EDItX International Steering Committee Minutes

Wednesday 11th April 2018, 9:15-10:00 GMT (UTC+0),
The Dark Room, Olympia, London

Attendees:

Luc Audrain (Hachette Livre) Chair
Graham Bell (EDItEUR, chair)
Maria Börman (Bokinfo)
Francis Cave (Consultant)
Brian O'Leary (BISG)
Karine Pansa (CBL)

Christer Perslöv (Bokinfo)
Johanna Roden (Bokinfo)
Chris Saynor (EDItEUR)
Ketil Stadskleiv (Bokbasen)
Karina Urquhart (BIC)

(apologies from Bibi Setayesh (MVB))

1. **Welcome and introductions** [Chair]

   LA opened the meeting, welcomed the attendees and reminded them of the aims of the Steering Committee.

2. **Minutes of last meeting held 11th October 2017, and matters arising** [Chair]

   LA introduced the minutes of the meeting held at the 2017 Frankfurt Book Fair, which was the second meeting of the committee. There were no comments, and the minutes were approved.

3. **Report on current EDItX activities** [CS]

   CS introduced his report (separate document). His primary activity had been to work on improved documentation for the specification of the EDItX Sales/Sales Tax Report format. This was being updated to HTML format (similar to the format used for the HTML version of the ONIX *Specification*). He anticipated this and the EDItX Inventory Report format specification would be finished and ready for approval at the next meeting. He noted that the intention would be to abstract the codelists from the documentation and make them available separately, so that they can more easily be updated.

   CS noted that the Inventory Report had two new elements, <EpubInventoryStatus> which will use the new code list – Inventory Status type that was agreed at the Frankfurt meeting. Plus, a new tag of <EpubInventoryNote>. He also noted that the Inventory Report could now use values from ONIX code list 44 as well as the existing EDItX codelists. The final update to the Inventory Report was to allow for use of ONIX code lists 150 and 175 in product form.

   GB noted that any updated documentation will be sent to the members of the ISC for approval before they are released publicly.

   CS then went on to report that the Sales and Sales Tax report formats were being reviewed in regard to the way price information is sent in ONIX 3.0, so that these reports can contain the same information.

   LA asked if this would include the latest updates to ONIX 3.0.4 – epub licences and price part description. GB confirmed these would be included.

   LA said that anything that can be reported in the business models sent in ONIX 3.0 should be reportable in the Sales /Sales Tax reports.

CS also confirmed that the Sales /Sales Tax report were being reviewed to align with the business models that can be sent in ONIX 3.0.4 and listed all the elements from ONIX 3.04 that could be used in the Sales / Sales tax reports. Specifically, for the Tax report he highlighted the two new elements that were added to ONIX 3.0.4 in the Tax element, Product Identifier, that was added for the German market and Price Part Description, that was added for the French market.

FC mentioned that he was reviewing the BIC Realtime and Library Web Services in the U.K. for update and that there is definitely a need to use the ONIX 3.0 price structures but he noted that the relationship between EDItX and ONIX 3.0 messages is not straightforward and it is very important that the different efforts to updated the EDItX messages and BIC Realtime should be coordinated and that eventual updates to the EDItX Sales /Sales Tax messages using ONIX 3.0 pricing information should also be reflected in all the other EDItX messages, so that these can cascade down into the BIC Realtime and Library Web Services formats.

GB noted that EDItEUR had started with Sales / Sales Tax report but any changes to align with ONIX 3.0 messages would then be looked at for all the other EDItX messages.

FC noted that if they came up with an updated way of doing pricing in Sales / Sales Tax this would then slot into the other reports.

LA asked if there is going to be a synchronisation between the schema for ONIX 3.0 and EDItX so that if something is updated in ONIX 3.0 it can be updated in EDItX.

GB noted that if we choose this option you could end up with the situation that all the messages are one big message and so if a requirement is updated in one, it has to be updated in all. It could have a modular approach, as in 'this is the way we express price', 'this is the way we express name and address', etc, but it would mean all messages have to be updated and that it will only be possible to do backward compatible updates and not new versions. This would add a lot of complexity every time an update was done.

LA asked for clarification if this meant making the existing ONIX 3.0 message modular so that it could be the 'source' message for the others. GB confirmed it would have to be the case. This 'one giant schema' approach would be very inflexible in practice.

LA then asked if the updated schemas for Sales / Sales Tax reports would use the relevant parts of the ONIX 3.0.4 schemas to validate the new ONIX price elements that would be integrated into the EDItX messages rather than making a reference to the ONIX 3 schema. GB said this would be the approach EDItEUR would take which would mean that they would not necessarily need to be all updated at the same time.

FC said for historical reasons the pricing structure in EDItX and ONIX are different, so you cannot just copy the ONIX 3.0 structure into EDItX and maintain backward compatibility. Otherwise you would need two alternative ways to send price to maintain backward compatibility, but this will add complexity for data receivers. There is not an ideal solution, we need to find a way of fitting the ONIX 3.0 pricing structures into EDItX in such a way that when there are future updates of ONIX 3.0 it is easier to make these updates to EDItX. The initial update of the message will be harder but then this will make updates easier in the future. GB said that there are elements in EDItX at the moment that are different to ONIX 3.0 so that it would not be just a straight copy across but that in the future, if certain elements of EDItX are deprecated this will allow the ONIX 3.0 and EDItX messages to converge to the same structures. For now, the idea is that they should be as similar as possible.

