Meeting Minutes: BNC EDI Committee

14 October 2003

Prepared by: Pamela Millar, BookNet Canada

Distribution: Public

Committee Members Participating:

Debbi Barton, Wiley
Melanie Britton, Random House
Hamish Cameron, UTP
Ken Chao, Pearson (T)
Richard Gokool, Fitzhenry & Whiteside
Joe Graham, Harper Collins (T)
Andrei Leus, Scholastic Canada
Bill McCarty, Pearson Education (T)
Pamela Millar, BookNet Canada
Doug Minett, Bookshelf
Garry Myles, Indigo
Olive Khan, Harper Collins (T)
John Sawyer, Raincoast
Stephen Schmitt, Canbook (T)
Michael Tamblyn, BookNet Canada (Chair)
John Wright, Indigo

Absent:

David Clarke, Scholastic Canada
Rose-Marie Decaire, Simon & Schuster
Brad Fenn, HB Fenn

Agenda:

1. **Committee Overview**

2. **New Document -- 820 Remittance Advice**
Objectives for this meeting:
- An overview of the capabilities of the 820
- A walk-through of a sample 820 specification
- Discussion of impacts in adopting the 820
- Next steps for specification and implementation

3. **Ratification of Standard –Cross-dock 850, 855, 856, 810**
Objectives for this meeting:
- Ensure that these specifications are acceptable to impacted EDI trading partners
- Ratify changes as part of the CBISAC standard

4. **New Document – 857 ASN/Invoice ("The Returns ASN")**
Objectives for this meeting:
- Discuss high-level implications in terms of business process, retailer responsibilities vs. publisher responsibilities
- Develop a roadmap for implementation
- Discuss Batch.co implications

Meeting Minutes

1. **Committee Overview**

Committee Policy

- scheduled meetings for 3rd Tuesday of each month – agreement from group
- process was highlighted for approval of standards documents. All detailed information is contained in the committee policy and members were encouraged to review this and bring forward any issues. This document is currently in draft form pending approval from the BNC Board of Directors.
- voting members – goal of the committee is to resolve by consensus but in cases where vote is required one vote per firm is permitted

A question was raised as to whether data implementation was going to be included as part of the process as there should be a distinction between guidelines and a standard.
MT – the committee is to include all business implications that are contained by the process of sending a document. The committee will have to create implementation guidelines to accompany the specifications.

2. **New Document -- 820 Remittance Advice**

High-level overview of 820 was presented by Michael Tamblyn.

(Note: All required changes to the 820 are also indicated in the appended version of the 820)

MT – Any firms who are currently using the 820?
-Pearson

Any other firms looking into using the 820?
– Random House US currently supports the 820 – not currently receiving in Canada

Michael Tamblyn, Garry Myles – outlined structure of the 820 document

Discussion:
The issue was raised that the 820 can support electronic funds transfer (EFT). The committee was asked whether they were trying to include clearing of cheques or do they want to include EFT?
Consensus was the committee would like to make the 820 as robust as possible. The CBISAC and IT committee tried to make every document as complete as possible even though all functionality may not be used.

Agreed that committee will go into as much depth as possible on the 820.

BPR Segment
BPR 04 and 05 will need additional codes for ETF as well as cheques.

Field indicates if the net amount will result in credit or debit value. Need to describe what is meant by this. It should pertain to whole transaction and not line level.

ADX Segment

ADX segment represents adjustments which can be anything that is not regularly on an invoice but can be included. This includes anything that is not considered a regular payment i.e. charge backs, debit memos, credit memos

ANSI has a list of codes under ADX03. Committee needs to define codes to be used as a subset. This should include a reference to item which is being adjusted i.e. short shipment is with respect to a particular invoice. The two ways of doing this are: we can have adjustments separate from invoice section or this can be included down further in document in invoicing section and have an ADX section.

Discussion

A discussion ensued around the fact that there is no way to close off a list of multiple invoices. The particular adjustment will not match with an invoice when the document pertains to a list of invoices. It was outlined that there is no way of closing multiple invoices.

It was recommended that we could use NTE and also have REF codes to potentially pair particular credit to invoice. A reference or note will give details and then further down in the document the actual ADX segment will be included that is specific to individual invoices.

