

BIC PRODUCT DATA EXCELLENCE AWARD (PDEA) REVIEW WORKSHOP – #5**Location:** Bowker Offices, 5th Floor, 3 Dorset Rise, London EC4Y 8EN**Date and time:** Wednesday 11th May 2016, 2-5pm**Minutes written by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
 Andrew Henty, Virtuales (AHE)
 Clive Herbert, Nielsen
 Thomas Herbert, Palgrave Macmillan
 Alex Ingram, EDItEUR
 Karina Luke, BIC
 Peter Mathews, Cambridge University Press
 Fraser Tanner, Batch
 Jack Tipping, Bowker (Chair)
 Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones (GAW)
 Keith Walters, Bibliographic Data Services
 Andrew Williams, Palgrave (dialled in) (ANW)
 Laura Williams, Penguin Random House
 Alfred Willmann, Random House Group (ALW)

Apologies

Graham Bell, EDItEUR
 Judith Bennett, Oxford University Press
 Jenny Brownley, WHSmith's
 Kat Coveyduck, Virtuales Publishing Solutions
 Nabiha Evans, Amazon
 Azar Hussain, Faber & Faber (AHU)
 Kate McFarlan, Clays
 Jean Roberts, PrintOnDemand-Worldwide
 Kieron Smith, Blackwell's
 Kate Stilborn, Blackwell's
 Paul Theijs, BooksoniX
 George Walkley, Hachette (GEW)

1. Welcome & apologies

JT welcomed the Group, thanking them for attending this half-day workshop – the fifth workshop held to review the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. The apologies were read out. KL noted that she obtained feedback from some individuals that were not able to attend, including KS of Blackwell's, AHU of Faber & Faber and KM of Clays, prior to this workshop.

2. Competition Law – conduct reminder

The Group were 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 actions from the last workshop

The minutes from the last PDEA Review Workshop, which took place on Thursday 10th March 2016, were approved without corrections. The following actions were discussed:

- Data aggregators & measuring ONIX files for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme
 KL informed the Group that CoreSource, Vearsa and Firebrand Technologies continue to show interest in measuring data for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. She reported that all have requested further clarification regarding the requirements for the measuring of data for this Scheme. She also noted that all the organisations listed above will need to investigate how they can measure the various timeliness and conditional requirements that have been incorporated into the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme, and that this Group needs to provide them with a specification document asap.

KL noted that, since the last meeting of this Group, PT has confirmed that BooksoniX would be willing to measure data for the purpose of the revised PDEA Scheme, if their involvement is approved by this Group. The Group raised concerns about this proposal, noting that BooksoniX would be measuring some feeds that they themselves have created, which could be a conflict of interests, and noting that BooksoniX is not currently a BIC member.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that it would not be appropriate for BooksoniX to measure metadata for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. However the Group encouraged BooksoniX to consider becoming a BIC member organisation so that a representative can join the UK ONIX National Group.
- **ACTION:** KL to continue to liaise with CoreSource, Vearsa and Firebrand about their measuring metadata for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme and provide an update on any progress made at the next meeting.

- CBMC Codes

KL informed the Group that she is liaising with The Publishers Association (PA) regarding their use of CBMC codes in reporting. CH remarked that CBMC codes are still in use by children's publishers however GAW informed the Group that Waterstones does not receive this information in their feeds at present (though the codes were included in the past). LW commented that CBMC codes can overlap, to some extent, with other provided metadata fields so, if the codes are not required, she suggested that it would be beneficial to publishers' workloads to remove the requirement.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that other retailers should be approached to ascertain whether they receive CBMC codes in their feeds.
- **ACTION:** KL to continue to liaise with The Publishers Association regarding CBMC codes and provide an update on this topic at the next meeting.
- **ACTION:** KL to approach the retailers that were not present at this meeting to ascertain whether they receive CBMC codes in their feeds.
- **ACTION:** CH to liaise with BookScan to ascertain whether they receive CBMC codes and report back at the next meeting of this Group.

