

BIC PRICE AND AVAILABILITY TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP (T&FWG)

Location: GoToMeeting/ Conference Call

Date and time: Thursday 31st January 2019, 2pm

Minutes taken by: Katherine Andrews

Present

Katherine Andrews, BIC
 Matthew Hogg, Macmillan
 Lada Kriz, Penguin Random House
 John Moffatt, Nielsen
 Karen Osterley, Pearson
 Karina Urquhart, BIC
 Gabrielle Wallington, Waterstones (Chair)

Apologies

George Bogdanovic, Bertram's
 James Bensburg, Egmont
 Vickie Clegg, Penguin Random House
 Liam Diggins, Ingram Content Group
 John Garrould, Bertram's
 Katarina Isufati, Coutts / ProQuest
 John Leith, HarperCollins
 Stephen Sharrock, Simon & Schuster
 Simon Skinner, BDS
 Peter Skone, Penguin Random House
 Jack Tipping, Bowker

1. Welcome & apologies

The Group was welcomed to the meeting and the apologies were delivered. It was noted that Matt Griffin of the Little, Brown Book Group and Andy Williams of Thames & Hudson have both now resigned from this Group.

2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder <http://tiny.cc/6ph28x>

The Group was reminded about BIC's Competition Law Policy – for more information regarding this policy, click here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>

3. Review of the minutes and follow-up on actions from the previous meeting

- **ONGOING ACTION:** GW to create summary documentation on all the recommendations to date (almost like a Q&A).
- **ONGOING ACTION:** KU to invite KO to the next meeting of the BIC Print on Demand (POD) & Short Run Task & Finish Working Group.
- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** GW to add the following to her summary document: "The Discount Group Code (DGC) will need to be entered into the organisation's internal structure and feeds."

4. Ascertaining what organisations do with titles that haven't changed in 8 years or more

GW agreed that organisations are no longer required to keep informing metadata recipients that they no longer stock an item after said item has been out of stock for 12 months. However historical data (for items that have been out of stock for more than 12 months) frequently still turns up in the full Price & Availability (P&A) feeds given to aggregators. This Group is working on guidelines to help publishers realise that they do not have to include all historical data in their P&A feeds. This will help with not overloading the feeds to data aggregators unnecessarily.

JM and KO have worked on a draft document of the definition of “full load, and this has been revised and re-circulated. The revised document was read out by GW and agreed upon by the Group.

- ❖ **DECISION:** JM and KO’s document of definitions of “full load” to be incorporated into the documentation being put together by GW.

JM and GW’s definitions of “full load” were as follows:

- Distributors

A full load should include all active titles and everything that has become inactive (because it is no longer available, or you no longer distribute it or it has been cancelled) in the past 12 months. It should not include anything that has been inactive for more than 12 months. For divested products or publishers no longer being represented, we would recommend that the availability is reported at line level using TRADACOMS List 54 value RF (‘refer to other publisher or distributor’) or ONIX code list 65 value 43 (‘no longer supplied by us’).

All forthcoming titles that have been previously supplied should also be included. Unless by prior arrangement, the full load should be delivered via your normal electronic file format.

- Publishers

A full load from a publisher should contain all active titles. Anything that has become inactive in the last two years should be included and all forthcoming titles that have been previously supplied (regardless of territory pricing or market rights changes) should be included. Publishers should ensure that they provide as full product information as possible for all areas of the record including descriptive content.

Unless by prior arrangement, the full load should be delivered via your normal electronic file format. Full loads should ideally be sent by arrangement between the sender and recipient.

GW reported that if Nielson have not heard about a particular product for a rolling 8 years then they automatically assign it the ONIX code “no recent update”. Even if nothing has changed in terms of an organisation’s pricing and availability it should be recommended that they regularly confirm it with Nielsen to avoid mislabelling. The Group agreed that this advice should go into GW’s summary documents.

- **ACTION:** GW to include a recommendation in her summary documentation to encourage data providers to confirm their data regularly with aggregators, even if there have been no changes.

