



BIC Task & Finish Working Groups
Project Briefing Document

Project Name:
Metadata Map

BIC Project Brief

The Purpose of the BIC Project Brief

The BIC Project Brief is required to enable necessary projects, or pieces of work to progress from being a good BIC Committee idea to a formal request for work that is submitted to the appropriate Task and Finish Group. The BIC Project Brief must be agreed upon and signed off initially by all members of the BIC Committee and then the dedicated Task & Finish working Group once established.

The BIC Project Brief should generally be short and provide an overview of the proposed project or piece of work.

The finalised, signed off document will be made visible to all BIC members, who will be free to provide comment or feedback on the intended project or work.

Document Status: FINAL
Project Name: Metadata Map
Version Number: 1.0
Created by: Karina Luke
Created date: 11th July 2016
Finalised date: 6th April 2017.

BIC Committee Review

Reviewed by	Name	Organisation	Date
Metadata Committee		<i>BIC membership</i>	13.07.16
Metadata Committee		<i>BIC membership</i>	12.10.16
Metadata Committee		<i>BIC membership</i>	22.11.16
Operational Board		<i>BIC membership</i>	26.01.17
Metadata Committee		<i>BIC membership</i>	08.02.17

BIC Committee Approval

Approved by	Name	Organisation	Date
Executive Board		<i>BIC membership</i>	January 2017
Operational Board		<i>BIC membership</i>	26.01.17
Metadata Committee		<i>BIC membership</i>	08.02.17

Document History

Version	Summary of Changes	Document Status	Date published
0.9	First DRAFT version	DRAFT	11.07.16
0.9.1	Amendments following Metadata Committee meeting held 13 th July 2016	DRAFT	07.10.16
0.9.2	Amendments following Metadata Committee meeting held 12 th October 2016	DRAFT	22.11.16
1.0	Final amendments made following the Metadata Committee Meeting held 8 th Feb 2017 as follows: -To refer to a small Steering Group (as opposed to a larger Task and Finish Working Group) -To refer to Project Coordinator being recruited.	FINAL	06.04.2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. PURPOSE**
- 2. BACKGROUND**
- 3. PROJECT DEFINITION**
- 4. OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE**
- 5. CUSTOMERS QUALITY EXPECTATIONS**
- 6. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA**
- 7. ANY KNOWN RISKS**
- 8. OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN**
- 9. BUDGET/COSTS**
- 10. AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE**
- 11. PROPOSED TASK & FINISH GROUP LEADER/PROJECT MANAGER**
- 12. CUSTOMERS AND USERS**
- 13. REPORTING**

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project is to collaboratively map the book industry's metadata supply chain from the point of metadata creation (with the publisher as the start point) through to the end recipient(s) of the metadata – in this instance consumers. In exploring how best to arrive at a Metadata Map, the project will need to consider the fluidity of the metadata supply chain, and should allow for changes and updates to material/information. It is intended that this Metadata Map will, as a “living document” help resolve issues and identify gaps or grey areas within the metadata supply chain. It will also shed light on where the metadata goes, what happens to it and who uses it. In the absence of any significant funding, and to help with the fluidity of the metadata workflow, the best model for this project would be a controlled “wiki” approach. Those BIC members who contribute detailed information on their own organisation's metadata practices would have full access to view the contributions of other participating organisations. Once the wiki is live, the information held there will be shared with **BIC member contributors only** and access for contributing non-members will be assessed by BIC on a case by case basis. Please note, non-contributing BIC members and non-contributing non-members will not have access to view any information. The goal is to encourage a level of learning across the industry with regards other organisations' practices by the mutual sharing of up to date information. The map will only be of value if it is kept up to date, and so this project needs to determine how to keep the map current.

2. BACKGROUND

The subject of the metadata supply chain has been discussed at length in many BIC committee meetings, most notably the BIC Metadata Committee and the BIC Operational Board, who have both acknowledged that no-one can categorically say that they know everything that happens to metadata at every point in the supply chain. This lack of knowledge was widely regarded as a major gap in supply chain information. It was agreed that a Metadata Map would help with this and could help resolve issues and identify further areas for work/improvement. It was suggested that the project could be holistically approached e.g. looking at pairings of metadata partners, subsets of participants or groups of partners e.g. publisher, aggregator, distributor and retailer as a group. The project needs to include the following types of stakeholders in the metadata supply chain:

- senders,
- receivers and
- those organisations that are both.

Non-BIC members in both the UK and from overseas should be encouraged to contribute information, although non-BIC members are not permitted to sit on the Steering Group for this project.