- Cover images

The Group discussed AI's summary of dimensions and colour profile information which was included in the minutes of the last workshop. AI commented that organisations are likely to benefit from being directed to EDItEUR's documentation on this topic for further clarification, if it is required. He also informed the Group that both URL and FTP are included in the current PDEA Accreditation documentation for the submission of cover images, though he noted that he would be wary to promote the use of FTP as Best Practice for the revised PDEA Scheme.

AW informed the Group that some organisations have to supply their cover images via an FTP site, at the request of their customers. He agreed that it would be good practice for all publishers to universally provide their images via URL however he noted it will not be

possible for all of them to do so in the imminent future. He suggested for this reason that organisations should not be judged on the method of their image submissions. GAW noted that if publishers /retailers would rather receive cover images via URL then the revised PDEA Scheme should support this method and promote it as Best Practice. LW disagreed, noting that the PDEA Accreditation Scheme is in place to accredit publishers and it should therefore support them in doing what they need to do to sell their books; even if the method for supplying this information is not as the publisher would like.

KL noted that the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme will need to measure the cover images that are provided using URL however she suggested that the Scheme should also support FTP usage. AW agreed that URLs should be recommended as Best Practice in the revised PDEA documentation but noted that the book industry will need to more widely adopt this method before it can become a mandatory requirement. AI advised that organisations will need to have a naming convention in place for their cover images (if they do not have one already) though this does not need to be standardised and will not be measured under the revised PDEA Scheme.

- ❖ **DECISION:** Supply of cover images via URL should be recommended as Best Practice in the revised PDEA documentation, though FTP should be listed as acceptable if it is required by the metadata recipient.
- **ACTION:** AI to ensure that the decision, above, is reflected in the ONIX data element grid and that the need for a naming convention is also noted.
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** KL to ensure that the revised PDEA documentation states that cover images must be supplied within the same timeframe as the rest of the metadata for the format of the book.
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** KL to provide a note of best practice in the revised PDEA documentation regarding what constitutes an acceptable/unacceptable cover image.

- eBooks

AI noted that he will amend the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme's documentation, placing 'Rights' above 'Price', shortly. In addition, KL reported that the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee will discuss what constitutes a suitable timeframe for eBook timeliness at their forthcoming meeting on Thursday 19th May 2016.

- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** AI to ensure that 'Rights' is located above 'Price' in the documentation and grids for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
- **ACTION:** KL to report back on the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee's opinion regarding a suitable timeframe for eBook timeliness for the revised PDEA Scheme.
- **ACTION:** KL to continue approaching other data aggregators regarding a suitable timeframe for eBook timeliness.

- Description data element

CH reported that it is possible that Nielsen will be able to measure all the descriptions that they receive (including those that are not ingested into Nielsen's system) for the

purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme; he noted however that Nielsen will need to receive a full specification, in terms of the fields that should be measured for the revised PDEA Scheme, before this can be confirmed. JT also reported that ProQuest is willing to measure the description field as well as other, select data elements for the purpose of the revised Scheme – though ProQuest will not measure the entire data element set. JT noted that the PDEA specification document should be produced asap so that the data aggregators in this Group can liaise about the implementation of the measuring tool into their respective systems.

- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** CH, KW and JT to liaise regarding the implementation of a measuring tool for BDS and Bowker's respective systems, once the specification document has been produced.
 - **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** Once the specification document has been produced, CH to liaise with Nielsen regarding their ability to measure all descriptions for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
- Additional question for the revised PDEA Application Form: When and where was the applicant organisation's last metadata feed sent?
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** KL to ensure that the revised PDEA documentation states that organisations which do not supply a delta feed at least once every 6 months are not eligible to gain accreditation.
- <RelatedProduct> composite:
- GAW informed the Group that the last meeting of the BIC Price & Availability (P&A) Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) was postponed and so a discussion did not take place regarding organisations' inability to state more than one relationship in P&A feeds. She noted that this composite may not be able to provide more than one relationship but confirmed that the T&FWG will next meet on Wednesday 17th August 2016 where this topic will be discussed.
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** GAW to discuss the fact that it is not possible to state more than one relationship in P&A feeds using the <RelatedProduct> composite with the P&A T&FWG at their next meeting and report back to this Group.
- Price Amount
- AI reported that any product with a price of 'zero' should be expressed using an Unpriced Item Type Code and not Price Amount. He noted that Unpriced Item Type Code is available in both ONIX 2.1 and ONIX 3.0, though the 2.1 version is not as developed as that of 3.0.
- **ACTION:** AI to ensure that the ONIX data element set states that any product priced at 'zero' should be communicated using Unpriced Item Type Code.
- Required and Expected

KL confirmed that she liaised with CH after the last meeting of this Group to discuss the definitions of 'required' and 'expected' in the current PDEA documentation. They noted that 'required' data element sets are only measured when they are applicable (i.e. they are conditional and measured by reference to the presence of data in other fields) and 'expected' data elements are best practice but are not measured for the purpose of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme.

➤ **ACTION:** KL and CH to ensure that the definitions for Required and Expected are included in the documentation for the revised PDEA Scheme, informing applicants which is measured / not measured / conditional; conditional elements, and what they are conditional upon, must be made very clear in the specifications.

- Print on Demand (POD)

KL confirmed that she has now liaised with PrintOnDemand-Worldwide, Faber & Faber, Blackwell's, Clays and The Booksellers Association regarding a suitable timeframe for POD timeliness. FT informed the Group that he has liaised with John Smith's and also Blackwell's. This topic and the feedback received will be outlined under item 6.

4. Review of Project Deliverables

KL reviewed the deliverables and objectives of this Project which are laid out in the PDEA Review T&FWG Project Brief. The key deliverables include:

- Rewarding the use of new industry standards (e.g. *Thema* and ONIX 3.0) and fully integrating eBook metadata data as part of the regular data supply chain.
- Revise the Scheme to allow for other data supply chain participants, e.g. retailers, distributors and so on.
- The assessment of applicant organisations' data by other / new data measurers
- Wide promotion of the revised Scheme including a document which lists its benefits
- Monthly progress reports for the BIC Metadata Sub-Committee
- Revised logos and certificates
- New Terms of Reference document for the PDEA Accreditation Panel
- A launch plan and timeline for the revised Scheme
- Test plan to be carried out prior to the launch of the revised Scheme

AI suggested that the testing of the revised PDEA Scheme could be executed in two phases: 1) by the data aggregators that are currently involved in this Project, then 2) by any new data aggregators / measurers that agree to participate. KL suggested that a volunteer organisation (publisher) could be sought out to pilot test the new Scheme prior to its launch.

Transition Period:

GAW asked whether the two PDEA Schemes (i.e. the current PDEA Scheme and the revised PDEA Scheme) will initially need to run concurrently. CH and LW agreed that the two Schemes will need to run in tandem for an extended period in order for the revised Scheme and its measurers to build up the necessary statistics. PM noted that a handover date (where the current PDEA Scheme is switched off) will need to be agreed and KL suggested

that this date should be a year after the revised Scheme is launched; meaning that, once the specification is agreed (and if this date is agreed by the Group), it will be another year until the revised Scheme is fully integrated. ALW noted that, should the timeframes for timeliness be amended, the statistics recorded cannot be amended retrospectively.

Documentation:

KL suggested that a more detailed list of deliverables should be produced to help this Group focus on what needs to be achieved. She noted that creation of the specification document for publishers is crucial. The Group also agreed this document should use a symbol to signify where information differs from the old scheme. An additional specification document for measurers should also be produced. In addition, the Group agreed that a FAQ document and promotion documents (both for new and reapplying organisations respectively) should be produced. KL noted that all documentation for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme should be written as though the reader has no prior knowledge of the Scheme.

