

**BIC TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION CLINIC MEETING – Minutes**

**Location:** CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE and GoToMeeting / Conference Call

**Date and time:** Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2017, 2pm

**Minutes written by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett

---

**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
James Cooper, Cambridge University Press (dialled in)  
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)  
Gary Lovett, Nielsen (dialled in)  
James Mayor, Gazelle Book Services (dialled in)  
Simon Parker, Batch  
Steve Roe, Blackwell's (dialled in)  
Abu-Sufian Shohid, Batch  
Dominic Stanley, Bertram's (dialled in)

**1. Welcome & apologies**

The Group was welcomed to the meeting. Some members of the Group (as indicated above) attended this meeting via GoToMeeting / conference calling facilities.

- **ACTION:** SE, AMB and Karina Luke (KL) to liaise regarding the format of this Clinic's future meetings and report back, ASAP.

**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 follow up on actions from the last meeting**

The minutes from the last meeting were approved with minor corrections; it was noted that the link included for Item 4.3 of the previous set of minutes appears to be broken.

- **ACTION:** AMB to amend the link and minutes accordingly and recirculate to this Group.

**4. Current EDI standard issues (TRADACOMS and EDIFACT)**

All current EDI standards issues are documented in the Action Grid overleaf.

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p><b>4.1</b> Electronic Code Lists <b>Raised by</b> PM, Ingenta <b>Date raised</b> 31.01.2013</p>	<p>SE reported that the draft electronic code list document was circulated to this Group on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017 for comment; the document contains TRADACOMS code lists 13, 54 and 202. To date, feedback on this document has been received from Francis Cave (FC), Peter Morley (PM) and JM. SE noted that this document does not include the latest changes to TRADACOMS List 54 which have been made by the BIC Price &amp; Availability (P&amp;A) Task &amp; Finish Working Group (T&amp;FWG). Once this T&amp;FWG publishes the final version of TRADACOMS List 54, SE will need to update the code list document. He asked the Group if the electronic document needs any other amendments and whether it should be expanded to incorporate further code lists going forwards. SP suggested that a full electronic document should be produced including code lists for ONIX and EDIFACT and SE agreed to produce the initial draft. SE noted that the style of the current document will be replicated for all the additional code lists. SP noted that PM intends to use this document to facilitate the automation of look-ups in real-time at Ingenta to ensure that the latest version of the code list is always used. (NB, this does not mean real-time lookups for programmes but a batch update on a regular basis).</p>	<p>SE to produce a draft document (including all code lists for TRADACOMS, ONIX and EDIFACT) and send to AMB for circulation, ASAP.</p> <p>ALL to provide feedback on the document, once it has been circulated.</p>	<p>SE</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>4.2</b> VAT Country Codes <b>Date raised</b> Prior to 31.01.2013</p>	<p>SE confirmed that EDItEUR has now documented the change / clarification to VAT and the use of VAT country codes to make up the full VRN (VAT Registration Number) in the EDIFACT standard (which was proposed by this Clinic previously) on its website; however no change has been made to the EDIFACT standard document. An auxiliary document has been used to list the modifications made since the standard was last updated. SE suggested that here could be a problem with this approach in that users who are new to EDIFACT may just look at the standard rather than the auxiliary document. SE suggested that eventually the standard should be updated in full. He also noted that the proposed change is already in use within the UK book supply chain but as EDIFACT is an international standard and its governing committee does not meet on a regular basis, the UK's changes will not be signed off internationally in the near future. He therefore asked whether it would be inappropriate to add the UK changes as a bona fide addition to the standard document. SE, SP and GL agreed that they would prefer the information to be consolidated in one document to ensure the standard remains up-to-date and continues to be a useful, stand-alone resource. It was suggested that a UK version of the standard should be produced which will clearly explain and highlight the UK amendments in red, and provide a link to the original, international document on EDItEUR's website. GL noted that other</p>	<p>SE to produce the UK EDIFACT standard document, including this Group's changes and updated examples, and send it to AMB for circulation ASAP.</p> <p>Once circulated, ALL to provide feedback and sign off on the UK document before the next meeting of this Group.</p>	<p>SE</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
	<p>countries have also implemented their own regional changes to the EDIFACT standard in this way. The Group agreed that Graham Bell (GB) of EDItEUR should be kept informed about this topic and remain involved in the work done. Regarding page 13 of the EDIFACT standard, SP suggested that information about both the numeric code and alpha-numeric code should remain in the document. It was also suggested that the sub-elements and examples included in the document should be updated. SE noted that the changes will need to be approved by this Group. SE also noted that he believes that the EDI standards have been managed by expert users for so long that new users may find them very hard to understand and implement efficiently. He suggested that an explanation for each document should be included going forwards to aid users to identify what they need more easily. The Group agreed.</p>	<p>SE and AMB to liaise to update the EDI webpage on the BIC website.</p>	<p>SE + AMB</p>	
