EDItX International Steering Committee Minutes

Wednesday 15th March 2017, 9:15-10:15 GMT (UTC+0), The Dark Room, Olympia, London

Attendees:
Luc Audrain (Hachette Livre)  Brian O’Leary (BISG)
Graham Bell (EDItEUR, chair)  Christer Perslöv (Bokinfo)
Phil Blanchard (Hachette)  Suzanne Rozario (EDItEUR)
Maria Börman (Bokinfo)  Chris Saynor (EDItEUR)
Francis Cave (Consultant)  Ketil Stadskleiv (Bokbasen)
Tim Devenport (EDItEUR)  Tim Wilson (Hachette)
Karina Luke (BIC)

1. Welcome and introductions

CS opened the meeting and reminded attendees of the aims of the Steering Committee and its meetings are to guide EDItEUR in future developments of the various EDItX message standards – in this it is similar to the established ONIX and Thema committees. GB noted that EDItX had been around for a decade, but the dozen or so defined messages have so far seen only limited adoption in a few countries and development has been ad hoc. The Sales and Sales Tax report is the most widely used, in its XML and flat file versions.

2. Selection of a chair for the Steering Committee

CS called for selection of a chair for the Committee. GB noted that FC had chaired the first meeting, for which many thanks, but that it would be better if the Committee were chaired more formally by an attendee who is not an EDItEUR staff member in order to provide a level of independence.

LA volunteered, and was accepted as Chair for a three year term, without objection. GB and CS handed running of the remainder of the meeting to LA.

3. Minutes of last meeting, and matters arising

LA introduced the minutes of the meeting held at the 2016 Frankfurt Book Fair, which marked the creation of the Committee. KL asked for a correction relating to the joint creation of EDItX by EDItEUR, BISG and BIC, and this will be corrected. Subject to this correction, the minutes were approved.

4. Report on current EDItX activities

CS introduced his report, noting that the main activity has been work on documentation of the Sales and Sales Tax report, including creation of an expanded HTML version of the Specification which will be similar to the ONIX Specification. It will include for example a full list of codes, a sample message, a glossary and so on. This will, when accepted, be made available on the EDItEUR website. Work has also begun on separating the codelists from the main part of the Specification (and from the message schema XSD).

EDITeUR will work on updating documentation for the other messages at the guidance of this committee.

CS asked what development priorities should be tackled after the Sales and Sales Tax report, noting inventory, trade orders/returns, library orders, and CDF form four ‘families’ of messages. CP noted that Bokinfo uses the trade orders message, but that requirements are stable and are not in need of development in the short term – however, documentation improvements would be welcome. He also noted that publishers in the UK were not aware of the possibilities for EDItX sales reporting. GB noted that
awareness and adoption is certainly limited, and where there are specific publishers who would benefit, EDItEUR may be able to use its contacts to raise awareness of EDItX. He also noted that the available documentation in the past has been in summary form, which made adoption a little more difficult. FC recalled that EDItX was created at a time when there were few XML-based alternatives for business messages. But it is only worth implementing XML messages where the requirements go beyond the functions provided by a range of existing non-XML solutions (Tradacoms, EDIFACT, X.12 etc). In more recent years, the market has changed, and while sector-specific XML such as EDItX still has advantages, there are other XML alternatives too – GS1, UBL may be more attractive for entrants from outside the book industry. LA reported that the French supply chain encourages digital sales reporting via EDItX. He said that if work on EDItX started now, it would most likely be couched in terms of defining APIs rather than messages – although FC pointed out that as with BIC Realtime, API payloads may still be EDItX-like.

GB noted that there is a clear distinction in EDItX between reports (Sales and Inventory) and transactional messages. KL described the relationship between EDItX and BIC Realtime. There are 19 Realtime APIs, many of which are based directly on transactional EDItX messages – as FC described, it covers some areas where traditional EDI (Tradacoms, in the UK) is weaker, for example real-time price and availability requests or CDF orders. KL stressed that BIC wanted to ensure there was no divergence between the Realtime APIs and the equivalent EDItX messages where the Realtime API request or response encapsulates an EDItX message fragment.

LA asked whether developments of the EDItX Sales and Inventory reports would have a knock-on effect for the EDItX transactional messages. GB replied that there would be no significant impact.

CS summarised the proposed areas of development as separation of the EDItX codelists from the main documentation (and from the main XSD), and the introduction of language-independent codes similar in style to ONIX and Thema rather than the English language keywords currently used. FC noted that the tags themselves (rather than the codes) would remain as English words.

FC broadened the discussion, suggesting that the Committee should look at the business models within which EDItX can be used. CS said that there is a clear need to develop the Inventory report for digital inventory (where really it is about ‘is this file on sale, or has it failed QA’), and a need to align parts of the report better with the product form section of ONIX. For the Sales report, there is a need to add flexibility on pricing, and align it with the various options that have been introduced in ONIX 3.0 (price IDs, price qualifiers, constraints and conditions, and maybe licence types). There is also a ‘device type’ in the Sales report, but it has no codelist.

TW related that Hachette had compared EDItX with Hachette’s own sales reporting specification, and noted that the development of device type would be beneficial. He also noted a requirement to mark some report lines as ‘subscription sales’, but PB explained the details here would need to be worked out (a ‘subscription sale’ triggered by a subscriber reading the second chapter of a book via (eg) Scribd is a more or less normal sale to Scribd, and the fact that it is made available to Scribd’s subscriber may not be relevant to the publisher). KS noted that Bokbasen would likely want something similar from subscription operators.

LA asked how such development would be progressed. Would EDItEUR look at the options and propose a number of developments? KL asked whether national groups would be formed? GB and CS suggested that EDItEUR would most likely progress requirements gathering over the remainder of the year, develop concrete proposals at the end of the year and form a Technical Working Group to discuss and possibly approve them. There is no need at this stage for formal national groups – interested stakeholders are welcome at this EDItX committee.

LA asked whether the group had any other clear requirements. GB noted that the group and EDItEUR should prioritise Sales and Inventory reporting developments, but the group is free to raise issues with any of the other messages too.
5. **Updates on adoption**

FC reported that German use of the Inventory report for consignment sales is significant. The order/order response and CDF transactional messages are used widely. LA also reported use of the EDItX Sales report in Germany (eg from Tolino, though their messages do not currently validate correctly).

GB noted the existence of a small group of Library order messages, but neither GB nor FC is aware of actual adoption. FC said that BIC may develop some API standards for library messaging, prompted by the Realtime developments.

GB reported use of some EDItX messages in Booknet Canada’s APIs (which are not based on BIC Realtime but carry similar payloads). There is also significant use of BISG’s simplified flat file version of the Sales and Sales Tax Report message.

LA reported on French development of messages for digital library lending within the PNB system, which did not look at EDItX. KS said APIs for digital lending are currently being developed by Bokbasen. FC noted that EDItX does not have any particular message for reporting on library lending – the existing drafts are about library orders.

6. **Any other business**

PB asked about retailer adoption. GB replied that there is little information available, although of course, existing message exchanges inevitably do include retailers. KL said that the BIC website plans include a capability grid, though GB advised that it is difficult or impossible to keep such grids up to date (he cited the ONIX grid on the EDItEUR website and a similar list kept by BISG). LA suggested there could be a similar grid for EDItX in the future.

7. **Next meeting**

Will be around 9am on the first day of the Frankfurt Book Fair (Wed 11th October 2017).

Graham Bell  
EDItEUR  
15/3/17