

# ICEDIS Meeting at Frankfurt Book Fair

Hotel Bristol, Ludwigstrasse 15, Frankfurt am Main  
Monday 6<sup>th</sup> October 2014

---

## Minutes

### 1. Welcome and introductions

- a. Shilo de Vries chaired the meeting with Dan Heffernan taking minutes.
- b. Shilo welcomed participants, who each introduced themselves. See the list of attendees and apologies for absence at the end of this document.
- c. Tim Devenport talked about the situation at Swets, who had recently announced filing for bankruptcy. Tim wanted to go on record as saying that despite things like this that happen in our competitive markets, Swets has been a big supporter of EDItEUR and ICEDIS over the years. We especially want to wish our friends Ramon Schrama, Bill Hoffman, and Nico Dickhoff the best in their future endeavors. We thank them for their work, especially Ramon, who was co-chair of ICEDIS for a number of years. Ramon & Nico both sent along their greetings through Tim. This announcement at the beginning of renewal season puts more work on all.

### 2. Minutes & actions from previous meeting (UKSG Harrogate, April 2014)

- a. **Tim** will have the Payment Reconciliation Document up on the website later this week.
- b. The minutes of the Harrogate meeting were accepted.

### 3. Next-generation ICEDIS messaging formats

- a. The survey sent out to all members has been open since 1 September.
  - i. There are 15 usable responses so far – not a big number, but it represents a large percentage of ICEDIS members.
  - ii. Tim would like to broaden the base a bit by chasing some other members to respond.
  - iii. Agencies, Publishers, Vendors, and other players (NISO, Ringgold) are all represented in the 15 responses.
  - iv. As a result of the survey, we were able to update the records of standards implementation around this table.
  - v. 93% of responders are using the ORT (Order, Renewal, Transfer) for renewals
  - vi. 71% are using the AES (advice on existing subscription) message
  - vii. 64% are using ORT for new orders also
  - viii. 43% are using ORT and end-user address
  - ix. 29% are exchanging IP addresses and 36% other e-credentials or info using ORT together with the IP Address and e-Journals optional records as appropriate

- x. 21% are doing EDIFACT claims
- b. Most responders are satisfied with the existing standards.
- c. Adoption of newer standards in XML is more limited, though a number plan to implement these.
- d. ONIX-PC is getting the most traction.
- e. No big surprises in the “most difficult” section, where these are listed in order of difficulty to automate:
  - i. Negotiated deals
  - ii. Customized pricing
  - iii. Identifying the customer
  - iv. Address matching and uploading
  - v. APCs
- f. Factors that might influence changes
  - i. Creates efficiency in your operations – high
  - ii. Improvements in service for your customer
  - iii. Reduction of your costs
  - iv. Widespread uptake in the industry – this is critical. (A telephone is only useful if there are at least two of them!)
- g. Possible impact of endorsement scheme
  - i. Fairly strong “yes” answers in encouraging interactions with trading partners.
  - ii. Shilo: it’s hard to get the business to get the funding and resources to make these changes. Accreditation can help encourage adoption.
  - iii. Graham Bell: there is more widespread practice of accreditation in the book world (e.g. the BIC and ONIX schemes). Graham mentioned that, in a previous management position, he had found getting silver level accreditation was a useful device for securing a valuable annual discussion with his CEO!
  - iv. Tim asked for input from the floor. Silence.
  - v. Shilo asked about downside to accreditation. Silence.
  - vi. Tim suggested that a first draft of an accreditation scheme might be useful in crystallizing our position.
  - vii. Henning: said that just advocating that we move to newer standards is not enough. It really needs some good business arguments. With ONIX-PC it was the mess with Excel spreadsheets – now these processes are faster and easier using the standard.
  - viii. Dominic asked how much the new standards will address the top two points above (efficiency and improvements in customer service)? Tim answered, but agreed that we haven’t been able to say exactly how much it will save in terms of time savings or error reductions.
- h. What might help from EDItEUR’s side?
  - i. Wide communication within the industry was the highest. We are aware that we need to communicate better.
  - ii. Better documentation addresses all the other items.
- i. Help in shaping new standards and advocate changes – 67% responded “yes” to this.

