but which was not sent out by Nielsen). CH said that this might be possible but he would need to liaise with his colleagues to confirm.

ACTION: CH to liaise with his colleagues about the possibility of Nielsen applying discretion to organisations that have included a description in their feed to Nielsen's free service and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

GB suggested that it would be beneficial to organisations that do not use ONIX for the description field to remain a recommended (but not mandatory) requirement. He noted that this is a necessary measure to ensure that organisations can gain accreditation for free. He noted that this decision could be reversed if / when more aggregators begin to measure metadata for the PDEA Scheme going forwards. LW suggested that this decision undermines the purpose of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme, i.e. the dissemination of quality metadata. KL and KW agreed but noted that, at present, the PDEA Review Group has little choice in the matter.

CH commented that there are very few organisations, at present, that would be affected by the description field becoming mandatory. KL asked whether it might be beneficial for Bowker and BDS to ascertain whether they could measure the inclusion of description fields (only) in the metadata they receive and in what timeframe this could be implemented into their systems. GB suggested that both aggregators will need to measure all elements for the Scheme, not a restricted set / single field.

CH suggested that an Implementation Group should be set up to discuss how the measuring process can be implemented into Bowker's and BDS's respective systems. PM noted that there are commercial reasons / benefits for Bowker and BDS to measure metadata, namely that they can provide better feedback to their customers. The majority of the Group agreed that the description field should be mandatory if Bowker and BDS are able to implement the measuring process into their systems.

ACTION: CH, KW and JT to liaise regarding the production of an Implementation Group and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

TH suggested that this decision should come down to what retailers need, i.e. they would prefer to receive metadata that is inclusive of a description field. NE agreed, noting that Amazon receives metadata from more than one aggregator / source. GB noted that every publisher that is able to send a description will clearly do so but, in order to gain accreditation on the Scheme as it currently stands, they will also need a commercial agreement with Nielsen. He noted that organisations using ONIX will be able to provide a description but some smaller organisations are not able to use ONIX. The Group agreed to list the description data element as 'strongly recommended' for the time being, with a view to it becoming automatically mandatory the moment other aggregators are measuring metadata for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme.

7. Transition to new Scheme

KL noted that, once all aspects of this accreditation scheme have been discussed / agreed upon, this Group will need to consider what the implications of the changes to this Scheme

may be for publishers. She asked the Group how publishers should be informed about the changes and whether a grace-period will be needed for the work to be carried out. AW noted that the changes will firstly affect system suppliers, who will need time to implement the changes into their customers' systems. Publishers will then need additional time to work through their full catalogue, ensuring that the changes have been addressed. The Group agreed that six months would be overly ambitious for publishers to incorporate the changes into their systems due to the development time for system suppliers and the subsequent volume of work to be carried out.

CH informed the Group that it will take Nielsen longer than six months to implement the changes into their current measuring tool; which will be almost entirely new when finished and will incorporate a flagging system. He commented that a detailed brief will need to be drawn up before work can begin on this tool, then there will be development time and finally lapse time for publishers' meaningful, timeliness statistics to become pronounced. CH noted that this work will tie-in with the launch of Nielsen's new system in Q3 of 2016. GB commented that the development time for this Project is ultimately the reason why *Thema* and ONIX 3.0 were raised for discussion – since it will take time for the two to be incorporated into publishers' systems. He commented that there is a huge amount of work to be done.

CH suggested that publishers should be informed about the changes to the revised PDEA Scheme – possibly as soon as April 2016 – so they can begin carrying out the necessary work. The Group agreed that the revised Scheme is unlikely to launch prior to 2017 and publishers should be informed imminently about the revisions, providing them with a year to implement the necessary changes into their system. KL suggested that the revised Scheme should begin accrediting organisations using the new data element set a year after the revised Scheme is announced, i.e. in April 2017. The Group agreed. KL noted that both Nielsen's and the publishers' developments will need to run concurrently throughout the year. CH informed the Group that Nielsen's developers will require a specification before they can estimate the time it will take for this work to be done.

Discussing Nielsen's ability to measure publishers' use of ONIX 3.0 in the lead up to the new Scheme (i.e. from October 2016 onwards), NE suggested that all accredited organisations that are seeking reaccreditation in this period should be deferred so that they can be judged on the revised PDEA Scheme in April 2017. CH suggested that it is also important to liaise with publishers about their progress along the way, since this could affect the decisions / deadlines this Group agrees on. The Group agreed that publishers' progress will be taken into account when making decisions for the revised Scheme however they noted that waiting too long for publishers to implement the changes would devalue the Scheme.