<p><b>4.3</b> HTML code embedded in text <b>Raised by</b> JM, Gazelle <b>Date raised</b> 15.01.2015</p>	<p>AMB provided an update on BIC's Best Practice for Embedding HTML Mark-Up in ONIX Workshop, which took place on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> April 2017. She noted that there is little more that BIC can do to promote this topic. JM and GL agreed that the issue is related solely to ONIX however any additional work that could be done to promote best practice / awareness in this area would be advantageous. GL agreed to speak with his colleagues to ascertain whether Nielsen can direct its new customers to EDItEUR's document, Embedding HTML Mark-Up in ONIX; this document is available online, here: <a href="http://www.editeur.org/files/ONIX%203/APPNOTE%20HTML%20markup%20in%20ONIX.pdf">http://www.editeur.org/files/ONIX%203/APPNOTE%20HTML%20markup%20in%20ONIX.pdf</a></p>	<p>GL to report back on the dissemination of EDItEUR's document to new customers.</p>	<p>GL</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>4.4</b> Order Rejection Code for eBook Orders <b>Raised by</b> GB, Bertram's <b>Date raised</b> 05.11.15</p>	<p>AMB reported that this Group's feedback was passed to the BIC P&amp;A T&amp;FWG on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2017. SE noted that suppliers still need to be able to inform their customers that an EDI order has been received but that it is for an eBook and so cannot be supplied. He noted that a code exists to this effect in EDIFACT: Code EX, List 8B. SE reported that it is the BIC P&amp;A T&amp;FWG's intention to import this code from the EDIFACT list into TRADACOMS List 54 in order to enable some organisations' to use this code in TRADACOMS 54. SP suggested that EDIFACT code list 8B may be available on the EDItEUR website in order for this Group to review it. SE agreed to locate the code list ASAP, noting that this Group will need to provide feedback on Code EX with a view to ensuring that it meets their requirements.</p>	<p>SE to locate the EDIFACT List 8B on EDItEUR's website and send the link to AMB for circulation.  ALL to provide feedback on the</p>	<p>SE</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
	<p><i>Post-Meeting Update: List 8B can be found at the following address:</i>  <a href="http://www.editeur.org/files/EDifact%20eancom%20pdfs/codes%20draft%20feb%202010.pdf">http://www.editeur.org/files/EDifact%20eancom%20pdfs/codes%20draft%20feb%202010.pdf</a></p>	<p>proposed code EX before the next meeting.</p> <p>AMB to inform the P&amp;A T&amp;FWG about this Group's feedback on Code EX.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>AMB</p>	
<p><b>4.5</b> Both SAN &amp; GLN used in Returns Messages <b>Raised by</b> SP, Batch <b>Date raised</b> 30.04.2015</p>	<p>SP noted that it should be possible to provide a GLN for a branch location as well as for head offices (in returns messages). SE agreed, noting that the amended documentation which outlines this fact will need to be added to the BIC website ASAP; this document was amended by SE and AMB following the last meeting. SE noted however that one issue remains; the example included in the latest version of the document depicts SANs as being 6-digits in length. SE reminded the Group that SANs in fact consist of 6 digits plus a check digit, resulting in a 7-digit total. SE agreed to amend the document accordingly with a view to recirculating it, prior to the next meeting, in order for it to be signed off by this Group. The Group agreed that examples should be provided in the document also.</p>	<p>SE to amend the document and include examples, sending it to AMB for circulation ASAP.</p> <p>ALL to sign the document off before the next meeting.</p>	<p>SE</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>4.6</b> Serialized Shipping Container Codes (SSCC) <b>Raised by</b> PM, Ingenta <b>Date raised</b> 09.03.2017</p>	<p>AMB reported that PM's document on this topic was circulated to both this Group and the BIC Physical Supply Chain (PSC) Committee on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2017. SE noted that SSCC (18-digit code used to identify logistics units for electronic commerce transactions), which is currently used by some supermarkets, may soon be implemented by Amazon and Tesco. DS informed the Group that Bertram's already uses SSCC with Amazon without issue. SE suggested that the introduction of SSCC by large retailers may have a greater effect on small to medium organisations – many of which do not use SSCC currently due to having a smaller volume of returns. DS noted that the only issue that Bertram's experiences in relation to SSCC is when organisations request specific fields to be included,</p>	<p>AMB to report back to this Clinic on the BIC PSC Committee's discussion regarding if BIC should become involved in the area of SSCC.</p>	<p>AMB</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
	i.e. a variation of the standard process, since Bertram's system has to be able to cope with this. SP noted that GS1 owns the prefixes for SSCC. AMB confirmed that the BIC PSC Committee will discuss if it is appropriate for BIC to get involved in the area of SSCC at its forthcoming meeting on Thursday 29 <sup>th</sup> June 2017.			
<b>4.7</b> Mixed-Rate VAT Products in TRADACOMS (ILD segment) <b>Raised by</b> SP, Batch <b>Date raised</b> 09.03.2017	SE reported that he has now clarified the EDI TRADACOMS Invoice document further; removing "or more" and "subsequent" and replacing them with "second" and "third". He noted that these amends address the ambiguities this Group identified previously. JC confirmed that Cambridge University Press would not receive an order that requires 4 invoice lines since its system would break each line down into separate products. SP agreed, noting that if a product is comprised of a standard VAT product and a non-VAT product, then only 2 lines are required as the first will provide an overall value and the second (and third, if necessary) line will provide information about how the overall value was reached. SE agreed to review the document a second time and ensure it is clear.	SE to review the doc. and send the final version to AMB for circulation, ASAP.  ALL to sign off the document via email before the next meeting.	SE  ALL	No
<b>4.8</b> Duplication of invoices and DNA RTX codes 978 and 979 <b>Raised by</b> PM, Ingenta <b>Date raised</b> 09.03.2017	SP reported that he has not liaised with PM regarding his issue as yet. SE noted that the invoice is sent via EDI and Batch however the information provided in each, differs; this issue has only been experienced with one of Ingenta's customers to date. SP suggested that Ingenta may not have switched one feed off when moving to an alternative method. He agreed that this matter should be investigated further to ascertain where and why the invoices differ.	<b>CARRIED OVER:</b> SP and PM to liaise regarding this issue and report back to the Group at the next meeting	SP + PM	No