AI noted that the Group previously suggested that multiple grids should be produced for the purpose of the revised Scheme – one for ONIX 2.1 and one for ONIX 3.0 respectively. He proposed instead that all ONIX information could all be housed in one spreadsheet to reduce the amount of documentation and any confusion this might cause. KL asked how readers will be able to identify the differences between the BIC Excellence and BIC Excellence Plus awards using this single grid. AI suggested that the differences could be explained using introductory text at the beginning of the document, noting that the key difference between the two awards comes down to the organisations' timeliness statistics.

PM disagreed with AI, reiterating that one document should be produced for each level of accreditation to alleviate the possibility of confusion for applicant organisations. He agreed that a statement about product attributes is required and that this information should be put in context with AI's proposed introductory text. AI noted that the introductory text has the capacity to become lengthy if it includes all the information contained in the National Best Practice Guidelines document. He suggested for this reason that a briefer document (approximately 10-pages in length) should be produced which would then refer to the National Guidelines for further information when necessary.

GAW noted that she has reservations about separating the requirements information into individual documents since this could unintentionally hinder organisations from striving to gain a higher award or noting the differences / similarities in the awards' requirements. The Group agreed that the information for all levels of accreditation should be included in a single spreadsheet. They also agreed that the key differences between each level of accreditation (i.e. timeliness) should be made clear at the beginning of the document.

ALW suggested that the benefits of gaining an award plus explanatory text about the timeliness should be incorporated into the revised PDEA documentation. He asked whether the proposed list of benefits can be quantified and CH informed the Group that Nielsen's white paper, *The Link Between Metadata and Sales*, will be updated this year and could be

referred to in the revised PDEA documentation. LW suggested that endorsements of the Scheme might be of benefit. PM agreed.

It was noted that the specification for the revised PDEA Scheme is roughly outlined in the ONIX grid – though the Group will need to ascertain the metrics involved in measuring these requirements and how this information should be presented. KL noted that the Group previously agreed that the metrics of the Scheme (i.e. 60% or 80% compliant) should not be changed however the data elements and timeliness will need to be agreed upon; she noted that the forthcoming discussion about POD titles will affect / inform the decisions made.

KL volunteered to liaise with the Group via email after this meeting to agree on a target date for the completion of the specification. The Group agreed that it should be produced asap.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed a symbol should be devised and used within the new PDEA documentation to signify that the information included differs from the previous Scheme.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that a single grid and single timeline requirements document should be produced to clearly explain the two areas of the Scheme: i) data element completeness and ii) timeliness.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to liaise via email in order to produce the draft specification document as soon as possible.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that two Press Releases should be produced; the first to announce the revised Scheme and a second to inform organisations when applications are being accepted.
- **ACTION:** KL to include 'ISBNs / data element sets that will be measured on the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme' to the agenda for the next meeting.
- **ACTION:** KL to approach this Group asap, via email, about the specification document, with a view to the draft document being produced before the next meeting.

5. Agree the timeliness criteria for POD books

ANW dialled into this workshop to participate in the Group's discussion about POD books with regards to agreeing the timeliness criteria. He noted that there are two types of POD product that need consideration in this context: new titles and backlist / Lazarus titles (i.e. titles that have been OP or backlist previously but have been republished using POD).

ANW noted that it is up to publishers to decide whether to adhere to the 16-week timeliness measure for all their POD titles and that Palgrave Macmillan worked hard to ensure that its metadata (93% of which is for POD titles) was supplied 16 weeks before publication date in order to meet the accreditation standard, and it would be hard for many organisations who have striven to do the same to accept that organisations which have not been able to achieve an award previously may now be able to do so under the revised Scheme.