GB noted that, once organisations are accredited on the revised PDEA Scheme's criteria, any organisation that had previously achieved a BIC Excellence Plus award but is not using the ONIX 3.0 enhanced data element set will be re-accredited with a BIC Excellence award. KL noted that organisations in this situation will be given the option to defer (for up to a

maximum of 6 months). GB noted that the 6-month deferral period (from October 2016) will take organisations up to April 2017 so, by this time, all organisations must be using ONIX 3.0 in order to achieve a BIC Excellence Plus award.

KL noted that it is this Group's duty to ensure that the sunrise date for this revised Scheme is fair to all organisations. GB noted that a specification will be needed (to ascertain the scale and timeframe of this Project) before publishers will then comment on their capacity. CH informed the Group that some requirements of the revised Scheme will be harder to implement than others. The Group agreed that the specification should now be produced. They noted that many of the decisions for this Scheme have now been agreed upon so, after the spec has been produced, the documentation for the Scheme will need to be reviewed to ensure it reflects these decisions. After this, the requirements of the Scheme can be announced. KL suggested that, by the end of this Workshop, the Group should be in a position to produce the specification. She commented that ultimately she would like to produce a timeline which can be displayed on the BIC website. CH suggested that the metrics of the Scheme should be made public too.

The Group broke off for lunch. GW of Hachette left the Workshop shortly before this time.

8. Review of ONIX 2.1 vs ONIX 3.0 release documentation – where / what are the difference?

AI noted that three spreadsheets were circulated to the Group prior to this meeting, one for each of the following: BIC Basic, ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0. In the case of ONIX 3.0, AI noted that the spreadsheet reflects the national guidelines of 2010. For ONIX 2.1 requirements, he noted that some elements have now been deprecated, e.g. where separate codes were suggested instead of a composite. He informed the Group that two columns have been added into the BIC Basic Required Information grid – the first to show the ONIX 2.1 equivalent of any requirement and the second to list if / how ONIX 3.0 differs from the ONIX 2.1 requirement; where this latter column is left blank this denotes that there is no difference.

- Product Identifier

AI noted that the wording for this requirement has now been tweaked; deleting a misleading reference to 'group identifiers'.

- Contributor Information

AI noted that each of the contributor roles are specifically named in both ONIX 2.1 and 3.0, however 'No Contributors' has now been added into the grid. GB asked the Group how to indicate that it is a mandatory requirement to list either a contributor role or 'no contributor' – he noted that the heading being highlighted in red may not be enough. AI suggested amending the text provided and suggested that an explanatory document could be produced to inform publishers about / define these sorts of requirements.

- Title Information

AI noted that there is a lot of difference between ONIX 2.1 and 3.0 for this requirement but it is simpler in ONIX 3.0 due to the <TitleDetail> composite. He suggested amending

the ONIX 2.1 requirement to use the <Title> composite, noting that granularity will not be lost and the extra detail will not be needed for mapping purposes. GB noted that the fields within the <Title> composite should be used and this Group will need to explicitly state that fields from 2004 have been deprecated. PM asked whether it is necessary to include this level of detail in the grid to which AI suggested that the wording could be made more concise. KW suggested that any clarification / explanatory text should be included in the notes column of the grid. AI noted that the grid could either include this information in the notes column or show changes using a specific colour. KL noted that the use of colour is beneficial for an at-a-glance reference. CH suggested that two documents could be produced – the first is the grid itself and the second as an appendix to provide further information about the requirements, should clarification be needed.

- Series Information

AI noted that this requirement was previously missing from the ONIX 3.0 spreadsheet but has now been added in. KL asked whether the year of annuals should be expressed in a specified way. GB suggested YYYY would be a good clarification; he noted that only the year is required and this should be the year specified on the cover of the annual, i.e. not the year of publication, if the two differ.

- Edition Information

GB asked whether the grid had previously included information about the controlled vocabulary of ONIX Edition Type. He noted that this information should certainly be included in the ONIX 3.0 column and possibly the ONIX 2.1 column too. The Group agreed. GB noted that edition type should be mandatory for ONIX 3.0 and this should be specified in the dependencies / notes column.

- Product Form

It was noted that List 150 (the whole product form) should be used here. AI noted that there are differences between ONIX 2.1 and 3.0 in the way product form is described. He noted that this requirement should be expressed in free-text for BIC Basic because it covers a multitude of possibilities than cannot be expressed in a controlled way outside of ONIX. AI noted that ONIX 2.1 and 3.0 have different composites for this requirement.