It was also agreed (by both committees mentioned above) that the Metadata Map could help educate organisations about discoverability, and to also determine where and how erroneous data occurs.

This will be a stand-alone project initially but, depending on the outcomes, may feed into the BIC Product Data Excellence Accreditation Scheme.

Beginning with BIC member participation, the Steering Group may want to consider involving non-member contributors, since this is a collaborative exercise looking at both metadata and discoverability for the whole of the book industry.

Before the project begins it will be necessary to clearly identify and communicate the benefits of participating in this project. It is anticipated this piece of work will be carried out by members of the Metadata Committee.

3. PROJECT DEFINITION

3.1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project should deliver a “wiki” style Metadata Map accessible to all contributing organisations that details, by organisation, the following areas in the metadata supply chain:

1. Metadata fields used by senders/recipients
2. Metadata fields not used by senders/recipients
3. Highlighting good and bad practice
4. Recipients of metadata – what do they change/add/edit and why?
5. How metadata recipients display information received
6. What validation is applied by recipient to the metadata
7. Method of sending/receiving – direct? Via 3rd Party? ONIX? Spreadsheet (fields should be described in ONIX terminology)? Other?
8. Frequency of sending/receiving, loading, processing, ingestion
9. Where are organisations sending metadata files? How?
10. Full files v delta files...when, why
11. Timeline for recipients to make necessary metadata changes
12. Where to go/who to contact with “x” issues.

The effort involved is envisaged to be:

- 1) Establishing who should sit on the Metadata Map Steering Group (MMSG) and recruiting the volunteers. Please note since Project Coordinator is being recruited, BIC will put together a small Steering Group for this Project rather than seek volunteers for a larger Task and Finish Working Group (T&FWG).
 - o 1 a) Promotion of the Project and recruitment of participants to sit on the MMSG
- 2) Establishing which organizations outside of the MMSG should be approached to contribute information about their metadata supply chain.
- 3) Recruiting a Project Coordinator
- 4) At least one face to face meeting of the MMSG. This will be held at BIC HQ and will involve hiring a room etc. Subsequent meetings may be conference calls but this is at the discretion of the project lead.
- 5) A review of the priorities and approach suggested by the BIC Metadata Committee.

- 6) Interviews with BIC member organisations – beginning with organisations on MMSG, the BIC Metadata Committee and BIC Operational Board. This to be a start point with the view widening out to other BIC members and non-members (if deemed appropriate).
- 7) Agreeing the design/format/look of the “wiki” so that it is easy to explore, understand, edit, access. How will it look on the BIC website? Where will it sit on the website?
- 8) Cost of the “wiki” – who will create it? How much will it cost. Who will design it? (an individual, an independent company?) How will it be tested? What tests will need to be carried out before go-live? Who will maintain it from a technology perspective? How will it appear on the BIC website? Who will have access to the admin areas? Etc.
- 9) Agree maintenance/review process to ensure the wiki content is always as up to date as possible.
- 10) Business benefits include greater understanding and visibility of what is a grey area for most of the book industry. The Metadata Map could over time, and assuming it is always up to date, become a valuable source of information regarding all participants in the metadata supply chain, which could result in time savings particularly when it comes to trying to resolve issues, understanding organizational requirements, or simply to know where to go for help etc.
- 11) Not doing the work would mean the situation regarding knowledge of the metadata supply chain does not improve and the all participants in the chain continue to operate in an uninformed, ad-hoc way which is ultimately time consuming and costly.

3.2. PROJECT SCOPE

The scope of the project is as follows:

1. Phase One will look at all metadata used in the UK book industry supply chain. There may be a requirement at a later stage to look at all metadata created in the UK and distributed internationally but this is yet to be decided and will not be addressed in Phase One.
2. It will include all participants in the metadata supply chain including libraries and library providers (at least to the extent that they share the same data as the trade). Once the data becomes ‘library data’ in MARC format, then it is out of scope as per 3.2.3.
3. When considering the transmission, receipt, and use of metadata the following formats/delivery mechanisms/standards are in scope: ONIX, spreadsheets, EDI, on-line portals – metadata submitted as hard copy/via paper is not included. MARC is excluded.
4. All UK originated metadata for all products with an ISBN is in scope, which means this project will be looking at both physical and digital products.
5. It is not intended that this project will create a best practice document since this already exists, but that it may inform such documentation.

6. It is intended that the Metadata Map becomes a valuable, up to date repository of information overtime.
7. Metadata Map maintenance

The success of the project lies largely in the hands of the contributors and their willingness to engage in the project and subsequently going forward on an ongoing basis to ensure accuracy of information at all times, or at least on a regular pre-agreed basis. Keeping the Metadata Map up to date will need monitoring to avoid information becoming redundant.

