METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

BIC PRODUCT DATA EXCELLENCE AWARD (PDEA) REVIEW WORKSHOP – #4
Bowker Offices, 5th Floor, 3 Dorset Rise, London EC4Y 8EN
Thursday 10th March 2016, 2-5pm

Present	**Apologies**
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC	Graham Bell, EDItEUR
Judith Bennett, Oxford University Press	Jenny Brownley, WHSmith's
Thomas Herbert, Palgrave Macmillan	Kat Coveyduck, Virtusales Publishing Solutions
Alex Ingram, EDItEUR	Nabiha Evans, Amazon
Karina Luke, BIC	John Green, Bertram's
Peter Mathews, Cambridge University Press	Andrew Henty, Virtusales Publishing Solutions
Paul Theijs, BooksoniX	Clive Herbert, Nielsen
Jack Tipping, Bowker (Chair)	Kieron Smith, Blackwell's
Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones	George Walkley, Hachette
Keith Walters, Bibliographic Data Services	Alfred Willman, Random House Group
Laura Williams, Penguin Random House	

1. **Welcome & apologies**
   JT welcomed the Group, thanking them for attending this half-day workshop – the fourth workshop held to review the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. The apologies were read out.

2. **Competition Law – conduct reminder**
   KL informed the Group about BIC's Competition Law Policy, summarising what constitutes appropriate conduct (in relation to competition law) and noting that this conduct applies to all forthcoming BIC meetings. Appropriate conduct includes but is not limited to diligently ensuring that the discussions of each BIC Committee / Group / Clinic are limited to the items featured on the meeting's agenda and ensuring that commercially-sensitive information is not discussed. KL noted that any concerns about this Group's conduct or discussions should be raised directly with the Chair during the meeting; any concerns raised will of course be recorded in the minutes of that meeting. Further information about BIC's Competition Law Policy can be found here: http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/

3. **Review of the minutes and actions from the last workshop**
   The minutes from the last PDEA Review Workshop, which took place on Thursday 28th January 2016, were approved with minor corrections. The following actions were discussed:

   - Data aggregators & measuring ONIX files for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme
     KL reminded the Group that she will be meeting with CoreSource at London Book Fair 2016 (LBF16) to discuss their potential involvement in this Scheme going forwards. She reported that Vearsa are also keen to find out more about this Project and how they can help. JT asked whether CoreSource and Vearsa receive an appropriate amount of eBook metadata in order for it to be measured for the purpose of this Scheme. KL confirmed this to be the case but noted that they will require a specification to set up a measuring mechanism.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

ACTION: KL to liaise with CoreSource at LBF16 and report back to the Group.

ACTION: KL to follow-up with Vearsa regarding the possibility of their measuring eBook metadata for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme going forwards.

ACTION: KL to arrange a meeting with Firebrand Technologies to discuss the possibility of their measuring eBook metadata for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme going forwards.

ACTION CARRIED OVER: KL to liaise with PT regarding the possibility of BooksoniX joining the PDEA Accreditation Panel going forwards and measuring metadata.

- <u>Feedback on this Group's discussion about a suitable timeframe for POD titles</u>
  GW – who is a member of both the Print on Demand (POD) & Short Run Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) and the PDEA Revision T&FWG – noted that, from a retailer's perspective, organisations should aim to provide their metadata as early as possible to facilitate sales. However she suggested that the appropriate timescale for POD titles may differ depending on whether the book is a front-list or backlist title; she suggested that metadata for all front-list titles (regardless of how they are manufactured) should be supplied a minimum of 16-weeks prior to publication date whereas a 4-week timeframe may be sufficient for backlist titles manufactured using POD. She noted that there is no real benefit for retailers to receive backlist metadata for POD titles 16-weeks prior to publication and imposing this timeframe could result in the PDEA Scheme penalising publishers for their respective business models.