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
<p><b>4.9 New issue:</b> RO1 returns refusals <b>Raised by</b> SE, Consultant <b>Date raised</b> 22.06.2017</p>	<p>SE raised returns calculations via Industry Returns Initiative (IRI) for discussion, noting that a miscalculation occurs when returning products that are bought and returned across one or many branches of an organisation. He suggested that in these instances the products may have been linked to an outdated order / an order that is beyond the returns window; this in turn results in an automated returns refusal and then subsequent manual intervention and additional administrative costs. It would be far better if the returns authorisation system software worked perfectly thus minimising refusals and manual intervention. He commented that returns systems do not keep a tally of the returns that are currently available to their organisation (i.e. eligible to return) and instead the current system looks back 15months and totals up all sales and returns. This can lead to minus figures which then leads to the refusal.</p> <p>SE informed the Group that less than 10% of returns are affected by this issue but that in some cases the retailer believes the refusal and fails to chase this with the supplier, leading to products being stored by retailers rather than being returned as they should be. He noted that the BIC IRI Review T&amp;FWG will be addressing this issue as part of the ongoing project. SR commented that it is good to know that an issue has been identified with returns calculations as Blackwell's had suspected this to be the case. SE noted that the returns process is more complicated when multiple branches are involved. He reported however that a potential solution has been identified: linking the return of a product to the first order of that product in the 15-month returns window and applying this to the total tally of returns. SE noted that this proposed solution will need to be tested by various organisations including distributors. He encouraged the Group to provide information to the BIC IRI Review T&amp;FWG if their organisation is experiencing this issue.</p>	<p>SE to provide an update on the BIC IRI Review T&amp;FWG's proposed solution for this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>ALL to contact SE and AMB if their organisation's system is currently unable to calculate or miscalculates the total tally for its returns, i.e. if the total goes into minus figures.</p>	<p>SE</p> <p>ALL</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>4.10 New issue:</b> EDN vs Invoices <b>Raised by</b> SP, Batch <b>Date raised</b> 22.06.2017</p>	<p>SP raised Electronic Delivery Notes (EDN) and invoices as an issue for this Clinic to address. He informed the Group that some major suppliers have recently changed their processes so that they no longer provide a paper invoice in their deliveries; only the delivery note. The paperwork provided is a post-pick delivery note, meaning that the organisations in question cannot include the invoice number on it. SP reported that Batch is introducing a search function to its software so organisations can search using a delivery note number in order to establish what the invoice number is. He noted</p>	<p>SE to amend spec. documents (referred to, below), adding clarification that it is preferable for organisations to</p>	<p>SE</p>	<p>No</p>

