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

BIC SAN & GLN TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP MEETING – Minutes
Location: Conference Call
Date and time: Thursday 28th April 2016, 2pm
Minutes written by: Alaina-Marie Bassett

Present	**Apologies**
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC	Gareth Bradley, Hachette
Diana Dalasini, Nielsen	Noah Genner, Booknet Canada
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)	Kim Graff, BISG
Karina Luke, BIC	Margaret Gray, TrueCommerce
Peter Morley, Ingenta	Adam Miles, Pearson
Simon Parker, Batch	John Purcell, Bowker US
Barry Richardson, Nielsen	Sophia Sophocleous, BIC

1. **Welcome & apologies**
   SE welcomed the Group to the call and read out the apologies.

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 minutes and follow-up on actions from the last meeting**
   The minutes from the last meeting of this Group were approved without corrections. The following actions were discussed:

   - Identifiers that provide location information
     SE and BR reported that most organisations which have their own location identifiers are outside of the book trade, though some book industry organisations do make up their own identifiers; this practice is especially common for direct FTP users. SE and BR confirmed that the majority of book industry organisations use SAN or GLN.

   - Feedback on the SAN / GLN Report
     SE informed the Group that he received feedback on this report from PM of Ingenta (formerly Publishing Technology) and BR and Jon Windus (JW) of Nielsen. He noted that all feedback received has now been incorporated into the draft report document (which was circulated on Thursday 28th April 2016), though further feedback will be collected during this meeting with a view to the report being revised one final time by SE; the final document will then be circulated to this Group to be signed off via email. SE reminded the Group that every member of this Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) will need to send a response about the final report document in order for it to be fully signed off; silence cannot be taken as approval.

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

Those present at this meeting confirmed that they are happy for the current report document to be sent to the BIC Operational Board. SE noted that feedback will now need to be obtained from the absent members of this T&FWG.

4. **Signing off the SAN / GLN report for the forthcoming BIC Operational Board meeting**
SE asked the Group whether they identified any issues, errors or omissions in the draft report – he read through the options listed in the report to facilitate this discussion. For Option 2 (divorce SAN from GLN), SE noted that he now has some figures that should be incorporated into the report to help the BIC Operational Board to make an informed decision. He noted that this Option will require a new SAN-allocating website or new functionality on the current website in order for organisations to edit / update their location information however he noted that this option will have cost implications.
ACTION: SE to add the figures that he quoted during the meeting into the report for Option 2.

It was noted that SAN was originally intended to be deprecated in favour of its successor, GLN. BR confirmed that Nielsen is able to use either SAN or GLN, or both – though only one is required. SE noted that the deprecation of SAN could have a huge impact on organisations; this impact cannot be measured / known since it will affect organisations that may not be in BIC membership, especially small / medium-sized organisations. BR suggested that more research should be done regarding the deprecation of SAN to see the scale of the impact of this Option. SE and KL noted that the BIC Operational Board are also concerned about the impact of deprecating SAN. KL suggested that a cautionary note, specifying that the implications of this decision for organisations should not be understated, should be added to Option 3.
ACTION: SE to add a cautionary note to Option 3 regarding the possible implications that this solution could have for organisations.

SE stated that both SAN and GLN are just numbers, which have to be unique to a trading organisation, and they should be seen as enablers to facilitate EDI rather than barriers. SE noted that an alternative solution would be for SAN and GLN to be uncoupled going forwards and that a key Option could be to make this requirement, i.e. require either an SAN or a GLN, not both. SP noted that the age of each organisation's system is likely to dictate the identifier required (older systems require SAN). BR noted that there is no real, logical reason as to why SAN and GLN should remain linked since no organisation requires both.

SE noted that the BIC Operational Board will be reviewing the SAN / GLN report on Thursday 12th May 2016 and will want to receive a recommendation / preferred solution from this Group. KL read out the Operational Board's feedback for the original SAN / GLN report, asking whether SAN / GLN are used for accounts or address / location. SE noted that they are used for both purposes depending on the organisation in question; he explained that each address has a number which relates to an account. BR agreed, noting that it is not essential to have an address – what is important is how the information is used. SE noted that a rule / clarification of use is needed for this reason. He commented that GLN can be used as an account number and can also be edited for changes of address, etc.

The book industry's supply chain organisation

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

BR noted that trading partners will need to be made aware of any subtle changes made to an address since these will not be obvious / advertised. SE agreed, noting that organisations will only carry out this exercise if they're especially conscientious or if functionality to notify other organisations is available on the website. He suggested that there needs to be a place to look up this information in order to incentivise organisations to keep it up-to-date; he suggested that there is no advantage at present to keeping the information current.