  PM noted that implementing differing timeframes for POD titles for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme has the potential to affect the results, enabling organisations that may not be able to gain an award on the current PDEA Scheme to become accredited or else allowing currently accredited organisations to gain a higher level of award. GW also noted that if this Group agrees to implement a separate timeline for POD books, they will need to find a way to identify POD within metadata for the purpose of these titles being measured appropriately. She noted that the POD & Short Run T&FWG has agreed that the method of manufacture for a book should not be expressed using availability codes and, as such, POD titles should be marked as 'Available' rather than 'POD / MD' going forwards.

  The Group questioned the importance of measuring POD books' timeliness, suggesting that it may not be necessary to measure this for the purpose of the revised Scheme. KL suggested that the Panel could instead address this matter on a case-by-case basis going forwards, taking the volume of each organisation's POD titles into account. GW suggested that other organisations, including retailers and The Publishers Association, should be approached for their feedback on this matter.

  KL circulated a document written by Andy Williams (AW) of Palgrave Macmillan (a member of the POD & Short Run T&FWG) who states the following: "I would have been aggrieved if after all our work to achieve accreditation – which we displayed to Gardners etc. – where we were delivering metadata to 4 months' lead time, our performance / accreditation was then apparently shown to be the same as [other organisations] who

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

were not able to deliver 4 months ahead but by virtue of greater use of POD for front-list at the time were being judged to a different/shorter standard." GW noted that the key word in the above statement is "front-list", agreeing with AW that all front-list titles should continue to adhere to the 16-week prior to publication date timeframe.

AW's document states that method of manufacture has become irrelevant since a book can be printed using both litho- and POD simultaneously in different countries / regions; as a result the members of the POD & Short Run T&FWG intend to reduce this "artificial differentiation". AW noted that digital printing processes have become 'business as usual' and the T&FWG members aim to minimalise the historical, negative connotations associated with the term POD, as such it may be detrimental to treat POD titles differently for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. He also suggests that any differentiation of POD titles should be based on market behaviour, i.e. lazarus (backlist) / fast track (from manuscript to publication in 3 months) titles, etc.

KL commented that it is the perception of effort that could prove to be an issue here. GW agreed, noting however that this Group will need to find a way to identify POD titles in order for them to be measured fairly, if the panel agrees that a separate timeline is required. She suggested that the term 'POD' could be removed from the chain, taking only frontlist, production schedule, fast track, lazarus titles, etc. into consideration. LW noted that pulling out these book types will prove to be just as problematic as pulling out POD titles from feeds. PM informed the Group that applicant organisations' titles must meet the 60-80% completeness / timeliness benchmark in order to gain accreditation on the current PDEA Accreditation Scheme; as such 20-40% of the titles (depending on the award being sought) do not need to meet the timeliness / completeness requirements. He argued that this failsafe was put in place to accommodate publishers with timeliness issues, such as those caused by POD.

LW noted that the 20-40% allowance does not accommodate organisations that produce a large quantity of POD titles / have an unusual business model that will never meet the timeliness requirements of the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. She therefore suggested that POD titles from these sorts of organisations could be discussed on a case-by-case basis or else omitted from the publisher's statistics for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. She noted however that it is very difficult (if not impossible) for publishers to currently label their titles in order for them to be omitted and asked whether whole imprints would need to be omitted for this reason.

AI commented that accreditation needs to be meaningful and a 4-week timeframe is fundamentally different to 16-weeks (prior to publication date). He urged the Group to consider what "meaningful" means in terms of the submission of POD metadata. KW noted that, for the purpose of the current PDEA Scheme, POD titles are stripped out of their organisation's timeliness statistics. He noted however that the differing timeliness for POD books is not entertained as an excuse / reason for organisations to submit poor quality data – only the timeliness of the metadata should be affected. KL suggested that

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

members of this Group who were unable to attend this meeting may have other suggestions about how to resolve this issue. The Group agreed to return to this item.

- CBMC Codes
  KL informed the Group that there was not enough time to discuss CBMC codes at The Publishers Association's (PA) recent meeting on Thursday 18th February 2016; as such they are now requesting feedback via email, which will be forwarded to KL in due course.
  ACTION: KL to liaise with Seonaid Macleod of The Publishers Association regarding their feedback about CBMC codes and update the Group at the next meeting.

