

**BIC Print on Demand and Short Run Task and Finish Working Group– Minutes**

BIC, CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount St, London WC1E 7AE

Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2015, 2pm.

---

**Attendees:**

Andrew Cochrane, Clays  
Roger Christiansen, Ricoh Europe  
Katya Dolgodvorova, Penguin Random House  
Katy Gibson, BIC  
Alison Lewis, Ingram Content Group  
Karina Luke, BIC  
Alan Rakes, Hachette UK  
Jean Roberts, Print on Demand Worldwide  
Nancy Roberts, Cambridge University Press  
Claire Walker, Harper Collins  
Andy Williams, Palgrave Macmillan

**Apologies:**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
Andrew Bromley, Ingram Content Group  
Charly Nobbs, Wiley  
Mark Walker, Macmillan  
Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones  
Alma Weber, Penguin Random House

**1. Introduction and Apologies**

The Group introduced themselves and KL welcomed the Group to the inaugural meeting of the BIC Print on Demand and Short Run Task and Finish Working Group. Apologies were delivered and the Group welcomed Alma Weber's delegate, Katya Dolgodvorova. KL noted the active responsibilities of the Group and commented that there may be shorter term and longer term solutions to the problems that the Group will discuss. Alison Lewis, of Ingram, noted Andrew Bromley would only attend if she was unable to.

**2. Confirmation of Project Leader and Deputy**

KL noted that the Group needed to appoint a project leader and deputy to work closely with BIC. The Group decided to wait on the decided actions from this meeting to decide on its Project Leader and the Group returned to this later in the meeting, under point 5, A.O.B.

**3. With reference to Project Brief, purpose of this Task & Finish Working Group****a) Review of deliverables, dates and schedule of Project**

The Group turned to the Project Brief and discussed its contents. AW noted how the Group's work would be closely aligned with that of the Price & Availability Working Group. With reference to Auto Stock Replenishment (ASR) and Print on Demand (POD) the Group discussed how these needed to be discussed simultaneously as ASR titles can be converted to POD. The Group also noted that the actual definition of Print on Demand, and associate terminologies, needs further discussion with regards to all its potential elements including printing, delivery and manufacture. JR noted that he regards Print on Demand as Manufacture on Demand but that both involve different delivery methods. KL asked the Group whether the ordering, manufacturing and supply of one copy is tantamount to a Print on Demand but the printing of multiple copies, for multiple orders, is a more commonly known as a short run; the Group agreed that this could vary depending on the organisation. Furthermore, NR noted how content can be licensed to retailers who can then print copies on demand and remit the money to the

publisher thereafter.

- Definitions

The Group discussed that the key problem here was the variable internal terminologies, for example, JR noted the use of the term “Book of One” at Print on Demand Worldwide where one digital copy is printed and AC noted how one printed copy could also mean a “short run”. KL asked the Group whether the definition is related to expectations within and without the book industry supply chain. AW responded that delivery timeframes surrounding POD need clarification as there are varying assumptions made by different parts of the industry and different organisations. AC noted that this feeds into the Price & Availability Task and Finish Working Group where essential questions are asked of the retailer, in particular, is the product available and, if so, when can the customer receive it. The Group agreed that, with reference to the Project Brief, defining terminology is critical to this Group’s aims and work. The Group then discussed the possible definitions of terms, for example, printing 1-25 books could indicate a POD run and 25 or more, a short run. However, the Group noted that figures should be included in potential definitions with caution, as this will greatly vary between academic and commercial publishers and thus the use of numbers is subjective; it cannot be standardised completely across the industry.

The Group thus discussed determining a scale and range of expectations, per term used.

**ACTION:** Group to determine workflows and expectations per term, at upcoming meeting.

- Dialogue with and input into the Price and Availability Task and Finish Working Group

The Group went on to discuss availability and POD as perhaps indicative of “permanent availability” which is preferable for retailers. JR commented that other terminology included “just in time” manufacture. AR noted the use of ASR as an answer code and its breadth of meaning, publishers are using it as meaning “may run out”, that is to say it is available but there is not enough stock to fulfil the order. He further noted this was used internally and that to the customer this would appear as “temporarily unavailable”. KD noted that internally at Penguin Random House “PDI” would be used to indicate the POD is under investigation, to the external world, however, this would appear as “OP”. The Group discussed the difficulties surrounding the codes here as what is communicated externally may lead to the consumer looking elsewhere for the product. NR noted the importance of conducting a conversation with retailers here as retailers printing titles on demand themselves may not always have the same quality controls in place as the publisher themselves. Therefore this may need explicit communication to the customer to clarify that the product was *not* manufactured by the publisher. This could be particularly important in situations where there are complaints from end users concerning quality of product. The Group discussed that a code indicating “Printed by Retailer” would be useful. The Group also discussed the potential for a code surrounding “Virtual Stock”, that is to say there are currently no copies held here but the product *will* be manufactured.