ALW agreed that the timescale for new titles (that are produced using POD) should adhere to the 16-week timeframe. He noted however that this timeframe should not be applied to backlist / Lazarus titles since this practice may result in a loss of potential sales simply in

order to be compliant with the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. He stated that retailers do not need to receive the metadata for backlist / Lazarus titles in the same timeframe as new titles. ANW disagreed, noting that POD is used increasingly as standard and that it is just a manufacturing process; as such it should adhere to the same rules as traditionally printed books. He also noted that the availability code should not be used to identify the method of manufacture; the Group agreed with this statement.

LW noted that Penguin UK currently doesn't allocate new ISBNs to titles that begin to be manufactured using POD; GAW confirmed that ISBN rules are clear that a new ISBN is not required if only the manufacture method has changed. ANW agreed and noted that titles which are Out of Print (OP) will require a new ISBN if they are brought back and made available to purchase. He also noted that the manufacture method of a single book can change multiple times throughout its lifetime.

The Group suggested that POD titles which were previously OP could be identified using the newly allocated ISBN. PM noted that this would not work for all reissues / Lazarus titles. FT informed the Group that both John Smith's and Blackwell's support the 16-week timescale however he agreed that this timeframe may not be necessary for backlist titles. GAW agreed, noting that the sale cycle for new titles differs to that of backlist titles, but questioned how the measurers of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme will be able to identify whether the book is manufactured using POD or litho in order to measure these product types separately.

PM asked when / in what timeframe retailers need to receive metadata for Lazarus titles. FT volunteered to ask his contacts this question. ANW asked whether POD titles can be dealt with for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme as an exception or on a case-by-case basis. GW noted that this is possible but that the exclusion / segregation of these titles (by measurers) can prove to be difficult if there are many titles of this nature and/or if those titles do not form a full imprint which can simply be stripped out. KL informed the Group that the PDEA Panel needs to be informed about any titles of this nature at least a month prior to its quarterly meetings, and that it is the responsibility of the publisher to do so in order for the titles to be considered separately.

GAW noted that such titles will only be exempt from measurement for a short period unless it is not appropriate to measure them due to the organisation's business model; she noted that organisations with unique business models should not be penalised. She noted that this Group will need to decide on the criteria for awarding exemptions. PM noted that ascertaining how this information will be measured is also imperative. He commented that previously the measurements for this Scheme have been dependent on Nielsen however now – with additional measurers voicing their interest – it might be possible to measure a data element in other ways, e.g. by sampling outputs.

CH suggested that the original publication date could be a potential way to identify the format and subsequently measure books for the purpose of the revised Scheme. ALW suggested that new titles could be submitted to the British Library (whether as a print book

or eBook) as copyright deposits, which could be noted within the organisation's metadata; though KL noted that this was overcomplicating matters. ANW noted that – as discussed at the last meeting of the P&A T&FWG – there is a way to state 'previously known as...' within a book's metadata.

LW suggested that exemptions from the 16-week timescale should only be considered if the titles in question affect a large proportion of the organisation's products since a 20-40% margin is already integrated into the Scheme. The Group agreed that the term POD is a red herring and that they should continue this discussion by referring simply to either new or backlist / Lazarus titles.

The Group agreed to retain the '4-week prior to publication date' timeframe for backlist / Lazarus POD titles on the revised PDEA Scheme. KL noted that the feedback she received from JR of PrintOnDemand-Worldwide and KM of Clays was similar to that of this Group. The Group agreed to discuss this topic further at the next meeting.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that availability codes should not be used to identify books' method of manufacture.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that POD should not be referred to in the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. Instead the Scheme should refer to new or backlist / Lazarus titles.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that all new titles, including POD / Virtual Stock, should comply with the '16-week prior to publication date' timescale for submitting metadata.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that all backlist / Lazarus titles should comply with the '4-week prior to publication date' timescale for submitting metadata and that a way of identifying these needs to be agreed.
- **ACTION:** FT to liaise with his colleagues at The Booksellers Association regarding the timeframe in which retailers need to receive metadata for backlist / Lazarus titles.
- **ACTION:** KL to include this topic on the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.
- **ACTION:** ALL to continue to discuss this topic with regards to backlist POD titles at the next meeting.