- Cover images
  AI confirmed that his actions were carried out after the last meeting of this Group, i.e. 'image last updated' is now listed as strongly recommended, holding images are expressively not recommended, and the Group's preferences for cover images (specific cover image > 3D cover image > promotional image) have all been included in the BIC Basic data element set grid. AI noted that this information has, at present, only been incorporated into the BIC Basic grid but the other grids will be produced / amended shortly. He suggested that the text included in the BIC Basic grid could be extracted and used to outline this Group's recommendations for dimensions and colour profiles.
  ACTION: AI to extract the recently amended dimensions and colour profile information for the ONIX documentation and send to AMB.

  Post-Meeting Update: AI has summarised the dimensions and colour profiles recommendations as follows: "A cover image for a product is mandatory and a BIC Basic element. An accurate URL, actionable by the receiver of the ONIX feed, linking directly to the image under the control of the publisher (e.g. on the publisher's website, but not a generic link to the publisher's home page) should be specified. Cover image art should be sRGB colorspace, 24 bits per pixel colour depth in JPEG with no clearly visible artefacts. Images should be of a flat perspective with a minimum size of 1000 pixels on the shortest dimension and with an accurate aspect ratio close to that of the product itself. Typically images should be significantly less than 2MB in file-size. Additional images for contributors or resources for sample content in text, video and audio can be supplied in a similar manner."
  ACTION: ALL to provide any feedback they may have on this statement, asap.

  KL noted that the following actions will be carried over.
  ACTION CARRIED OVER: KL to ensure that the revised PDEA documentation states that cover images must be supplied within the same timeframe as the rest of the metadata for the format of the book.
  ACTION CARRIED OVER: KL to provide a note of best practice in the revised PDEA documentation regarding what constitutes an acceptable / unacceptable cover image.

- eBooks
  KL noted that the pooling of measured metadata will be discussed under Item 5 of this meeting's minutes. She suggested that this Group will need to consider whether to revise

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

their decision to request the submission of eBook metadata a minimum of 4-weeks prior to publication date following the discussion about POD titles.

AI confirmed that the BIC Basic data element set now reflects the fact that GBP is only a mandatory requirement if the eBook is available for sale in the UK. The Group confirmed that "in the UK" refers to the eBook being available for sale in the UK as opposed to the seller / publisher being in the UK. They discussed whether to amend this statement of rights to "available for sale in the UK or to a UK-customer" but agreed that this clarification is not necessary. KW noted that the price(s) supplied for an eBook should match the regions / countries that the eBook is available in, i.e. a GBP price should not be supplied if the eBook is not available in the UK. GW commented that specifying each book's rights is useful for tax advice.

AI noted that 'Rights' comes after 'Price' in the documentation and grids for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme despite the fact that Rights information can affect the way that Price is dealt with. He suggested that, in the BIC Basic data element grid, this issue could be simplified by listing the price twice – once inclusive of tax and again exclusive of tax – or that a footnote could be added into the grid to clarify what is required. The Group agreed to instead list 'Rights' above 'Price' in the documentation for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme to encourage organisations to consider Rights in relation to Price.
ACTION: AI to ensure that 'Rights' is located above 'Price' in the documentation and grids for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.

KL noted that she will shortly liaise with both the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee and data aggregators regarding the measurement of eBook metadata and a suitable timeframe for eBook timeliness.
ACTION CARRIED OVER: KL to approach the BIC Digital Supply Chain Committee and/or other data aggregators to gain their feedback about what constitutes a suitable timeframe for eBook timeliness.
ACTION: KL to add 'Timeliness of eBooks' to the agenda for the next meeting.

- Description data element
  At the last meeting, CH was actioned to liaise with his colleagues at Nielsen regarding the possibility of their applying discretion to organisations that have include descriptions in their feeds to Nielsen's free service. KL noted that CH was unable to attend this meeting and, as such, a response will be received by the next meeting.
  ACTION: CH to liaise with KL asap regarding Nielsen's ability to measure descriptions for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme (regardless of whether the information is ingested into Nielsen itself).

