PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

BIC PRINT ON DEMAND & SHORT RUN TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP – Minutes

Ricoh UK Ltd, 20 Triton Street, London NW1 3BF
Wednesday 10th February 2016, 2pm

Present	Apologies
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC	Andrew Bromley, Ingram Content Group
Roger Christiansen, Ricoh Europe (Deputy)	Andy Cork, Printondemand-worldwide
Tim Cruickshank, Cambridge University Press	Nancy Roberts, Cambridge University Press
Alison Lewis, Ingram Content Group	Claire Walker, Harper Collins
Karina Luke, BIC	Mark Walker, Macmillan
Kate McFarlan, Clays	Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones
Alan Rakes, Hachette UK	Linzi Webb, Wiley
Jean Roberts, Printondemand-worldwide (Chair)	Alma Weber, Penguin Random House
Andy Williams, Palgrave Macmillan	

1. **Introduction & apologies**
   The Group were welcomed to the meeting and JR read out the apologies.

2. **Review minutes and follow-up on actions from the last meeting**
   The minutes from the last meeting were approved without corrections. The following actions for the previous meeting were discussed.

   - Publishers Storing-Up Orders
     GW was not present at this meeting to update the Group on this action.
     ACTION CARRIED OVER: GW to liaise with her colleagues at Waterstones to ascertain whether it is possible to find out which publishers are storing up orders for ASR.

   - Amendments to the Best Practice Guideline document
     JR noted that her actions were carried out either during or after the last meeting of this Group. GW's will need to update this Group on her action at the next meeting and it will therefore be carried over for this reason.
     ACTION CARRIED OVER: GW to clarify availability codes, answer codes and Publisher Status codes within the Best Practice Guideline document and recirculate to the Group, asap.

   - AL's amendments for the Virtual Stock definitions grid
     AL confirmed that her action was carried out after the last meeting. The amended document was circulated to the members of this Group on Thursday 26th November 2015.

   - Feedback on Section 2.4 of the Best Practice Guideline document
     JR asked the Group whether MW's feedback on this section is still required. AW noted that this Group lacks representation from retailers and distributors, as such feedback would be beneficial.
     ACTION: MW to provide feedback on Section 2.4 of the Best Practice Guideline document, relating to Macmillan's practices. This feedback should be sent to JR, RC, KL and AMB, asap.

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

3. **Review the draft Best Practice Guidelines document**

At the last meeting, the members of this Group were actioned to provide their feedback on the amended Best Practice Guidelines document. AMB informed the Group that this action was chased but she received only one set of feedback (from KM). KM's comments have since been reflected in the final, draft document.

KL asked whether the limited feedback received suggests that this Group is in fact satisfied with the document. JR commented that this will need to be ascertained during the meeting. She noted that all changes made to the Best Practice Guidelines document were recorded in the last meeting's minutes so the purpose of the final review was to ensure that this Group is happy with the content of the document before it is circulated for further comment more widely. KL noted that this document will also need to be approved by BIC's Product Data Excellence Award (PDEA) Accreditation Scheme Review Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) and BIC's Price & Availability (P&A) T&FWG before the wider dissemination can take place. AW noted that only one BIC T&FWG should be held responsible for the POD availability codes that are agreed upon – though the decision will of course be informed by the other Groups' feedback; he noted that this Group will need to decide which T&FWG this responsibility should lie with.

KL noted that the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee has liaised with Graham Bell (GB) of EDItEUR regarding possible alternatives to the availability codes: POD / MD (Manufacture on Demand). She referred to the 'Response to the Physical Supply Chain Committee's suggestions on POD codes (ONIX 3)' document which was written by GB; copies of which were circulated during the meeting. KL commented that if the method of manufacture does not affect the availability or terms of a book then end-customers do not need to know it. She read out GB proposals for both forthcoming and published titles:

- Forthcoming books:
  - Code 12 should be used to express "not yet available, will be manufactured to order"
  - Code 13 should be added to the codelist to express "not yet available, will be to order (i.e. for non-stock items)"
  - Code 14 should be added to the codelist to express "awaiting digital inventory"
  - "Estimated <OrderTime> is recommended" should be included as a note for Codes 12 and 13 (in addition to expected availability date)

- For published books:
  - Code 23 (POD) should be deprecated (NB: this will be dependent on other countries' input)
  - Code 21 should be modified to express "available as a physically-stocked item or where manufacture on demand order time is identical / very similar to physically-stocked items, e.g. same day / next day"
  - An additional code, Code 24, should be added to the codelist for "in digital inventory"
  - The following definition should be applied to Code 21: "requires <OrderTime> except when fulfilment is same day or next day, or in exceptional circumstances where no order time is known"
  - The following definition should be applied to Code 22: "requires <OrderTime> except in exceptional circumstances where no order time is known"

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

Taking the proposals into account, AW asked whether the deprecation of POD (code 23) only applies to published books. He commented that, in order for GB's proposals to work, organisations will need to update and maintain their metadata to a high standard, noting that some organisations leave their availability information unstated which will cause issues if this practice continues. TC noted that there are therefore two sets of requirements for POD / Virtual Stock: 1) new books (produced first via POD) and 2) the revival of books via POD. KL agreed that best practice with regards to availability codes for each should be clarified.

