

BIC PDEA REVIEW TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP MEETING

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

Wednesday 22nd July 2015, 2pm

Present

Judith Bennett, Oxford University Press
Clive Herbert, Nielsen
Thomas Herbert, Palgrave Macmillan
Karina Luke, BIC
Peter Matthews, Cambridge University Press
Andrie Morris, BIC
Jack Tipping, Bowker (Chair)
Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones
Laura Williams, Penguin Random House

Apologies

Keith Walters, Bibliographic Data Services
Ltd.
Alfred Willman, Random House Group

1. Introductions and apologies

The Chair welcomed the Group to the meeting and delivered the apologies.

2. Review minutes and actions from the last meeting and any matters arising

- Surveys

KL confirmed the questionnaires had been issued and responses received.

3. Surveys

The Chair informed the group that questionnaires were signed off and sent out at the end of June to The Publishers Association and The Booksellers Association. They were pleased to support the initiative by sending emails to the majority of their members.

The Group discussed whether it was worth asking The Booksellers Association to send out the email again with a “last chance to win” message. Targeted emails to new recipients should also emphasise this as an opportunity to have a say in the accreditation scheme; all who apply for accreditation should complete a questionnaire.

ACTION: CH to look at who can be targeted from Nielsen’s monthly metadata report.

ACTION: CH to invite his metadata report recipients to complete the survey before 4th September.

ACTION: KL to send a reminder email to BIC members and non-members and also request BA and PA mention the extension to their own members.

KL reported 71 responses in total. ALL considered this number; it was agreed to be satisfactory.

KL proposed that opportunity to complete the surveys be extended to 4th September. This would give the Group time to assess the results and how they would inform the agenda of subsequent meetings on this theme.

The Group proceeded to summarise the main points emerging from the 4 surveys, thus:

Retailers Survey

- LP observed a disappointing response from retailers and queried i) whether or not they understood the purpose of the survey and ii) whether the survey was reaching the right contact at the retailer.
- GW observed that with one exception, there were no online only retailer responses to the survey.
- Question 9, Problem 3, #1: PM raised the possibility of the Group putting together a more refined survey for those who have already answered this question, given that they are a small number of respondents. KL also suggested going back to respondents and asking them to expand their answers.

ACTION: GW to complete the survey.

ACTION: GW to ask a member of the Waterstones online team to complete the survey.

Data Aggregators Survey

- The main themes of responses concerned i) use of the standard and ii) what is in the data file, highlighting the need of the Accreditation scheme to recognise how data is sent, how often, what it looks like and how it is measured. The Group was reminded of the need to accredit people who can produce valid ONIX files.
- Question 6, issue 3, #2: The Group noted that elements of ONIX were open to interpretation despite explanatory notes. This should be shared with Graham Bell at EDItEUR to inform best practice. The Group considered this a valuable lesson for the Accreditation Guidelines, which should be as clear as possible, especially where conditional scenarios are used.
- Question 7, issue 2, #2: GW wondered how the Accreditation scheme could address this point to prompt companies to carefully consider how deeply web developers understand data formats and language.
- Question 9: The Group noted it was difficult to attribute comments to respondents because of skipped responses; the table shows a sequence of responses.
- Question 9, Obstacle 3, #1: PM suggested there should be something in the Accreditation scheme about keeping up to date with the standard.

ACTION: KL to encourage Head of Zeus, Bibliocloud and UK divisions of Ingram to complete survey.

Distributors Survey

- The Group noted the positive and encouraging responses from the 9 participants.

Publishers Survey

- The Group agreed that responses to question 5 suggests that there are a lot more people in the industry who are not aware of BIC's Accreditation scheme.
- The Group agreed that publishers – including small ones - should be encouraged to give provisional data e.g. publication date, even at production stage; this information can be modified at a later date.
- PM identified less mention of digital. The Group discussed possible reasons for this: perhaps because of a simpler supply chain and companies are working within newer systems.
- Question 8; Challenge 3, #16: KL suggested that a stronger link needs to be established between what retailers want and what publishers can send.

ACTION: PM to approach a colleague at CUP to assess the statistical value of data generated by survey, with a view to detecting any significant patterns. This may help when devising a survey of a larger sample.

4. Forthcoming Workshop

ALL present agreed to attend on 30th September, 10am-4pm. Lunch will be provided.

The Group considered inviting Graham Bell from EDItEUR to the afternoon session after analysis of the publishers Accreditation scheme. This will entail a forensic line-by-line examination, to consider a range of issues including: the validity of compulsory fields; different timelines for different products; the appropriate levels and percentages for each level; how information gathered from the survey can be reflected in its detail.

The Group agreed Graham's contribution may be more valuable later on this process. All discussed ideas of other potential invitees. These included a wholesaler and another retailer.

ACTION: KL to send Graham a summary of points extracted from the survey to inform his contribution to the Group.

ACTION: KL to extend invitations to Patrick Neale (Jaffe and Neale), Kieron Smith (Blackwells), John Garrould or Angela Belham (Bertrams) and Book Depository to the Workshop.

5. Updating BIC's Product Metadata Guidelines for ONIX 3.0

The Chair agreed this needs updating as soon as possible and done bearing in mind the agenda for the Workshop.

6. Reminder of deliverables (with reference to Project Brief)

The Chair informed the Group that this can be done at the Workshop.

7. Project Plan

This is on track.

8. Accreditation schemes in other regions

The Chair said no response from Booknet Canada was forthcoming, although a PowerPoint file was sent to his colleague, which the Chair hopes to receive and share.

ACTION (carried over): Chair to email Group with further details about the Australian Accreditation scheme.

9. A.O.B.

None.

10. Date of next meeting.

The next meeting will be held on 30th September 2015.