  PM noted that there is a difference between Nielsen's commercial products and its role as a measurer. He suggested that it should be possible for Nielsen to measure the data it receives regardless of whether this information is disseminated further or not. TH noted

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

that the PDEA Accreditation Scheme is concerned with metadata that reaches the end-customer. PM agreed but noted that it is bad practice to send metadata to only one data aggregator and, as such, their description fields should reach end-customers through other means / aggregators.

At the last meeting, members of this Group suggested that an Implementation Group should be set up to discuss how the measuring process can be implemented into Bowker's and BDS's respective systems. KL noted that this Group has not been set up as yet. KW confirmed that BDS are in favour of producing statistics going forwards but will require a specification in order to put the measuring process in place.

ACTION: JT to liaise with ProQuest regarding the possibility of their measuring metadata for this Scheme in future and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

ACTION CARRIED OVER: CH, KW and JT to liaise regarding the implementation of a measuring tool for BDS and Bowker's respective systems.

- BIC Basic data element set grid
  AI confirmed that this grid has now been amended to reflect the Group's decisions from the last meeting. He noted that the amended grid was not circulated for comment since it is a work-in-progress and is not finished at present.

- Lifecycle of the ONIX 3.0 Badge
  It was confirmed that, at the last meeting, this Group agreed that the ONIX 3.0 Badge will not be awarded as part of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
  ACTION: AMB to amend the last set of minutes accordingly.

4. **Summary of what was agreed at the last PDEA Review Workshop (#3)**
   KL circulated a document to the Group, during the meeting, which lists what was agreed at the last PDEA Review Workshop; in addition, the summary documents from the first and second PDEA Revision Workshops were amended and re-circulated. The Group reviewed these lists during the meeting and the following points were raised for discussion:

- Price & Availability (P&A) feeds
  The Group agreed that publishers should confirm in writing when the responsibility of their feed should switch over from themselves to a third party distributor or vice versa.

- Print On Demand (POD)
  The Group agreed that further organisations should be approached for their feedback on a suitable timeframe for timely POD metadata. They noted that NE and GW have expressed their desire to be in receipt of this information as early as possible to facilitate pre-sales however GW noted that the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should not penalise organisations for their business models. She noted that this Group will need to find a way for these organisations to inform the PDEA Panel that their business model for select titles will never meet the timeliness model.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

- Specification and supporting documents for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme
KL noted that the Group agreed previously that the specification and accompanying documents for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme need to be produced "asap". The Group suggested that a target date should be agreed upon soon.
ACTION: ALL to set a target date for the completion of the specification and supporting documents at the next meeting of this Group.

- eBooks
The Group noted that "dimensions" was listed (by mistake) in the minutes from the last meeting as a requirement for eBook metadata and this should be amended.
ACTION: AMB to amend the last set of minutes accordingly.

KL asked whether organisations supplying dimensions within their metadata for eBooks should be accredited on the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. PM commented that providing this information, more than anything, makes very little sense and should be discouraged at the very least. AI noted that EDItEUR has a sophisticated tool that is able to identify eBooks that have dimensions included in their record, so it may be possible for eBook measurers to identify these titles too. The Group agreed that any eBook titles containing dimension metadata should be failed on the revised PDEA Scheme.

- Additional question for the revised PDEA Application Form: When and where was the applicant organisation's last metadata feed sent?
The Group previously agreed that if a feed (full or delta) has not been sent within 6 months of the organisation's application / review, the decision on their award should be deferred; though this will be considered by the Panel on a case-by-case basis and the size of the publisher and its volume of titles will inform the decision. The Group also previously agreed that the PDEA Accreditation Scheme should recommend that a delta feed is sent at least monthly, where possible.

KW noted that issues arise when publishers 'turn off' their feed prior to supplying their imminent, new feed. GW commented that publishers should send a full feed at the very least once a year, especially when providing a new feed. It was noted that once a book has become IP (available, in print and in stock) this availability code may not be modified for years. For this reason, KL suggested amending the question as follows: "When and where was your last metadata feed sent? If your feed was sent more than 6 months ago, please explain why."