AL asked what the difference is between Codes 22 (to order) and 23 (POD), noting that both are manufactured to order. KM noted that the Group previously agreed to use Code 20 (available) for all POD titles that can be supplied within the same timeframe as physically-stocked books. KL agreed, noting that organisations that are unable to supply the book within this timeframe will need to specify the range of dates (using the <OrderTime> composite) that the title will be supplied / delivered in. AW asked whether Code 12 (not yet available, will be POD) should now be expressed using both Code 20 and 21. The Group agreed that this is too complicated and may be misunderstood as a result.

AW noted the similarity between Codes 13 and 14. KM asked whether retailers specifically need to know where an order comes from. AL responded that GW of Waterstones has previously suggested that retailers only need to know about the availability of books. JR noted that there is no difference between Codes 10 and 12 since the book is either available or not, regardless of manufacture method. She also noted that Code 11 is not applicable to Virtual Stock since distributors will never be "awaiting stock" for POD titles.

TC noted that Cambridge University Press uses Code 10 initially and then changes this to Code NP (not yet published) prior to publication, informing end-customers that the title will be available imminently. AW commented that the main issue with this practice is what retailers / distributors do with this information when they receive it. He noted that this Group does not have enough representation from end-users in order to make an informed decision. AW and KM agreed that further retailers should be approached for feedback – showing them the two proposed models and asking for their preference.

AR asked what volume of titles goes straight from 'NP' to '23' to which AW replied that, in academic publishing, the figure would be approximately 2200 titles per year. AR noted that Hachette do not take POD stock back into the warehouse.

JR noted that organisations require all of the following: price, discount and market / sales rights. AW suggested that the fewer codes for availability in use, the better. KL noted that GB's two proposals to include the <OrderTime> composite for both Codes 21 and 22 are beneficial; she also commented that, due to the way ONIX is structured, it will be necessary to have different codes for published and forthcoming titles. The Group acknowledged the proposed addition of Code 24 (in digital inventory); 'digital' here meaning 'eBooks'. AW commented that only two codes are needed for forthcoming eBook titles: Codes 10 (not yet available) and 14 (awaiting digital inventory). AL and AW noted that Codes 20 and 21 are the same. The Group agreed.

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

AL suggested that Codes 22 and 23 are also the same and could be merged. AW noted that Code 22 forces organisations to include a lead time, which could – due to it being a mandatory requirement – be an invented timeframe without substance. KL noted that EDItEUR deals with other countries' requirements as well as the UK's, as such the amendment of these codes will need to be agreed upon by other regions too. She commented that this decision will subsequently need to be referred to the UK ONIX National Group and the ONIX International Steering Committee.

TC asked whether exporters should also be involved in this decision-making process; he noted that they have a number of issues with POD, especially with regards to consolidating orders. He commented that exporters' metadata is provided by publishers but customers order directly through the publisher. AW noted that this is the correct procedure since the origin of the book does not need to be seen by / announced to the customer. KL suggested that this issue is therefore out of scope. The Group agreed.

TC commented that the use of POD can either lengthen or reduce the delivery time of a book, depending on where the book is printed. JR asked whether this should be mentioned in the Best Practice Guidelines document and KL suggested that an advisory note may be most appropriate, informing organisations to address the global aspects of the POD process. JR noted that quality, returns and the liability of the organisation listed as the book provider in the front of each book also have an advisory note.
ACTION: JR to include an advisory note into this document to explain global aspects of POD, i.e. exports.
ACTION: KL to seek further feedback from other retailers once the draft document has been agreed.

JR asked whether customers want to know / are concerned about where their order comes from. AW noted that they are only concerned by the timescale involved. JR asked whether a section should be included in the Best Practice Guidelines for issues that are out-of-scope for this Project but are exacerbated by POD. The Group agreed that only an advisory statement is necessary.

KL suggested that the final, remaining item for this Group to consider is GB's proposed availability codes – she asked whether the document should explicitly list the agreed codes. JR noted that this Group has provided feedback / its opinions on the proposals during this meeting but the ultimate decision should belong to the P&A T&FWG. She suggested that the response of this Group should be approved by GW of Waterstones before it is referred to the P&A T&FWG. AW suggested that the general consensus of this Group should be captured in a recommendation document. AL also suggested that the codes should be added to the Best Practice Guidelines document as an appendix.

KL noted that she will now liaise with GW in order to obtain feedback from a retailer and will then circulate the final draft document to the BIC Physical Supply Chain Committee (including the P&A T&FWG and the PDEA Accreditation Review T&FWG), the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee and the BIC Metadata Sub-Committee for further comment. TC suggested that further feedback should also be obtained from global retailers. JR noted that this Group intends to circulate the final draft document to the IPG and ALPSP which should allow for global feedback to be received however she reminded the Group that this document is UK-orientated. KL agreed, noting that BIC's remit is within the UK and those organisations that trade with the UK. AW noted that the main body of the

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

document is likely to be relevant to most regions / countries; only the timescales listed might be different. KL agreed to liaise with both BISG (in the US) and Booknet Canada for their feedback when the document is circulated to BIC's Committees.