- j. Organization prepared to commit to new standards? 50%+ said “yes.”
- k. Must have some long-term planning so organizations have time to prepare.
- l. Tim: we’re not sure we have the level of buy-in and commitment in the ICEDIS group that we need!
  - i. EDItEUR can do the work, but only if the group commits to get actively involved
  - ii. The membership must bear the pain but will also reap the benefits
  - iii. Went around the room to let all give their input:
    1. Dan (Advantage): We need to have our clients push this up the list on our roadmap
    2. Annette (Harrasowitz) – would like to automate more and wishes to implement other standards in next two years.
    3. Greta (Wiley): we are committed but currently have organizational issues. She described Wiley as “94% committed.”
    4. Hiro (Kinokuniya) – Hiro: very important topic. Kinokuniya is addressing lots of system issues and so are not actively involved right now in implementing new standards; but if the right time and opportunity comes, they like to adopt. Keeping eye on progress.
    5. Seija (LM Info) – always have been committed, but situation with Swets has changed priorities a bit. Their resources are limited and IT priorities are going to be on that issue for a while. They have put a lot of effort into ONIX-PC.
    6. Bettina (EBSCO) – resources are limited and priorities have changed. If there is a demand from publisher partners, then they will move forward. If there is demand from just a few, then they would have to analyze further.
    7. Dominic (NPG/Macmillan) – limited development resources and need to get a better sense of cost benefits to push it up the development list. Must make business case for it. Accreditation would be a useful encouragement. If ICEDIS membership could help give a sense for operational efficiencies realized (without compromising competitive information) it would help.
    8. Henning and Iris (Springer) – we have always been committed to adopting ICEDIS standards. Have already launched ONIX-PC and have already noticed improvements in various internal workflows.
    9. Shilo (T&F) – always been committed. But in same position as other publishers – limited resources, is it cost-effective, how does it benefit the business? APCs, for example, are higher on the priority list.
    10. Graham (EDItEUR): coming from the books world, it’s really helpful to have a very clear roadmap. Taking a step-by-step approach is good, but you need to know what the next steps are. Each step may be difficult to justify, though the whole roadmap is perhaps easier to justify.

- a. EDItEUR can do what it can do, but they can't do the work for the ICEDIS members.
  - b. A couple of things to bear in mind:
    - i. Value of retiring old standards – using old software which may be costing you money in terms of maintenance. So don't overlook the cost savings of moving off older standards and technologies.
    - ii. Don't underestimate the timescales. We are in the middle of the move from ONIX for Books 2.1 to 3.0. It has taken 5 years to get to this stage. Phasing out the older versions takes a long time, and it is difficult to support both.
11. Gaelle (ISSN International Centre): libraries have been using older formats, primarily MARC, and are moving to RDA. They encountered the same problems – a few libraries are ahead of the field and implement new standards. Other libraries find it difficult to translate into their own languages or situations. There is some talk about improving the governance of RDA so the libraries can feel more a part of the changes proposed. Vendors wait for the request from their library customers.
  12. Todd (NISO): the factors mentioned round the table apply to any standard (revising it and moving it forward). The new methodology has to be faster, more efficient, or cheaper. There should be a subgroup which is working on that question – how will this improve the standard? That is, “we're trying to solve this problem, and here's why it will benefit you to implement it.” It will benefit everyone in the group if a couple of people invest the time to explain the benefits.
  13. **Tim** will set up an informal subgroup to identify and better explain the benefits in prospect.

#### **4. ONIX-PC (ONIX for Price Catalog)**

- a. Had an informal catch-up call during August with those implementing or planning to implement. This was a pretty lively session. Lots of activity from publishers who've implemented standard. T&F, Wiley, Springer, and Elsevier are all producing the files in one form or another. Various agents are accepting the standard, including LM and previously, Swets. Harrasowitz are working with Springer on test files. Still some issues validating file against schema, but working at both ends to resolve this. Springer is making some changes to its file generation routines.
- b. Springer will send sample files to Kinokuniya.
- c. Tim proposes to hold a similar call every couple of months to measure progress if participants wish.
- d. Tim would like to get Sage Publications and Cambridge University Press into the fold, possibly with the support of their shared system vendor Publishing Technology.

- e. Future training workshops – Tim would like to do something in the US and will investigate possibilities in Charleston.