KW noted that organisations which do not send metadata feeds cannot be accredited on the PDEA Accreditation Scheme since it is reliant on the measurement of the metadata supplied. TH agreed, noting that organisations which publish at least 10 books a year (a stipulation of this Scheme) will almost certainly have changes to their metadata within a 6-month period. PM confirmed that the recommendation of this Group should be that organisations will not gain / retain a PDEA award if they do not send an update / delta feed at least once every 6 months. The Group agreed. They also

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

agreed that sending a full feed every 6 months should not be recommended due to the workload involved for the recipient.

ACTION: KL to ensure that the revised PDEA documentation states that organisations which do not supply a delta feed at least once every 6 months are not eligible to gain accreditation.

5. **Measuring eBooks**

It was noted that this Group should not assume that the scores of each eBook measurer / data aggregator will be the same, though AI noted that the scores will not be made public. KW suggested that the scores should be compared rather than 'pooled' so that each data aggregator's score is taken into account. AI commented that the data aggregators will need to ensure that their respective systems and the specification used to score applications for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme are as similar as possible; to ensure that the variant is as slight as possible. The Group agreed that the draft specification and representation from further eBook measurers are required before this matter can be discussed fully.

JB noted that this Group will need to agree upon what data elements of eBook feeds should be measured for the purpose of the revised Scheme. TH and LW agreed that software will need to be discussed alongside each organisation's available eBook formats. LW asked the Group how they propose to merge Nielsen's score for print metadata and the various eBook measurer's scores. AI noted that the scores will be meaningless if they do not include the number of titles scored per report. He commented that interactive reports would be beneficial to the Scheme but that this may not be possible; if this is the case, it will therefore be necessary for the Panel to make a judgement on the collated information themselves.

LW commented that the scoring system for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme should be as transparent as possible and should not therefore come down to human perception. The Group agreed. LW suggested adding the raw statistics (provided by each data aggregator) together, though there are potential issues with this. PM noted that a level of human intervention in the revised Scheme will be necessary but should be kept to a minimum; he reminded the Group that under the revised Scheme applicant organisations will have the opportunity to attend their review meeting to discuss their award.

KL noted that this Group must first decide upon what data elements should be measured in order to gain accreditation for eBooks on the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. She noted that this specification can then be given to the respective data aggregators / measurers to see what is viable; the specification will therefore be dependent on each eBook measurers' capabilities. The Group agreed that they should ascertain both what the key data elements for eBooks are and how Nielsen will be approaching the changes to their measuring system (and how this will affect other measurers) at the next meeting of this Group. KL informed the Group that she will send Nielsen's report to CoreSource, Vearsa, etc. for their information / consideration.

ACTION: KL to add "eBook data element set" to the agenda for the next meeting of this Group,

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

including discussion about what should happen if different feeds are sent to aggregators for the same titles / how scores should be compared in order to gain a final, collective score.

6. **Continued review of ONIX 2.1 vs ONIX 3.0 release documentation**
   AI informed the Group that this Item will be discussed from the perspective of ONIX 3.0, with a focus on eBooks. The following data elements were discussed:

   - Product Form:
     AI informed the Group that Product Form is largely written from the point of view of print books and may need to be amended for this reason.

     - Product Form Feature
       AI informed the Group that there is a conditional requirement for physical products that contain a toy to include a toy-hazard safety warning in their metadata, i.e. this is only required when the product includes a toy. He suggested that it may be too technical to measure this conditional requirement as part of the revised PDEA Scheme. The Group agreed.

       AI noted that, for digital products, Product Form Feature should detail accessibility features and eBook file format version numbering or operating system requirements. LW noted that publishers are very rarely asked for accessibility information, if at all. She asked what the Group intends to base their requirements on and suggested that they should be informed by retailers' needs. AI told LW that the requirements are based upon a combination of Best Practices and data elements that have been asked for by ONIX users. He noted that providing recommended data elements in feeds is beneficial to publishers and their data's recipients, supporting Best Practices, even if the requirements are not mandatory. He commented however that some publishers', due to their eBook platform, may not be able to provide this information in their feeds. The Group agreed that the supply of Product Form data elements should be recommended rather than mandatory for this reason.