LA asked what the steps are to move towards the position when there are straight copies of modules and has this process been started? GB confirmed that this process is starting with the updates of the messages, but it will not be a one-step change.

CS asked what the Committee thought the priorities should be for EDItEUR between London and Frankfurt. KS said they worked a lot with the library business and had to deal with complex licensing

information in ONIX 3.0 and he was looking forward to seeing how this would work in an updated Sales / Sales Tax report. He also expressed a hope that publishers in the U.K. would start accepting EDItX reports, instead of customised csv files. When the updated Sales / Sales Tax Reports can handle complex library licences linked to price then the next message to look at should be Orders. He also noted that there is a danger if we only update one message and leave the others lagging behind. GB asked KS if he meant the library order message or the trade order message. KS confirmed that as they already had an API for the trade order it would be this message.

CS asked CP what messages were being used in Sweden. CP said Trade orders and Order response were used and confirmed Trade Order would be the most important for them.

FC noted that for BIC they want to maintain the match between BIC Realtime messages and EDItX messages. The Trade Order message was not much used yet in the U.K. but that it is important that this remains in step with the ONIX 3.0 messages and updates to other EDItX messages. GB noted they were already slightly out of step as the ONIX 3.0 catalogue information not reflected in EDItX and that all the messages have to be eventually updated and brought into step with ONIX 3.0 but there would be a period when some messages were still only using the older versions. FC noted that the current work in BIC is on the Library Web Services. GB noted that we must pay attention to the versioning and for the BIC Realtime messages that encapsulate EDItX messages how the Realtime envelope would encapsulate the versioning. FC said this would only be the case with Invoices and Credit Notes.

BL noted that EDItX not much used in US market yet but companies such as Barnes & Noble are looking at ways of revamping how they interact with publishers. Some Booksellers in US are looking at options and so there may be an opportunity to raise the profile of EDItX in the US market as an alternative. GB noted it was not new to the US as the Sales / Sales Tax Report formats exist as flat file formats and are used by some already in the USA.

FC noted that resistance to use of the structured message might be due to the limited knowledge in certain organisations, so it might be good to offer a JSON version as well if organisations already had skill sets around JSON. GB noted it is being considered as EDItX, unlike ONIX, has limited xml attributes so it is fairly simple to create a JSON message. The downside of this is the schema validation of JSON is not good, so a user would not be able to tell if their file was fully valid. Maybe could do a sample message in JSON.

LA asked if GB meant JSON or JSON-LD and GB said he would prefer to do a JSON-LD sample. GB noted that many APIs are built using REST with a lightweight JSON, so having an example of an EDItX message in JSON would show another way, as long as it has the same data and has the same semantics, the syntax is less important. He noted the only difficulty with JSON is testability.

LA asked that along with the updated schema, sample files using the new schema should also be made. He also asked what the timetable was for updating the messages, was there any urgency. GB noted it was up to the group to decide this. LA asked the group what they thought. KU noted that the BIC Library Web Services project had to be finished by the end of December 2018. KS said that they were signing new library contracts with UK publishers so testing a new Sales / Sales tax Report message with complex library pricing would be good for them. LA suggested that the Frankfurt Book fair would be a good time to publish updated reports. GB agreed that for Inventory / Sales / Sales tax report this should be reasonable but probably not for Trade Orders.

4. Updates on adoptions from user groups

LA asked for updates. KP said she was there as an observer from Brazil. KP said that the EDItX trade order message was the most common one in Sweden. They are looking at Order Response and planning to start implementing it. KS said Trade Order fairly widely used in Norway along with some use of Sales Report. There are plans for trying to use these in the library space.

FC main focus in UK is on the BIC API's both for trade and in library supply. There is a lot of interest in aligning library web services with EDItX, there is also interest in Price and Availability which is more linked to ONIX messages. There is a lot of interest in UK library sector to create API's with the various messages based on a single standard. LA said Hachette has a few retailers that already send sales reports in EDItX messages, plus they are asking publishers what needs to be added to EDItX Sales report.

GB asked LA if there was evidence that using EDItX with the small group of retailers was more cost effective and efficient? LA said it had saved them development time and Hachette can ask smaller retailers to use a standard. They are also talking to Gallimard to see where there is a divergence in their EDItX sales reports messages.

FC added to the report from UK that in connection with the Library web services project they had been in contact with NISO about a library project called FASTEN which is a project looking at standard API messages for libraries in USA, not as developments but so they can recommend them. BIC hopes that some of their Library Web Services might be recommended and FC said there may be some opportunity for EDItX messages here. LA asked if FC could talk more about the BIC API's at a future meeting so that if a European country was interested in creating API's for EDItX they would not be starting from scratch. FC said that there were already existing NISO standards for libraries and these could be the ones that the project FASTEN recommends.

GB said that the BIC API's already exist, so a European country which wanted to create its own API's could look at these. LA asked if the BIC Realtime specifications were free to use and GB confirmed they were free to use. LA said it was important that this information was made available to European countries, so they would know they do not need to start from scratch and communication of this information is vital.

.

5. **Any other business** [Chair]

   There was no other business.

6. **Next meeting** [Chair]

   Will be at 9:15am on the second day of the Frankfurt Book Fair (Wed 10th October 2018).

<div align="right">
Chris Saynor
EDItEUR
24/09/18
</div>