**5. Guest presentation: Henning Schoenenberger (Springer)**

- a. Henning thanked ICEDIS for the invitation to speak. He gave an informal and very interesting insight into his and Springer’s approaches to questions of metadata and standards.
- b. Henning is responsible for metadata at Springer. He ranged briefly over various topics.
  - a. ISSN. Not just Springer, but also T&F and Wiley are in the same situation. Growing more and more into the open access business. Journal articles often get published before they are assigned to a specific journal issue. As a recognized multinational publisher, Springer is able to request nearly all their ISSNs from the Frankfurt ISSN center, which is a considerable simplification. Also not tied to specific journal/issue. Standards bodies should look at the companies to see the needs. Workflows get faster, and workflow changes get faster. He wonders if there need to be discrete version changes – how about constant changes of metadata standards? There is always a need for change.
  - b. MARC records – this is more from the book side. Is MARC dead? Still almost 25% of Windows users are using XP, which is not supported anymore! MARC records are 50 years old. Still they basically work. By looking at download figures, they can see that these are really used. Springer puts a lot of effort into these. They are also looking at newer standards, of course. But there is still a lot of demand there.
  - c. ONIX, especially ONIX-PC. ONIX is a major topic of the future. ONIX-PC should be renamed ONIX “Product Catalog” rather than “Price Catalog.” The movement toward Open Access is important. Packages/combinations also need to be covered by ONIX-PC. [Tim notes that packages/combinations are already supported by the standard.] The trade on the one hand, and libraries on the other need standards. ONIX-PC could be a format for ingesting and exchanging journal/serial data.
  - d. Next-generation ICEDIS standards. Henning doesn’t simply “believe” in anything. Springer has business interests. They want to publish content from their authors. Development may be dead (as in the case of MARC records), but there can still be demand. On the other hand, the technology is outdated. We should go in the direction of XML. He thinks we need some good business cases – cost-saving, more efficient, less error-prone, etc. Let’s find a sufficient number of participants. Not just agents and publishers, we need a larger group. The Autumn 2015 sunset date originally proposed seems early. However, the more versions he supports the more inconsistencies! Support costs money.

## **6. Guest presentation: Gaelle Bequet (ISSN International Centre)**

Gaelle reminded us of the central missions of the ISSN International Centre in Paris, before moving on to highlight various recent initiatives, including the ROAD project and the special arrangements recently devised for multinational publishers to deal with just one national agency to obtain and maintain their ISSNs. A copy of her very useful briefing is circulated along with these minutes.

## **7. Pilot exchanges of ICEDIS New Orders and other newer standards**

XML versions of New Orders and Claims/Responses messages are both ready to pilot. Please contact Tim if you would like to help with this.

## **8. ICEDIS Open Access Working Group**

- a. Tim convened a group and an Initial conference call took place in August. What we had in mind as a group was to answer these questions:
  - a. Whether or not there is a groundswell to change existing messages to take into account open access?
  - b. There'd been a lot of discussion about APCs – is the time right to try to set up a standard for transactions for APCs?
  - c. Are there other areas of interest that could benefit from a standards-based approach?
- b. **Headline messages:**
  - a. Group was 15 people in the middle of summer – so quite good size.
  - b. When the call came around it was strangely silent.
  - c. Open access market is very volatile right now. Lots of experimentation going on. Lots of different models being tried out. Hesitation about getting involved in the “commercials.”
  - d. Players in this space were quite carefully guarding their competitive edge.
  - e. No appetite at all to set up a new APC standard at this time.
- c. **Henning:** lots of things not clear. Nothing much to hide, but this is about open access and we need to be open about it, too! With regard to APCs, he feels it would be worth looking at this again and keeping it under review.
- d. **Conclusion:** there should be an ongoing discussion of Open Access topics over the next 2-3 years. Still a lot of things needing to be finalized. ICEDIS should follow this discussion. There is also some synergy with ISSN, etc. Don't want whatever we do to be completely outside of ONIX-PC.
- e. There was much more support in the call for how to use ONIX-PC to support Open Access models. In the short term it is good to communicate some guidelines for handling open access.
- f. Graham agreed that modifying ONIX-PC would make good sense.
- g. Is ICEDIS on its own the right forum for mapping and understanding APC workflows? Tim thinks not.
- h. Two outlined initiatives: NISO “Access and Licensing Indicators” and JISC “Gold Open Access Infrastructure.”
- i. Springer & Wiley, both of whom have implemented ONIX-PC, indicated that they would be interested in participating in OA development of that standard.

Harrasowitz also said they would participate, since they are already trading with this standard. ISSN may also be interested.

- j. Annette (Harrasowitz) raised another aspect of Open Access. This relates to the emerging practice for hybrid OA journals to be priced based upon the percentages of OA and conventionally charged non-OA articles in some previous period. This practice, intended to demonstrate that publishers are avoiding so-called “double dipping”, needs to be supported in any future ONIX-PC modifications.
- k. **Tim** will set up another call, since the people in this meeting are not the same representation as those on the call.