5. Expressing more than 1 relationship in Price and Availability (P&A) feeds using the <RelatedProduct> composite in ONIX

KU confirmed that more than one relationship can indeed be expressed in ONIX 3.0 using the <RelatedProduct> composite (using Product Relationship code list 51). EDItEUR’s “ONIX for Books 3.0.5 Specification + Guide + Codelists Issue 45” states that this composite is “An optional group of data elements which together describe a product which has a specified relationship to the

product described in the ONIX record. The composite is repeatable in order to specify different products which each have a relationship to the product described.”

The Group were grateful for GB’s feedback with regards the following question: *Is it possible for P&A feeds from distributors make use of, (or are even able to make use of) the information contained in ONIX relating to RelatedProduct at all?*

GB’s response was: “If the P&A feed is an ONIX 3.0 block update, then I see no reason why not — just include Block 5 along with Block 6. You could even send Block 5 only (a related product update). In ONIX 2.1 or 3.0 you could of course send a full record update at any time. In TRADACOMS and EDIFACT, I don’t think you can.”

6. Review documentation on BIC Discount Group Codes (DGC)

KU showed the Changing an Existing Discount workflow on screen.

- **ACTION:** KU to recirculate this workflow to the Group.

Several errors were noted in the documentation.

- **ACTION:** GW to amend details where “digit” has been used where “publisher” would be better. GW also to re-write the comments section and remove the invalid “APUB09” note.
- **ACTION:** GW to investigate if the box labelled “Recipient (customer) specific” in the notes section is required.

It was noted that there have been issues with publishers not understanding the DGC process. An example was given of Publisher X only sending aggregators their terms codes and not realising they also need to send their matrices. GW stated that she feels the current DGC documentation is too technical for beginners.

- **ACTION:** GW to review the current DGC documentation for errors and excessive technicality, then recirculate it.
- **ACTION:** KO’s junior colleague and KA to act as test users and read and amend GW’s revised document to provide a beginner’s perspective.

This Group needs to find a different way of presenting the matrices so they show each customer individually instead of all the customers in one.

- **ACTION:** GW to clarify the matrix descriptions on the third scenario.
- **ACTION:** GW to clarify the final box starting “Customers received” in the third column of last scenario on flow chart.

GW stated that the BIC DGC website page needs to be revised in terms of DGC and would also benefit from a section on alternative ways of providing price and information e.g. personalised price feeds. KU agreed and added that there should be links to all 5 standards of personalised pricing.

- **ACTION:** Test users to look over the current DGC page on the BIC website and provide a beginner’s perspective to KU and GW by 1st March.
- **ACTION:** GW and KU to look at the above website issues based on the test users’ feedback.
- **ACTION:** ALL to look over KU and GW’s website edits when completed and provide feedback.

7. Discussing DGC matrices

How a matrix should look and how often it should be maintained is currently a missing component from the DGC page and needs to be incorporated.

- **ACTION:** GW to make recommendations to this group for discussion of what a matrix should look like and how often it should be maintained.

8. Update on the work of the BIC Print on Demand (POD) Task & Finish Working Group regarding the use of P&A availability codes for POD / ASR purposes

There was no update, as the project has not yet resumed.

- **ACTION CARRIED OVER:** BIC POD & Short Run T&FWG to resume and finalise the work on guidelines for the use of P&A availability codes for POD / ASR purposes.

9. Agreeing next steps for the project

- ❖ **DECISION:** Test users to provide feedback on BIC website page by Friday 1st March 2019.
- ❖ **DECISION:** GW to complete her actions and the summary document within 3 months of this meeting.
- ❖ **DECISION:** This Group should be signing off on everything in the next meeting, until then we need time to provide each other with feedback and subsequent changes where necessary.
- ❖ **DECISION:** Out of Print (OP) needs its own T&FWG.

10. A.O.B.

The Group did not have any other business to discuss.

11. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 4th June 2019.