KL asked what the hypothetical downstream impact would be if SANs could be amended, eradicating the need to allocate a new SAN every time an address needs to be changed. SE noted that the brunt of the impact would be felt by the website provider that would need to create this functionality. DD suggested that a new identifier could be created and allocated instead, though she acknowledged that this solution would involve both cost implications and policy changes due to moving away from GS1. SE noted that it is possible that the book industry could have its own set of rules designed for the book trade as an alternative to normal GS1 policies.

KL suggested that SE should list the likely impacts for each Option within its corresponding paragraph in the SAN / GLN report. SE agreed to do so, though he informed the Group that a number of the impacts will be unknown / unforeseen and are likely to come to light after the chosen solution has been put in place. He asked whether it is necessary for the chosen solution to be free; though he acknowledged that there will be costs for the set-up and maintenance of the allocation system. KL noted that the BIC Operational Board would like an analysis of the financing options that are suitable for this Project. SE commented that the Project could be financed in a number of ways including sponsorship and levies.
ACTION: SE to list the possible / most obvious "impacts" for each solution on the report.
ACTION: SE to list, in the SAN / GLN report, the possible ways in which the new system could be financed / contributed to.

KL informed the Group that the BIC Operational Board would like further analysis about the potential charges for each Option in addition to its profitability. KL noted that the Group's recommendation should include reasons as to why the chosen Option is preferred.
ACTION: SE to list the possible charges, in the SAN / GLN report, for the chosen solution.
ACTION: SE to formulate this T&FWG's recommendation to the BIC Operational Board, with an accompanying paragraph explaining the reasons for this recommendation.

KL noted that the final version of the SAN / GLN report will need to be circulated to the BIC Operational Board on Thursday 5th May 2016. She informed the Group that the BIC Operational Board intends to review the report and come to a decision about the SAN / GLN Project during their meeting on Thursday 12th May 2016. She noted that the Board may respond to the report with further questions if necessary.

The Group agreed that it would be beneficial to know how often SANs are allocated; they suggested that a counter could be added to the SAN website (if one does not already exist) to see how often the site is visited / used. SE and KL noted that they already have some

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

figures for the number of allocated SANs which can be included in the final report.

ACTION: BR / DD to inform the Group as to whether a counter exists on / could be added to the SAN Agency webpage to ascertain how many SANs are allocated within a certain period.

ACTION: SE to add his SAN allocation figures to the report.

ACTION: KL to send the figures she possesses to SE for inclusion in the report, asap.

SE noted that some of JW's feedback was not incorporated into the current version of the SAN / GLN report due to concerns about commerciality (NB Nielsen runs the SAN agency under licence from BIC). He informed the Group that JW believes that deprecating SAN will be a lengthy and costly process. For this reason, SE advised that should this Option be chosen, the process must begin as soon as possible and that BIC should work in collaboration with the US and Canada since these regions use SAN almost exclusively.

SE noted that it is not always against GLN / GS1 policies to change address information but he noted that Nielsen are rightly concerned about breaking any rules. He noted that the rules for SAN and GLN are slightly in conflict as they developed separately over time and they have very different charging models so BIC would need to approach GS1 regarding this matter. KL noted that the cost of the GS1 license is more than the royalties received. BR commented that EDI demands the use of GLN, as such it will be more costly for organisations to have their own identifiers and more costly in turn for organisations to use / implement all the new identifiers into their systems. He noted that the key issue is that all organisations are currently using different systems so there is not an easy solution for all.

ACTION: SE to amend the report as per the discussion of this meeting, ensuring that the Operational Board's questions are answered, and circulate the final draft report to this Group by Wednesday 4th May for this T&FWG's approval.

ACTION: ALL to provide feedback on SE's final draft report, or else reply to the email to confirm that they have no comments and are happy for the report to be sent to the BIC Operational Board, by the end of the day on Friday 6th May 2016.

5. **A.O.B.**
   None.

6. **Date of next meeting**
   The Group agreed that a meeting should not be scheduled until the BIC Operational Board has made a decision / provided additional feedback on this Project.

   ACTION: AMB to arrange the next meeting of this Group via Doodle Poll, if / when required.

   Post-Meeting Update: Following on from the BIC Operational Board meeting which was held on Thursday 12th May 2016, please be advised that BIC will now be closing this T&FWG with a view to instigating a new, very specific follow-on Project. For further information, please contact info@bic.org.uk.