6. Measuring eBooks – agreeing how eBooks and print books statistics can be combined

The Group discussed how the forthcoming scores which will be provided by more than one measurer for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme can be merged. It was suggested that the Panel could simply choose the best (or worst) statistic provided by all the measurers. However, AI noted the differences in what is measured for print books and eBooks respectively, commenting that it may be difficult to merge records that do not contain the same data element fields. PM noted that there are some digital requirements that are equivalent to print book requirements but there are also new data element sets in addition that would need to be taken into account.

AI reminded everyone of the digital data element requirements that were agreed by this Group in previous meetings.

Accessibility Features:

AI noted that eBook accessibility features cannot be included at BIC Basic level since some organisations that apply for accreditation do not use ONIX. He noted that the book industry supply chain needs to get to the stage where accessibility information is ingested as standard so that retailers can then inform their customers about accessible products.

LW asked whether it is necessary to state that an ePub file (a format that is capable of providing accessibility features) is accessible; she suggested that this fact will be known by those in the book industry and as such it could be a duplication of efforts. AI advised that ePub files are not guaranteed to be accessible as standard (since they can be reduced) so providing this information at title-level is both necessary and Best Practice.

DRM:

AI stated that DRM for eBooks is a 'required' data element set of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme at present. LW commented that it is possible to send full DRM information at edition-level though she suggested that supplying this information is not considered critical. KL agreed, suggesting that this data element should be 'expected' going forwards.

Page Extent:

AI noted that both cover images and tax information requirements for the PDEA Scheme apply to print books and eBooks however they do differ in their requirements for 'Page Extent'; for physical books Page Extent is required but for digital products the requirement is Print Page Equivalent. KL suggested that the requirement should be mandatory for both print and eBooks going forwards. AI agreed, noting that this decision will also affect the information provided for audio books. GAW asked if there is a way for publishers to communicate whether an audio book is abridged or unabridged. AI confirmed that it is possible at title-level. The Group agreed that the abridged / unabridged data element should therefore be 'mandatory' on the revised PDEA Scheme.

Audio Books – Edition Number and Edition Statement:

AI informed the Group that Edition Number and Edition Statement are currently included in the PDEA Accreditation Scheme at BIC Basic level but that there currently isn't a reference to audio books in the documentation for these data elements – it is however mentioned in the National Best Practice Guidelines as a recommendation.

Audio Books – Performance and Adaption:

GAW noted that Performance and Adaption aren't technically eligible for audio books though some need to express this information nonetheless. AI confirmed that it is possible to state that an audio book is an adaption, if applicable. The Group will need to decide at the next workshop whether this data element should be included in the grid for the revised PDEA Scheme and if so whether it should be a 'mandatory', 'required' or 'expected' field.

AI suggested that it may be fairly straight forward to measure eBooks metadata for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme due to the limited amount of measurable

data elements included; he explained that the current PDEA documentation was not written from a digital perspective. He asked what elements retailers really need to receive for eBooks, referring to Price and Availability as key requirements. KL noted that some organisations are not prepared to send this information to other 3rd party organisations due to commercial sensitivities. She reminded the Group that BIC is not in the position to be telling organisations where to send their commercial information since this is a business decision that can only be undertaken by the organisation concerned.

Reduced Data Set for eBooks?

KL asked the Group for their opinions on whether organisations sending a reduced data set (i.e. minus the commercials) to data aggregators might resolve this issue. CH suggested that it might. PM noted that the price of eBooks can vary depending on the supply chain in question and the territory the book is being sold in.

LW asked why the measurement of P&A is so complicated for eBooks, questioning whether all the eBook's prices should be listed or not. AI informed the Group that Price (which is a 'mandatory' requirement) is caveated in ONIX 3.0 and will therefore be difficult to measure. GAW noted that this Scheme could potentially state that organisations which do not send their feeds to at least one UK data aggregator cannot be accredited on the revised PDEA Scheme. She commented however that all the PDEA Panel really needs to know is whether a price exists for the eBook – CoreSource (for example) will then be able to confirm if this information has been reported accurately without releasing the price itself.