**ACTION:** ALL to consider a “Virtual Stock” and “manufactured by retailer” codes and to think about models used in their respective companies.

- Other Deliverables

The Group discussed emphasising a focus on the expectations of the consumer into the

deliverables of the Project Brief. Furthermore, in reference to the first three Project Objectives the Group discussed that in order to start this process of striving for best practice guidelines, each member of the Group would need to define their own narratives and timeframes in relation to Print on Demand, and other related terminologies in order for the Group to establish commonalities and differences.

**ACTION:** ALL to define narratives, providing timeframes, surrounding POD and short runs (see below at point 4 for more detail).

- Project Scope

The Physical Supply Chain Committee have noted that this Group will feed into the work of the BIC Price and Availability Working Group and the Product Data Accreditation Review Group. The Group discussed the issues of metadata exchange as there are sometimes challenges with responses from printers over POD's and it was agreed that more information regarding workflow/progress of order from printers would be desirable. The Group agreed that messaging standards need addressing here, particularly in resolving problems with customers. AR questioned how far the Group would take their endeavours here and KL replied that the scope can extend (at this initial stage of the project only) as far as the Group deems necessary, but to exercise caution, once the project is up and running, with regards scope creep. AW suggested that the scope could extend as far as invoicing and that this was worth consideration even though it might be difficult to reach a clear solution. The Group commented that it would be very useful to have more retailers on the Group. Furthermore, the Group hoped that by establishing best practice guidelines that would consequently improve the customer experience there would be a positive uptake of the guidelines by the industry. AC asked KL if Nielsen were involved with Group. The Group discussed that as this Group will feed into the world of the BIC Price and Availability Working Group, they may also wish to be included and attend when the Group discusses metadata.

**ACTION:** KL to ask Nielsen if they are interested in involvement in this Group.

**ACTION:** AB/KG to invite P&A Group members when metadata discussed on POD and Short Run Group.

- Timeline/Schedule of Project

KL informed the Group that draft guidelines from the Group are expected in September and following this the guidelines would be tested/piloted and returned with feedback. Then the guidelines would be revised and launched in early 2016 with a view to semi-regularly reviewing these guidelines, perhaps yearly. The Group agreed this was a realistic timeframe to work towards. The Group also highlighted the importance of attendance at these meetings as the subject matter required discussion and could not be easily completed via e-mail.

b. Reminder of Terms of Reference for BIC Task & Finish Groups

KL referred to and reminded the Group about this document for their information as to their responsibilities as part of this Task & Finish Working Group.

**4. Agree first actions and owners, with reference to Project Brief**

As previously discussed, the main outcome of the meeting was to action each Group member to describe the narratives and timeframes involved in their ASR, POD and short run methods and

deliver this in a grid format in Excel (see below). This is to include names of processes and items and their definitions according to the organisation’s internal terminology. Into this grid the Group members must also add where data exchanges occur between parties. The Group acknowledged that different members of the Group may actually enter this grid at different points, depending on where they appear in the supply chain, but that at the end of this exercise the Group will have an overview, highlighting potential “pain points” in the workflow.

<u>Day (point in publishing process)</u>	<u>Person involved in system (job title or automated process?)</u>	<u>Consequences</u>	<u>Data Feed (Between who?)</u>
(From beginning point where company enters supply chain)			

**ACTION:** ALL to prepare and send above chart with detail of narratives and timeframe to KL before 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015. Once they are all received, they will be circulated prior to the next meeting for Group members to annotate and begin to collate the various models.

**5. A.O.B**

The Group returned to discuss the roles of Project Leader and Deputy. Jean Roberts, of Printondemand-Worldwide and Roger Christiansen, of Ricoh Europe, volunteered, with Jean Roberts as Project Leader and Roger Christiansen as Deputy.

**6. Date of next meeting**

The Group discussed how frequent the meetings of this Group should be and suggested six weeks until the next, due to the main action of the meeting; the production of the example flowchart above. AR asked whether the meetings could be held in the morning due to travel arrangements.

The Group also agreed that because the work of this Group will influence the Price & Availability (P&A) Working Group, it was worth delaying the P&A Group’s discussion on answer codes pertinent to POD/ASR/short run etc until this Group had agreed what is required.

The next meeting will be held on 26<sup>th</sup> March.