#### **9. News from EDItEUR (Graham Bell)**

- a. Graham first introduced Alex Ingram, who has recently joined the EDItEUR team.
- b. ONIX for Books 2.1 to 3.0: have a formal sunset procedure for ONIX 2.1 – end of December this year. Nothing will stop working, as far as the messages go, but no more additions or enhancements will be made to 2.1 and active support for that version will cease. EDItEUR will provide some recommendations about doing v2.1 file validation locally, since it will (deliberately) no longer be possible to do that via the EDItEUR website.
- c. Migration to ONIX 3.0 is going well, depending on the countries. In Japan, for example, ONIX 2.1 is already gone. In Sweden, moved the entire industry in March over a weekend! US, UK, and Germany have been the most reluctant to move. Hundreds of publishers and thousands of recipients involved.
- d. Success story this year has been THEMA – the international subject classification system for trade books. BISAC is American. BIC is UK-based. There are other subject classifications in other countries. THEMA tries to be helpful in as many countries as possible. It’s already been adopted in the German Books in Print system, and other countries. Looking at working on Version 1.1. Various mappings and translations have been produced.
- e. Increasing level of engagement with the World Wide Web consortium (W3C). Online publishing people rely on identifiers, and the W3C doesn’t appear to place the same importance on the supporting metadata. We need to understand their metadata, but publishers shouldn’t have to maintain two entirely parallel sets of metadata. Need to be able to express different schema of metadata in different syntaxes.

#### **10. Related standards initiatives (Todd Carpenter, NISO)**

- a. Todd reported briefly on a few projects worth keeping under review.
- b. Open Access License indicators group – renamed Access and License Indicators now. Over 140 comments on the draft circulated earlier this year. This is in essence a tagging set: with two main tags: one specifies whether the content is open or more specifically, is it free to read? If so, the second tag provides a link to the relevant license. More details at: <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/ali/>
- c. NISO has recently published two recommended practices: KBART Phase II published in May and Open Discovery Initiative released in June. More details at: <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/kbart> and <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi>

- d. NISO is also taking over responsibility from UKSG group for Project Transfer <http://www.uksg.org/Transfer>. UKSG doesn't see its role in the community as maintaining this sort of thing. UKSG has also stepped back from KBART. NISO will be responsible for Transfer and KBART maintenance moving forward.
- e. Todd also mentioned a white paper on data quality recently published by OCLC, entitled Success Strategies for Electronic Content Discovery and Access. More details at: <http://oclc.org/go/en/econtent-access.html>
- f. NISO has been working on a significant project related to alternative metrics and new forms of assessment. Many publishers are interested in this. More details at: [http://www.niso.org/topics/tl/altmetrics\\_initiative/](http://www.niso.org/topics/tl/altmetrics_initiative/)

#### **11. Dates and venues of next two meetings**

The next two meetings of ICEDIS will be as follows:

ICEDIS North American Meeting & EDItEUR update, at Charleston Conference, 5th November 2014, 10:00-13:00, Holiday Inn Charleston Historic Downtown, 425 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC.

ICEDIS Meeting at UKSG, 1st April 2015, Glasgow, 13:30 - 16:30, venue details to be finalized.

**List of participants:**

Bettina Bartsch	EBSCO
Graham Bell	EDItEUR
Gaelle Bequet	ISSN International Centre
Greta Boonen	Wiley
Todd Carpenter	NISO
Tim Devenport	EDItEUR
Dan Heffernan	Advantage
Annette Hooss	Harrassowitz
Alex Ingram	EDItEUR
Hirotsu Kano	Kinokuniya
Seija Lappalainen	LM Information Delivery
Phil Nicolson	Ringgold
Iris Nord	Springer
Dominic Pettit	Macmillan (Nature Publishing Group)
Jouni Ruusinen	LM Information Delivery
Henning Schoenenberger	Springer
Christian Schuetz	ISSN Germany
Barbara Schwarz	Springer
Shilo de Vries	Taylor & Francis
Anthony Watkinson	CIBER
Nick Woods	EDItEUR

**Apologies received from:**

Francis Cave	
Tony Davies	Sage Publications
Graeme Doswell	Sage Publications
Linda Hine	Cambridge University Press
John Keston Hole	Publishing Technology
Nettie Lagace	NISO
John Lawson	Klopotek
Alan Medd	Turpin Distribution
Barry Richardson	Nielsen Book Data
Heather Staines	SIPX
Petra Steinfeld	Klopotek
Keith Whiter	Elsevier