GAW commented that retaining this requirement as part of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme will encourage organisations to supply better price information within their metadata. LW agreed, noting that it will also help to ensure that eBooks continue to be discoverable to those who want them.

AI informed the Group that there is a way to express "please enquire direct for price information" using ONIX. GAW suggested that this code should be used to send information to data aggregators going forwards. KL agreed, noting that the requirement should be mandatory: recipients should provide the code (which AI referred to above) to recognised UK data aggregators and subsequently provide their specific price information to their appropriate Digital Asset Management organisations and/or other relevant sellers that require it. GAW commented that the requirement should have in mind what retailers need to be supplied with. PM noted if the eBook is not available to all then the information does not need to be disseminated to those who are not able to sell it.

eBook Availability Codes:

GAW commented that it would be beneficial to retailers to be provided with eBook availability codes however LW informed the Group that this requirement would be problematic for publishers. KL asked LW whether Penguin's P&A information is sent to a central point and LW confirmed that it is; KL noted that the P&A information could again be measured through this central organisation providing that the organisations is willing to do

so. AI commented that this requirement will need to be clearly written in order to make it as understandable and simplistic as possible for publishers.

LW noted that Penguin would be happy to be measured through a central point for the purpose of the revised PDEA Scheme however GAW informed the Group that some organisations do not send their metadata to central points, meaning that they can neither send prices for the purpose of this Scheme nor inform recipients of this fact.

KL asked what information would need to be supplied for Availability. GAW suggested that the Availability of the eBook within the UK would be sufficient. ALW also suggested that applicant organisations could list one seller that receives their full P&A information. PM noted that the latter would depend on where / which region the seller is based – he suggested that the documentation would need to specify whether the seller should be in the UK / sell into the UK or not. CH suggested alternatively that organisations could be asked to supply World Availability for the purpose of this Scheme, rather than requesting UK-specific availability codes. ALW noted that there are now only 3 key Availability codes in use for books: NYP, IP or OP.

AI noted that, even if in the minority, there will be some organisations for which it will not be possible to measure P&A information. He asked whether, in this case, the PDEA logo should state that digital products are not included in the award. The Group agreed that this should not be specified.

GAW noted that the current PDEA Accreditation Scheme cannot accredit organisations that publish only digital products. KL commented that this Group will need to decide whether data aggregators or a central point should measure digital product – stating that it should be either / or, rather than both and might be different for each publisher. She asked what would happen if smaller organisations cannot use a central point in the same way that large publishers do. KL and GAW agreed that it would not be appropriate to say that digital-only publishers must send their metadata to a central point in order to gain accreditation on the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme, but that metadata should be sent to at least one UK data aggregator.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that the measurement of digital products is in scope for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
- **ACTION:** AI to ensure that DRM data element set is listed as ‘expected’ in the grid for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
- **ACTION:** AI to ensure that Print Page Equivalent is listed as ‘required’ in the grid for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
- **ACTION:** AI to ensure that it is ‘mandatory’, in the revised PDEA documentation, for organisations to state whether audio books are abridged or unabridged at title-level.
- **ACTION:** KL to include Audio Books – Abridged / Unabridged’ as an Item on the agenda for the next meeting for the Group to decide whether abridged / unabridged audio books should be stated for all levels of accreditation or just the top 2 tiers of award.

- **ACTION:** AI to ensure that a reference to audio books is present in the BIC Basic documentation for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
- **ACTION:** KL to include 'Audio Books – Performance and Adaption' as an item on the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.
- **ACTION:** KL to include 'Measuring eBooks' on the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.

7. Deferral Process

This item will be discussed at the next meeting of this Group.

8. A.O.B.

The Group did not have any other business to report.

9. Date of next workshop

Thursday 18th August 2016.