- Product Properties

AI noted that “as soon as available” has been added into the notes field for the requirement to provide height and width measurements. The Group suggested that the number provided should be rounded up / down to the nearest whole number (in mm). The suggested that an example should be provided. GB noted that the measurement could also be zero, and this needs to be stated also. KL noted that only the number (i.e. not followed by ‘mm’) is required here.

- Audience

AI noted that, since the last meeting of this Group, ‘Audience’ and ‘Content Warning’ have been added into the BIC Basic Required Information grid. He noted that, where a

book is clearly adult trade, a notification about the content must be provided (whether the adult book contains adult content or not).

- Subject Classification

AI noted that subject classification is simpler in BIC Basic and ONIX 2.1 however there are composites to express subject classification in ONIX 3.0 (with flags in some instances). GB noted that the requirement to include a BIC Main Subject code has not been deprecated but is not now advised. GB noted that the use of *Thema* is now recommended but organisations trading in to the US should also consider providing BISAC codes too. AI noted that the use of keywords is not recommended at BIC Basic level however it is recommended for ONIX 2.1 and 3.0 users.

- Publisher Information

AI noted that both Imprint Name and Publisher Name are now mandatory requirements of the BIC Basic award. GB noted that organisations should use both wherever possible and NE confirmed that Amazon require both.

- Publication Information

AI noted that Publication Date is a composite in ONIX 3.0. GB noted that a question about publication date was asked at The Publishers Associations' most recent Digital Publishing Forums session. The attendee asked whether publishers should provide information for both the specific book's publication date and also the publication date of the original work. He asked whether this latter publication date might be useful to retailers / recipients of metadata. NE commented that the date of the original work is not something Amazon would use however publication date of the product is vital. GB noted that retailers at the event has suggested that the additional date may be useful.

- Related Product

AI noted that the composite for Related Product is the same in ONIX 2.1 and 3.0. He noted that "successor" has now been redefined. GB noted that it is very common for publishers to misuse / misinterpret the relationships (i.e. predecessor / successor) in this requirement, e.g. publishers mistakenly 'replace' edition 3 with edition 2.

- Cover

AI noted that cover image is a mandatory requirement for BIC Basic under the revised PDEA Scheme. He advised that a note about the recommended dimensions / pixels will be incorporated into the grid soon (following on from this Group's earlier discussion). He also noted that the submission of the cover image via a URL / link is recommended. AI informed the Group that the composites for jacket image differ between ONIX 2.1 and 3.0. PM suggested that "for cover image" in the ONIX 2.1 and 3.0 columns should be replaced by "for link". AI noted that "URL" has been added into the notes section for this requirement and suggested that this makes the requirement sufficiently explicit.

- Supplier
AI noted that the BIC Basic requirement for supplier now states “GLN or SAN”. He informed the Group that no additional fields are required. GB noted that the advice to not supply an SAN was removed previously.
- Supplier Availability
AI noted that the addition of Market Publishing Status has been included in the ONIX 3.0 column of this grid.
- Price
AI noted that the requirement for Tax in ONIX 2.1 is outlined in the ONIX 2.1 guidelines document. He commented that the process is less complex in ONIX 3.0. He noted that VAT details have been removed from BIC Basic since this is described in Price now, i.e. the Price is inclusive of VAT.
- Territorial Market Rights
AI noted that no changes have been made to this requirement in BIC Basic as yet however the requirement may need to be more clearly communicated. NE asked whether the United Kingdom should be referred to as ‘GB (Great Britain)’ or ‘UK’. GB noted that ‘GB’ is the correct country code so ‘UK’ would not be accepted. AI noted that this definition is not required for BIC Basic since the country codes are expressed as a number, i.e. 01 = exclusive, 02 = non-exclusive, etc.

NE noted that UK isn’t mapped at present (since it is not a country code) but publishers do supply UK mistakenly in their expression of rights. She noted that Amazon needs to find a way to ingest the incorrect codes so the information can be used. LW noted that it would be easier to contact the offending publishers and inform them of their mistake. NE suggested that the use of ‘ONIX country codes’ should be explicitly stated in the note for this requirement. The Group agreed that the following should be added into the grid: “NB, the correct country code for the UK is ‘GB’.” They agreed that “United Kingdom” should be referenced in the Statement of Rights relating to the UK.