     - Primary Content Type code
       AI informed the Group that this field is populated with free-text but he suggested that the conditional requirement should be measured when applicable for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme.

     - Digital Rights Management (DRM)
       AI noted that an eBook's DRM will not always be included in the titles' metadata. KL commented that she is happy for DRM to be an expected / recommended requirement for the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. PT agreed, noting that some publishers will never send this information in their feeds so it cannot be a mandatory requirement. The Group agreed that DRM should be 'expected'.

   AI noted that there are very few data elements that can be measured in Product Form.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

- Extents & other content:
  - <Extent> composite
    AI noted that file size was previously expected but this has now been deprecated. He informed the Group that only physical books (i.e. books with a page extent) should include the number of pages at BIC Basic level. He asked whether this should be extended to ONIX 3.0. PM suggested that only eBooks with a print equivalent should feature this information but KL noted that there currently isn't an easy way to refer to the print book. PM suggested that this should be done using Related Products. The Group agreed that a print page equivalent should be 'expected'.

- <RelatedMaterial>:
  - <RelatedProduct> composite
    AI informed the Group that this composite, as a whole, is only 'required' due to the fact that it's not applicable in every context. He noted that work has been done to the Best Practice document for <RelatedProducts> and this grid will need to be amended accordingly to mirror the changes made. PM noted that this requirement cannot be measured but that it should be recommended where a print version of the book is available. The Group agreed that this conditional requirement should be 'recommended', if applicable.

    GW noted that it is not currently possible to state more than one relationship in P&A feeds, as a result it will not be possible to inform recipients (via metadata) that a book is produced by a different publisher. AI noted that, if it is not possible to express that a title has been replaced by something else, it's better not to provide any (non-specific) information.
    ACTION: GW to discuss this with the members of the P&A T&FWG at their forthcoming meeting on Wednesday 27th April 2016 and report back to the Group.

    AI noted that the <RelatedProducts> composite is 'required' on the ONIX 3.0 data element sets grid at present. He commented that this Group will need to ensure going forwards that digital book suppliers are not penalised in any way due to their format / capability to express Related Products.

- Supplier, availability and prices:
  - Price Type Code
    AI noted that Price Type Code is 'required' for all awards except at BIC Basic. LW informed the Group that Penguin UK is currently discussing the possibility of sending eBook metadata to data aggregators without price information included; though the prices will of course be sent to the organisations that require this information. AI noted that special arrangements of this sort should not be measured by the PDEA Accreditation Scheme. GW agreed, noting that at least one of the recognised UK data aggregators for the PDEA Scheme will need to be in receipt of the prices in order for the metadata to be measured.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

- <DiscountCoded> composite
  PT noted that publishers do not want to disseminate this information despite the fact that the level of discount is not detailed in the feed. He noted that it is an irrational fear that is prevailing amongst some publishers. AI noted that publishers must supply either a <Price> composite or Price Type Code and the grid should be amended to state this more explicitly. GW noted that the <DiscountCoded> composite is currently under discussion by the P&A T&FWG and, as such, this requirement is not set in stone. AI agreed but suggested that he would be surprised if the recommendation for Best Practice was not to supply a Price Item Type.

- Price Amount
  AI noted that he is uncertain whether it is acceptable to list '0' (zero) here.
  ACTION: AI to check whether it is acceptable to state 'zero / 0' in Price Amount and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

- <Tax> composite
  PM suggested that 'UK' should be amended to 'GBP' in the notes section for the <Tax> composite. AI amended this during the meeting.

- <PriceDate> composite
  AI noted that this composite has relevance to eBooks however it is only 'required'. KL asked how measurers identify when a price has been superseded.