The Group agreed that the Virtual Stock Best Practice Guidelines document should be circulated as soon as possible (once GW's strawman document has been received). AW commented that other retailers' feedback will also need to be sought out since this issue is especially pertinent to retailers. He suggested that all of the minutes for this Group should be made available on the BIC website so that those reviewing the Best Practice document can establish how / why the Group came to its decisions. He also suggested that those reviewing the document should be provided with a deadline.
ACTION: AMB to make all of this Group's minutes available on the BIC website and send the URLs to the members of this Group so that they can be distributed alongside the Best Practice Guidelines document, when circulated.

ACTION: KL to liaise with GW regarding a retailer's perspective on GB's document. This information should then be fed back into the P&A T&FWG for their consideration of the specific codes; which will be added to the Best Practice Guidelines as an appendix.
ACTION: KL to inform GB about this Group's recommendations for POD codes (i.e. that there should be as few codes as possible for simplicity's sake), asap.
ACTION: GB to liaise with the ONIX National Groups respectively and ultimately the ONIX International Steering Committee to ascertain whether the agreed codes address all regions' needs and report back to this Group.

ACTION: KL to liaise with GW regarding any feedback she may have for the Best Practice Guidelines document from a retailer's perspective, before the document is circulated for wider feedback.
ACTION: JR to make final amends / edits to the Best Practice Guidelines document and format it (with contents page, etc.) by the end of **April 2016**. (Circulation of this document is dependent on receiving the retailer's strawman document from GW, see Item 4).
ACTION: KL to set a deadline for all feedback, before the document is disseminated widely. (Circulation of the draft documentation is dependent on feedback from GW).

ACTION: KL / AMB to circulate the final document to the Physical Supply Chain Committee (including the P&A T&FWG and the PDEA Accreditation Review T&FWG), the Digital Supply Chain Committee and Metadata Sub-Committee for feedback (with a deadline), asap.
ACTION: KL to circulate the final document to BISG and Booknet Canada (for global perspectives / feedback), and IPG and ALPSP (for feedback from smaller organisations that are not represented on this Group) asap (with a deadline).

4. **Review GW's strawman document for retailer requirements**
   KL informed the Group that this strawman document has not been written as yet but will be circulated soon. She noted that this document will feed into the Best Practice Guidelines document.
   ACTION: KL to liaise with GW regarding the progress of this strawman document with a view to it being circulated asap.

The book industry's supply chain organisation

PHYSICAL SUPPLY CHAIN
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

5. **Review of this T&FWF's Project Deliverables**
   KL read through the Project Deliverables for this T&FWG (Item 3.2 of the Project Brief). JR noted that the terminology grid (which was amended by AL and approved by this Group) has now been included in the Best Practice Guidelines document. She suggested that all of the deliverables have been met.

6. **A.O.B.**
   KL informed the Group that the Product Data Excellence Award (PDEA) Review T&FWG has agreed that all metadata for POD / Virtual Stock titles needs to be supplied a minimum of 4 weeks before publication date in order to meet the accreditation scheme's criteria for timeliness. Taking this decision into account, AW asked whether the metadata for POD books would therefore be indistinguishable from the metadata for physical books. He noted that, with this new timeframe in place, organisations that are currently unable to gain accreditation (due to their inability to meet the 16-week timeframe for physical book) will gain accreditation on the revised scheme. He suggested that moving the bar downward may not be what's best for metadata quality / standards.

   AW asked whether the requirement to include a different ISBN per format for POD books is noted in the Virtual Stock Best Practice Guidelines document. JR and RC suggested that it is but agreed to double-check this is the case.
   ACTION: JR to check whether the requirement to use a different ISBN per format type is included in the Best Practice Guidelines document; if one is not present, JR to add a note in the document.

   KL read out the volumetric measures for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme for each of the three levels and noted that, should the 4-week timeframe be implemented, the PDEA Review T&FWG will need to find a way for publishers to show that the book is Virtual Stock (and should therefore be exempt from the 12-week timeframe). JR agreed with AW that this Group believes that Virtual Stock titles should be treated in the same way as physically-stocked books, i.e. their manufacture method should not be relevant.

   AMB informed the Group that the PDEA Review T&FWG had made the decision to reduce the timeliness timeframe to 4 weeks due to a number of publishers' Out of Print titles being revived using POD; the members of the PDEA Review T&FWG did not want publishers to be affected detrimentally as a result of carrying out this work. AW noted that the revival of backlist titles using POD is slowing up now and will not be as prominent an issue going forwards. KL agreed to review this decision with the PDEA Review T&FWG, informing the T&FWG of this Group's recommendation.

7. **Date of next meeting**
   The Group noted that the next meeting of this T&FWG will be dependent on the feedback received / when the deadline for feedback expires (which is in turn dependent on the work being done to the Best Practice Guidelines document). They agreed that the Group should liaise via email until the need for a meeting is established.
   ACTION: AB to send out a Doodle Poll, if a meeting is required in future.