Discussing the Statement of Full International Rights, it was noted that organisations should be encouraged to provide all country codes wherever possible, though the Group agreed that this process is more complicated at BIC Basic than ONIX 2.1 and 3.0; unless the book in question has full international rights. NE noted that the information provided by publishers at BIC Basic is often unusable due to it being supplied in free-text. The Group therefore questioned whether it should be a requirement for BIC Basic. KL and PM suggested that its inclusion in publishers’ feeds should not be discouraged however GB agreed with NE, that the information cannot easily be ingested from a spreadsheet. KL noted that some BIC Basic organisations use ONIX but only provide no more than BIC Basic requirements in their feeds. LW commented that these organisations should specify ‘ROW’ in their feeds because they have the ability to do so but suggested that other organisations should not provide full international rights. The Group agreed.

- Elements not in BIC Basic for reference

These elements include Product Description, Notification Type Code, Order Time and Discount Group Codes. NE asked why keywords has been removed and AI informed her that keywords are not relevant at BIC Basic but are included in the grid for ONIX 2.1 and 3.0. GB noted that the Group had previously agreed to strongly recommend the use of keywords. The Group agreed that keywords should be recommended at all levels of accreditation but should not be mandatory for any award.

AI noted that all information included in the most up-to-date ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0 grids respectively has been transcribed into the BIC Basic grid and they do not, for this reason, need to be discussed separately. AI noted that he will amend the BIC Basic grid, according to this Group's discussions, and recirculate it for comment / feedback.

ACTION: AI to amend the BIC Basic data element set to reflect the Group's decisions from this meeting and recirculate for comment.

GB suggested that further work is needed to ensure that the documents are clearer. AI agreed, noting that there are still requirements included in the grids that need to be deprecated. KL asked whether it is necessary to have three documents, noting that the more documents there are the more confusion this could cause. AI suggested that there should, in fact, be three further documents as follows (on top of the circulated grids):

- A BIC Basic spreadsheet that is devoid of ONIX requirements
- An updated National Best Practice document
- An explanatory document, providing further information about the four available spreadsheets (including the two BIC Basic grids and the two further ONIX grids)

GB noted that the BIC Basic grid should consist of three columns (Basic, ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0), the BIC Excellence grid should consist of two columns (ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0) and the BIC Excellence Plus grid should consist of just the one, ONIX 3.0 column. He noted that this will encourage organisations to see what else they could be doing to achieve a higher tiered award. LW suggested that a document that outlines what publishers should do to achieve a higher award would be beneficial. The Group agreed. This means that there will be seven documents for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme in total.

PM left the room at 3:30pm.

9. Lifecycle of the ONIX 3.0 Badge

KL noted that the ONIX 3.0 Badge was discussed previously under Items 2 and 3 of this agenda. She asked the Group what the lifecycle of the ONIX 3.0 Badge should be and what should happen to the awarded Badges once the revised PDEA Accreditation has launched. She also asked whether organisations that are using ONIX 3.0 but only achieve a BIC Basic award should retain their Badge on the revised Scheme. GB suggested that all accredited organisations should be reviewed at the first PDEA Accreditation Panel meeting for the revised Scheme and that the ONIX 3.0 Badge should be deprecated at this time. The Group agreed.

KL raised non-qualifying books – i.e. books / products that will never meet the timeliness requirements for this Scheme due to the nature of the title – and non-book products for discussion. She noted that products of this nature often adhere to a different, shorter timeframe. GB commented however that these titles will be planned in advance but go out of print quickly. AW noted that some organisations / imprints will simply not be able to provide metadata for their books in the timely manner laid out in the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. GB informed the Group that this is why organisations are given 20-40% margin to work within (since 60-80% of the titles provided must be supplied in a timely manner to attain PDEA awards). He noted that excluding products which are produced on a shorter timescale will cause the organisation's percentage for timeliness to rise.

KL asked whether the PDEA Accreditation Scheme documentation should outline some examples / circumstances where certain types of titles might reasonably be excluded from an organisation's statistics due to the nature of the product's business model. KW suggested that organisations that have an imprint / series of this nature should liaise with the PDEA Accreditation Panel prior to their review meeting to request that the titles be omitted and explain why; the Panel members will then need to discuss this during the meeting.