Title of Issue	Brief Description of Issue	Actions (if any)	Responsible for Action	Issue resolved? Yes / No
	<p>however that some organisations do not include a delivery note number on their delivery notes nor the invoice number. SE agreed that it would be beneficial if organisations could include both numbers on all their paperwork. SP noted that the search function is live on Batch's website.</p> <p>The Group agreed that guidance for organisations which are not currently providing invoice / delivery numbers should be produced. SP noted that the supply of the delivery number is a mandatory requirement in the Delivery Notification File and the Invoice File specification documents however some organisations are still not doing so; these documents can be found on the BIC website, here: <a href="http://www.bic.org.uk/files/pdfs/100818%20trade%20delivery%20note.pdf">http://www.bic.org.uk/files/pdfs/100818%20trade%20delivery%20note.pdf</a> and here: <a href="http://www.bic.org.uk/files/EDI%20Tradacoms%20Guidelines%20-%20The%20Invoice,%20July%202014.pdf">http://www.bic.org.uk/files/EDI%20Tradacoms%20Guidelines%20-%20The%20Invoice,%20July%202014.pdf</a>. SE agreed to revise page 22 of this specification document. SP suggested that if an organisation does not use delivery numbers they could instead use the delivery date in this field. SR noted however that organisations which receive more than one order from the same supplier on a single date will need a separate identifier. The Group agreed that if a delivery number exists, its inclusion on the delivery note should be mandatory.</p>	<p>include a delivery number on invoices, and send to AMB for circulation.</p> <p>ALL to provide feedback on the revised doc. before the next meeting (particularly booksellers).</p> <p>SP to send the link to Batch's search function to AMB.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>SP</p>	
<p><b>4.11</b> Potential new issues to be addressed</p>	<p>The Group did not have any other new issues to report. SE noted that any matters that do arise between now and the next meeting of this Group should be brought to BIC's attention prior to the next meeting date.</p>	<p>ALL to send details of any new issues to SE and AMB prior to the next meeting of this Group.</p>	<p>ALL</p>	

## TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION CLINIC

@BIC1UK

[www.bic.org.uk](http://www.bic.org.uk)

[info@bic.org.uk](mailto:info@bic.org.uk)

### 5. Report from the Library Technical Implementation Clinic (LTIC)

SE informed the Group that the BIC LTIC has not met since the last meeting of this Group, as such there is no update to provide at present. The next meeting of the LTIC will take place on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2017. The latest set of minutes from the LTIC can be found on the BIC website here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/121/Libraries-Committee/>

### 6. Watching Brief on the Price & Availability (P&A) Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG)

SE noted his concerns about some of the deprecations suggested by the BIC P&A T&FWG. AMB agreed to recirculate the revised TRADACOMS List 54 document to this Group, ASAP.

- **ACTION:** AMB to liaise with Gabrielle Wallington of Waterstones to obtain a copy of the revised TRADACOMS List 54 document, ASAP.
- **ACTION:** ALL to provide feedback on the TRADACOMS List 54 document by Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017.

*Post-Meeting Update: the revised TRADACOMS List 54 document was circulated to this Group on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2017.*

AMB reported that the next meeting of the P&A T&FWG has been cancelled. In its place a BIC workshop will take place on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2017 to address communicating price details in ONIX; this workshop will relate to the second phase of the ongoing P&A project. AMB encouraged the members of this Group to attend the forthcoming workshop and agreed to circulate further information about the event in due course.

- **ACTION:** AMB to circulate information about the forthcoming ‘Communicating Price in ONIX’ workshop to this Group on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2017.

The latest minutes from the P&A T&FWG can be found on the BIC website, here:

<http://www.bic.org.uk/118/Physical-Supply-Chain-Committee/>

### 7. ONIX / EDItX XML / Web Services

#### - ONIX

AMB informed the Group that ONIX Codelist Issue 37 was released in April 2017; as such the proposals document for Issue 38 is now underway. Further information about ONIX for Books, the latest ONIX codelists and any related documents can be found here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/5/ONIX-for-Books/>

SE noted that the IRI Review T&FWG will need to ensure that returns metadata is in-line with ONIX / can be sufficiently expressed using ONIX going forwards.

#### - EDItX

The Group did not have anything to report regarding EDItX.

#### - Web Services

AMB reminded the Group that the *BIC Realtime* Implementation Guide was published on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> April 2017; information about which was circulated to this Group on Wednesday

## TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION CLINIC

@BIC1UK

[www.bic.org.uk](http://www.bic.org.uk)

[info@bic.org.uk](mailto:info@bic.org.uk)

3<sup>rd</sup> May 2017. To receive your copy, please sign up here: <http://eepurl.com/b-dqZD> SE noted that the governance of *BIC Realtime* will be passed over to this Clinic shortly.

- Library Web Services

AMB reported that the next meeting of the Library Web Services T&FWG will take place on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

### 8. Actions for Training, Events & Communication (TEC) Committee

AMB informed the Group that the BIC Training, Events & Communications (TEC) Committee has not met since the last meeting of this Group; as a result, her action will be carried over.

- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** AMB to add “providing updates on the BIC TIC’s and LTIC’s progress” to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC TEC Committee and report back.

### 9. A.O.B.

The Group did not have any other business to report.

### 10. Date of next meeting

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017.

---

BIC website address: <http://www.bic.org.uk/>

BIC EDI listserv: [http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/BIC\\_ECOMMERCE\\_IMPLEMENTATION\\_GROUP/](http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/BIC_ECOMMERCE_IMPLEMENTATION_GROUP/)

BIC training courses: <http://www.bic.org.uk/93/All-Courses/>

BIC is very active on twitter so, if you use twitter, you may want to follow BIC and keep up with BIC announcements, activities and events via twitter: @bic1UK

As always, any comments / corrections, etc. should be sent by email to both [alaina-marie@bic.org.uk](mailto:alaina-marie@bic.org.uk) & [simon.edwards@dial.pipex.com](mailto:simon.edwards@dial.pipex.com)