7. **Required, Mandatory and Expected**
   KL noted that this Group needs to specify what 'required', "expected" and 'mandatory' indicators mean in relation to the scheme.. AI agreed, noting that there are a lot of 'required' data elements though some of these are conditional. GW suggested that the language used within the PDEA grids and accompanying documentation could be revised / clarified. The Group agreed that this would need to be discussed with CH before any changes are made, to ascertain how the potential changes to the grid would affect the measuring process for the PDEA Accreditation Scheme.
   ACTION: KL to liaise with CH regarding the definition of / different uses for 'required' in the PDEA documentation to see what issues could arise if this wording is amended going forwards.

8. **Export-only titles**
   KL asked the Group whether export-only titles are in scope and should therefore be measured for the purpose of the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme. PM suggested that the answer to this question is simple – he noted that titles of this nature are exported outside of the UK and as such they are out of scope. He noted however that it is the responsibility of the publisher to make it clear that the title / edition is an export-only. GW agreed, noting that Market Rights should be used to express this. KW commented that this Group should nonetheless encourage publishers to send the same quality of metadata for export-only titles as they would / do for all other titles. He suggested that, for this reason, publishers should be informed that, if they do not label their export-only titles clearly then they will be measured alongside the rest of

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

their metadata for the purposes of the Scheme. The Group agreed. TH noted that publishers should already be incentivised to provide good metadata for their export-only books because of the effect this has on sales.

9. **Transition to the revised PDEA Scheme – timeline and start date**

KL informed the Group that this workshop is the last meeting to be held by the PDEA Review T&FWG before London Book Fair 2016 – the Group had originally discussed announcing the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme at the Fair. She suggested however that the revised Scheme is not yet at a stage where it can be announced. The Group agreed, noting that the announcement is likely to raise questions that the Group may not be able to answer at present. They also noted that supporting documentation regarding the revised PDEA Scheme, which interested parties should be referred to for further information, has not been produced as yet.

The Group agreed that the announcement about the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme will be far-reaching and that all aspects of the Scheme (i.e. all documentation and application forms, etc.) should be in place before it is made public. GW suggested that the announcement about this Scheme should not be connected to either London Book Fair or Frankfurt Book Fair since the press release could be swallowed up in the plethora of information at those times. The Group agreed, suggesting that the Scheme should be announced (if at all possible) before Frankfurt Book Fair 2016 followed by a presentation on the revised Scheme at BIC's Building a Better Business Seminar at London Book Fair 2017 – which will hopefully lead to a new wave of applications.

PM and AI noted that London and Frankfurt Book Fairs attract an international audience and would not be best placed for the announcement of a UK-focussed accreditation scheme such as this. AMB and KL noted that the revised PDEA Accreditation Scheme could be announced at BIC's New Trends in Publishing Seminar in September 2016, or else an entirely new event could be formed for the announcement.

10. **Print on Demand (POD)**

Following the Group's earlier discussions (see Pages 2-3 and 6 of these minutes), KL asked the Group what should be done to resolve the POD issue. GW suggested that BIC should liaise with trade publishers (including Faber & Faber and Bellow), The Publishers Association, retailers and printers (including Printondemand-worldwide) to bridge the gap between this Group and the POD & Short Run T&FWG and to obtain further feedback / other perspectives on this matter. The Group agreed that further feedback is required. KL suggested that those targeted could be invited to the next meeting of this Group to provide their feedback and join the discussion.

ACTION: KL to liaise with trade publishers, retailers and printers (as outlined above) to obtain feedback about the timeframe for POD timeliness. Those approached should be invited to attend the next workshop of this Group to participate in the discussion.

ACTION: KL to include this topic as an Item on the agenda of the next meeting.

METADATA
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

11. A.O.B

KL suggested that the following should be addressed on the agenda for the next workshop:

- Nielsen to confirm how they measure metadata for the purpose of this Scheme
- Project deliverables
- eBook data elements (to be measured)
- How to measure and combine / compare scores
- Deferral process

12. Date of the next workshop

The Group agreed that holding another workshop to continue discussions about the revision of the PDEA accreditation scheme would be beneficial. They suggested that a half-day workshop should be arranged to take place after London Book Fair 2016.

The next workshop will take place on Wednesday 11th May 2016.