CH noted that omitting certain series / imprints can make it difficult for Nielsen to compile organisations' statistics for the purpose of the Scheme. TH empathised but noted that Palgrave Macmillan have an imprint that produces books in a 3-month period, from concept through to distribution. He noted that this imprint will therefore never meet the requirements of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. GB noted that, unless this imprint's publications amount to 20-40% of Palgrave Macmillan's output then this imprint should not affect their statistics. He noted that this Group's decision will need to take into account the aim of the accreditation scheme. KL noted that the decision should, in her opinion, be based on the business model of the imprint.

PT asked whether stationary products such as diaries or calendars are taken into account on the PDEA Scheme. CH confirmed that these products are stripped out of each organisation's statistics as standard providing that they are clearly described in ONIX.

AW noted that this Scheme needs to be flexible enough to deal with imprints that do not fit the standard business model for publishing. He noted that the book industry is changing all the time and organisations' accreditation awards should not be penalised for trying out something new. The Group agreed. KL asked whether the Group would therefore support these products being excluded on notification (providing this is agreed upon by the PDEA Accreditation Panel members). GB noted that this measure would at least ensure that organisations benefit from being honest.

LW commented that some books of this nature can be buried within an imprint. The Group agreed that these titles – if only a small amount – should be included in the publisher's statistics. KL asked whether imprints / series that will fail due to their business model should be stripped out of the organisation's figures or whether their percentage should be raised.

NE noted that this decision should be based on how many titles there are of this nature / the overall percentage of the publisher's catalogue. She suggested that it needs to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

KW suggested that the PDEA Accreditation Panel should continue to deal with these exceptions as they have done previously, on a case-by-case basis. KL noted however that the Panel will need to know the criteria for acceptable exclusions, which should be agreed by this Group. NE suggested that the Group should firstly consider the timeline of the products; she suggested that if the books are produced in 3 months or under, due to the imprints' business model, these should be excluded. GB informed the Group that metadata does not provide a date stamp in order for this information to be ratified.

KL suggested simply stating that "products which will never meet timeliness / completeness requirements on the PDEA Scheme due to business model will be judged on a case-by-case basis". AW noted that the rest of the metadata for these titles would need to be good in order for the omission to be awarded; only the titles' timeliness should be affected by the business model. CH suggested that the exclusion should be for products that continue to be produced as part of an ongoing business model; he noted that one-off products should not be omitted as standard, though they can be discussed separately by the Panel, if required.

GB noted that there are two special business models to take into account here: 1) products that are deliberately produced in under 16 weeks and 2) products that have their publication date brought forward. NE reiterated that the Panel will need to consider what percentage of the organisation's overall catalogue these titles constitute. GB agreed that the omission needs to be extraordinary and dependent on the amount of books (in comparison to the full catalogue).

LW noted that the metadata used for the purposes of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should only be supplied by the publisher of that product or a dedicated / approved third party (that has been pre-agreed as a trusted source by the publisher). She noted that Penguin has a number of titles that are related to Penguin historically but are no longer theirs. GB noted that ISBNs do not specify the owner publisher. CH agreed, noting that it would be very difficult to omit these titles from the PDEA Accreditation Scheme automatically. AW insisted that these books need to be taken into account when the organisation's accreditation is under review. LW noted that the problem is of an on-going, cyclical nature. She informed the Group that Penguin tries to inform Nielsen about the historical titles they are aware of, which in turn affect their timeliness statistics; Nielsen then strips these out of Penguin's feed but it takes time for their figures to rise and, by the time the figures have risen, more titles of this nature have come to light.

The Group agreed that the PDEA Accreditation Panel should inform publishers about the award they are likely to gain two months prior to the PDEA Accreditation Panel meeting. They agreed that any feedback or notification about any books that will not meet the criteria for timeliness of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should be brought to the PDEA Panel's

attention (by the publisher) as soon as possible during the two-month period – not after the Panel has met.

10. A.O.B

- BooksoniX

PT noted that BooksoniX, as a systems supplier, would be interested in joining the PDEA Accreditation Panel going forwards.

ACTION: KL to liaise with PT regarding the possibility of BooksoniX joining the PDEA Accreditation Panel going forwards.

11. Date of the next workshop

KW noted that a draft document for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should be drawn up before the next meeting of this Group. GB agreed but noted that there is still a lot of work to be done before this will be possible. AI noted that he will continue to edit / amend the circulated spreadsheets, with a view to producing the new spreadsheets (outlined by this Group in Item 8 of these minutes) as soon as possible.

The Group agreed that holding another workshop to continue discussions about the revision of the PDEA accreditation scheme would be beneficial. They agreed that this forthcoming workshop should be a half-day event.

The next workshop will take place on Thursday 10th March 2016.