3.3. OUTLINE PROJECT DELIVERABLES AND/OR DESIRED OUTCOMES

Key deliverables are:

1. Project Plan – showing deadlines for each deliverable with actions/owners clearly assigned
2. Benefits Statement (for the creation and ongoing maintenance of the Metadata Map)
3. List of interested parties to sit on the MMSG and/or to be approached for interview
4. The Metadata Map itself, which should be written using ONIX3.0 terminology
5. User Guide – introduction to, purpose of, and documentation on how to use/contribute to the Metadata Map (for new users), to include “code of conduct for authorized users” i.e. what is expected in terms of updates and so forth, what they are entitled to view etc.
6. Best practice document/agreement on how the Metadata Map will be maintained
7. Agreement documented on the format/specification and capabilities of the “wiki” (for example do we want the wiki to be able to generate reports, have a live forum?)
8. Common errors/trouble shooting area (within the wiki) that may take the form of a Q&A or FAQ section
9. Agreement on what the contributor/participant interviews should ask/seek out
10. Documented interviews from participants as outlined in section 3.1 above (this will help to inform the format/spec of the “wiki”)
11. Progress reports from the Project Coordinator (or person(s) assigned by the Project Coordinator) to the Metadata Supply Chain Committee
12. A glossary of ONIX terminology in plain English and to include a definition of ‘metadata’, specifying what fields are in scope.
13. Marketing plan to encourage wider engagement with the Metadata Map (this may involve advertising in industry press)
14. Mechanism for ensuring only the authorized users have access to detailed information - only broad high level information should be available to a wider audience

3.4. CONSTRAINTS

This will be a multi-year project for BIC and so it will be vital to recruit a competent Project Coordinator and a committed MMSG to work on this project and these individuals must all buy into the Project Brief and BIC’s Task and Finish Working Group Terms of Reference from the outset. They will need to be informed in advance of the following:

- Time needed from them in total and how this breaks down over the course of the duration of the project.

- **Phase One**, assuming adequate funding from BIC is secured, is estimated to last no less than 12 months and will concern itself with the collection of information and the representation of that information. It will also include the creation of the wiki.
- **Phase Two** will concern itself with the potential commercial impact of errors and the analysis of the data collected. This work may last 6-9 months.
- **Phase Three** will concern itself with establishing Best Practices for the ongoing governance and maintenance of the wiki. This may last 6-9 months after Phase Two, or the Project Leader may decide to run Phases Two and Three concurrently.

- What actions are likely to be expected of them and when

The workload of individuals will be a potential constraint. It is also important that all individuals involved in the Project (contributors and the MMSG participants (these may be different people)) leave a suitable handover contact, or comprehensive handover notes should they leave their role in the organisation they represent.

Budget is a potential constraint. The main costs currently for BIC are likely to be the creation of the wiki itself, meeting room costs, and the appointment of the Project Coordinator.

3.5. INTERFACES

Many BIC member organisations may be interested in this project. Having obtained sign off from the Operational Board, the BIC Metadata Committee is ultimately responsible for the success of this project, however the BIC Physical Supply Chain and BIC Digital Supply Chain Committees may have interested members too. The MMSG should keep in mind the BIC Product Data Excellence Accreditation Scheme (PDEA) which is currently under review. Depending on the outcomes/progress of this Metadata Map project, it may be necessary to keep the PDEA T&FWG informed.

4. OUTLINE BUSINESS/INDUSTRY CASE

Please refer to sections 1 (Purpose) and 2 (Background) above

5. QUALITY EXPECTATIONS

It is important that the layout, appearance, and specification of the “wiki” template, and what the project wants the Metadata Map to show/share/detail now and in the future, is agreed and documented.

Once the Metadata Map is live, contributing organisations should be made aware that responsibility for the accuracy of their content lies with them and not with BIC.

The importance of this project work will be in the following order of priority:

1. Quality
2. Cost
3. Timeline

Quality is most important because BIC's work must be to the highest standards and misinformation in such a key area would be detrimental to BIC's reputation across the industry. Cost is the second priority because BIC's budget is important and BIC's resources must be managed. Timeline is the least important because if overrunning slightly was still within budget and delivered optimum quality then this would be acceptable. The timeline is only estimated. The crucial point is that delay should not lead to increased costs.

It may be decided that responsibility for the maintenance review of the Metadata Map lies with the BIC Trade Clinic, but this is to be agreed by the MMSG.

6. ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

Members of the MMSG, the BIC Metadata Supply Chain Committee, and the BIC Operational Board should be able to tell how the Metadata Map would be received/used within their parent organisations. As such it is expected that these members/contributors would be able to advise and agree on how the Metadata Map should look, feel, behave etc.

The Metadata Map should be easy to use, both in terms of contributing and finding out information – it should be searchable.

The MMSG may want to investigate how easy it would be for users to download certain information from the “wiki”

The Metadata Map should only be accessible-all-areas by authorised users i.e. BIC member organisations who have contributed up to date and complete data. Contributing organisations that are not BIC members will have their access levels reviewed on a case by case basis. This will need to be tested.

BIC should have the right and the ability to remove incorrect data and/or organisations (from the wiki) if information is not kept up to date by the organization in question.

BIC should be able to promote certain anonymised data for promotional reasons, and the copyright for such compilations of data should be BIC's.

7. RISKS

One key risk is the risk of not doing the work. Not doing the work would mean the situation regarding knowledge of the metadata supply chain does not improve and that all participants in the chain continue to operate in an uninformed, ad-hoc way which is ultimately time consuming and costly and does not allow the book industry to maximize the value of an understood metadata workflow.

It is likely that once completed, this project may result in the creation of an ongoing, permanent, annual task for BIC in addition on the ongoing moderation of the forum group(s). The impact of this needs to be assessed and considered carefully with regards budget/funding, BIC team resource and so on.

Another risk is that the Metadata Map may inadvertently highlight bad practice for others to copy. Adequate care both during the project and afterwards (as the Map is maintained going forwards) needs to be taken to avoid this happening.

Allowing the Metadata Map to contain out of date information is a major risk since this could jeopardise the whole initiative. It is imperative therefore that a method of regular

review/update is agreed both by this project group and by each contributing organization going forward, once the project has ended. Contributing organisations will need to be encouraged to commit to regular updates.

8. OUTLINE PROJECT PLAN

The BIC Metadata Committee, and the BIC Operational Board will be asked to sign off on this project brief. It is hoped that a final sign off will be possible by the start of December 2016 and that the project could hold its first meeting in early/mid-2017 with an estimated end date (month) for Phase One of January 2018. Estimated end date (month) for Phase Two being September 2018. Estimated end date (month) for Phase Three (if run after Phase Two and not concurrently) being June 2019. This would be the date by which all the deliverables outlined in Section 3.3 above have been achieved. A more detailed project plan should be put together by the Project Coordinator and should be one of the first actions for the MMSG.

9. BUDGET/COSTS

At the moment of writing, the costs to BIC are limited to the recruitment of the Project Coordinator, cost of building the wiki, meeting room costs, staff time, staff travel expense (should there be any) and potentially advertising costs to help with the promotion of the Metadata Map once the project has completed.

10. AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE

Executive Director of BIC

11. PROPOSED STEERING GROUP PROJECT LEAD/COORDINATOR

This appointment is tbc and will be discussed at the first meeting of the MMSG. Until a Project Coordinator is appointed Karina Luke, Executive Director at BIC, will temporarily assume the role.

The Project Coordinator will report into Karina Luke and the MMSG will provide the Project Coordinator with the steer for the project itself.

12. CUSTOMERS AND USERS

Known stakeholders, who may want to participate (either as part of the MMSG, or in a more limited capacity by being interviewed and then updating the Metadata Map later themselves, once the project has ended) include:

BIC Metadata Committee
BIC Operational Board
BIC's PDEA Panel
BIC's PDEA Review T&FWG
The wider BIC membership

Types of organisations to include:

Publishers – trade, academic and STM
Retailers – online and retail/both
Distributors
Data Aggregators

(Data) Service providers
Wholesalers

BIC may want to approach non-members too to feed into this project, particularly other retailers, supermarkets and so on. A definitive target list should be drawn up by the MMSG.

13. REPORTING

It is assumed that the MMSG will report to the BIC Metadata Committee which meets quarterly. Previous experience has shown that reporting monthly is probably too frequent and quarterly or every two months reporting better reflects progress made as it coincides with the expected schedule of conference calls and BIC's management needs. This reporting should include, but may not be limited to, the following:

- i) Costs to date v budget (if applicable)
- ii) Projected costs to date v budget (if applicable)
- iii) Progress of deliverables against agreed timeline/project plan
- iv) Engagement of MMSG
- v) Potential or actual obstacles to delivering the project on time and in full

The Project Coordinator will take responsibility for this type of reporting. This reporting on progress does not take the place of the MMSG minutes.

END