EDItEUR’s 40th International Supply Chain Seminar
Frankfurt
9th October 2018

ONIX 3.0 in the UK

Karina Urquhart, Executive Director, BIC
@bic1UK
Karina@bic.org.uk
Data Provider Respondents (42)

- publisher services: 71.43%
- wholesale/distribution services: 9.53%
- data aggregators: 7.14% (2 each)
- other: 7.14%
- publishers: 4.76%
Data Recipient Respondents (13)

- retailers/book product sellers: 30.77%
- wholesale/distribution services: 7.69%
- data aggregators: 7.69%
- library suppliers: 23.08%
- libraries: 23.08%
- metadata/content management system providers: 7.69%
Top Level Data Provider Summary

▶ Of the 76% that have implemented and are distributing ONIX 3.0
  ▶ 91% use it for both print and digital
  ▶ 72% are still required to send ONIX 2.1 files
  ▶ Over half have been able to do so for more than 2 years
  ▶ 78% send separate feeds for print and digital products despite most being technically capable of sending separate and/or combined print-digital feeds

▶ Of the 24% that have not yet implemented ONIX 3.0
  ▶ 70% intend to do so within 2018 or the first half of 2019
  ▶ 10% planning for 2020
  ▶ 20% have no plans to implement ONIX 3.0
Top Level Data **Recipient Summary**

- Of the 92% that accept ONIX feeds
  - 83% accept ONIX 3.0 feeds. Of these,
    - 70% have been able to do so for more than 2 years
    - 100% also accept ONIX 2.1
  - 80% accept ONIX 3.0 for print and digital (most receive separate feeds for each)
  - 20% do not accept ONIX 3.0 for both print and digital
    - half don’t deal with print products at all
    - half do deal with print products but cannot handle them in ONIX

- Of those that have not yet implemented ONIX 3.0 (including those that have not yet implemented ONIX at all)
  - Two thirds have plans to do so this year (2018)
  - One third have no current plans to implement
Top 3 General Benefits Realised by Implementers

- Send/receive new data elements:
  - Providers: 56%
  - Recipients: 80%

- Improved accuracy of displayed data:
  - Providers: 31%
  - Recipients: 60%

- Send/receive data to/from new trading partners:
  - Providers: 44%
  - Recipients: 80%
Top 3 Metadata Benefits Realised by Implementers

- **Digital products e.g. improved flexibility to express pricing, product description, DRM, licencing, usage constraints**: 69% Providers, 48% Recipients
- **Markets e.g. great ability to add market-specific publishing details, sales restrictions**: 77% Providers, 38% Recipients
- **Collections e.g. improved functionality to describe and link titles in sets and series, master brand, title statement**: 77% Providers, 28% Recipients
Top 5 Provider Metadata Benefits: Realised v. Anticipated

- Digital products e.g. improved flexibility to express pricing, product description, DRM, licencing, usage constraints: Realised 48%, Anticipated 60%
- Markets e.g. great ability to add market-specific publishing details, sales restrictions: Realised 38%, Anticipated 50%
- Collections e.g. improved functionality to describe and link titles in sets and series, master brand, title statement: Realised 28%, Anticipated 30%
- Ability to provide block updates: Realised 28%, Anticipated 30%
- Publishers e.g. greater ability to include multiple publisher and imprint identifiers, product contacts: Realised 10%, Anticipated 40%
Actual Investment Time
Actual Biggest Challenges for Implementers

- Rebuilding or reworking IT systems: 58% Providers, 41% Recipients
- Lack of "top-down" management support: 17% Providers, 15% Recipients
- Difficulty in interpreting ONIX 3.0 specs: 25% Providers, 15% Recipients
- Budget constraints: 17% Providers, 12% Recipients
- Other: 17% Providers, 12% Recipients
- Level of trading partner interest and/or capability: 9% Providers, 9% Recipients
- No issues encountered: 9% Providers, 9% Recipients
- Hiring or training the appropriate personnel: 25% Providers, 9% Recipients
- Not known: 8% Providers, 6% Recipients
Anticipated challenges (non-implementers)

- Expected internal resource cost (testing, data cleansing, training etc): 50% (Providers), 33% (Recipients)
- No business requirement: 40% (Providers), 33% (Recipients)
- Lack of internal knowledge: 10% (Providers), 33% (Recipients)
- Internal IT systems limitations: 10% (Providers), 0% (Recipients)
- Other: 10% (Providers), 33% (Recipients)
Opportunities

- Case studies to help overcome perceived challenges/obstacles
- Promotion of all benefits (general and metadata)
- Metadata service level agreements for feeds
- Promote greater use of structured response file
- 69% of recipients and 40% of providers still accept/produce product metadata via Excel/CSV files that have not been designed to be ONIX like. Organisations should be encouraged to move to ONIX compliant XML files (ideally), or at least Excel/CSV files that have been designed to be ONIX like.
- Promote use of block updates e.g. price changes
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