Group agreement – consensus

RMR Segment

Discussion:

With regards to the payment action code we will have to specify what kind of codes should be included. The example provided in the existing documentation does not make sense anymore. If we want to do adjustment to specific invoices we will need to have a loop similar to that which is outside to individual invoices.

Indigo was asked whether it was their intention to do short shipping claims in this document. The response was that the intent is to replace current paper documentation but they do not believe they will expand document functionality to include short shipping claims. We therefore do not have a document that can be used to detail line level information on short shipments.

Michael Tamblyn enquired on whether RMR is used for terms of trade of just adjustments?

Net and discount codes together should amount to gross. RMR 06 will be an adjustment off invoice which has nothing to do with terms. RMR is the payment action code plus two other monetary amounts. In 04 the amount is actual amount paid. 05 is amount paid if discount is applicable. 06 is specifically the discount taken. The adjustment is not specified. Need to look at other way to do this.

One option proposed is we could come up with a generic adjustment reason code and reason is contained within ADX's. This allows for as many ADX's with the specific reasons. The structure doesn't currently allow for multiple reasons or adjustments in RMR. It was agreed that we need ADX loop below RMR to be specific to invoices

MT – assume all adjustments are in RMR 06.

Group agreement – consensus.

It was recommended that we should see how people are currently using the 820.

Melanie Britton will look into this with Random House U.S.
Pearson does not currently break out total of adjustments on particular RMR segments.

A list of ADX segments will be created by BNC and a group of committee participants.

An additional issue raised was whether it is possible to send a credit note to a vendor and have them reference the credit note number. The committee would like to see ability to retain that information in the document.
Doug Minett recommended including this above the RMR. If using supplier generated number then use in RMR if not supplier-generated then put in ADX.

Group agreement – consensus.

MT-Enquired as to the timelines / impacts to internal systems if the 820 was adopted?

The consensus was that if there were no changes to the existing specifications several publishers could be up and running within the next few months. There were issues with scheduling any technical changes due to currently scheduled upgrades and testing. Having the document implemented in a timely manner is a priority for Indigo. Indigo is willing to start development effort this month which means they would have the ability to send out remittances by November.

Participants for drafting process for code subsets:
Garry Myles, Bill McCarty, Ken Chao, John Sawyer, Doug Minett.

MT presents high-level overview of Batch.co.uk to see if any group interest in discussing further.

Group interested with regards to learning more about Batch.co.uk.

Next steps:
Expanded code list to be circulated by BNC prior to October 17. First draft to be completed by early the week of October 20th.
Draft version of specification will be available at next committee meeting.
BNC will prepare an educational package/session on Batch.co.uk.

3. Ratification of Standard –Cross-dock 850, 855, 856, 810

John Wright outlined the following cross dock changes:
-added one address segment which includes final destination as the store N1 'ship to'. The secondary N1 would be the 'final destination' as store number
-cross dock enabled vendors can still do direct to store. The 'ship to' and 'final destination' would both be the store number
-if the vendor does not participate in cross dock then there are no changes

Next steps:
If there are any questions or issues with the existing cross dock specifications send to Pam prior to next meeting. If no issues then these will be posted as the new standard. Comments will be circulated by BNC prior to the next meeting.

4. **New Document – 857 ASN/Invoice ("The Returns ASN")**

MT-We need to look at returns process and where information is currently changing hands then look at best approach to the documentation to support the process. UK model currently contains a request for returns followed by a response for returns including information on how to handle the returns (i.e. send to pulp, send back, etc.). Included is an exchange of credit values.

MT asked the committee if there was any value in sending advisories before pulling?

Doug Minett outlined that for independents it would be valuable if returns were processed in a more timely manner so that credit was able to arrive sooner. For all vendors if the goal was to reduce NOP's then this is a valuable subject to pursue.

It was agreed that a valuable exercise would be in going from the "base case" in business process and then build out to decide on what documents to use.

Group agreement.

MT – A "straw" version of document available for next month. This will be a rough outline of the type of information that would be passed forward. It will not go down to the detail of actual codes.

There was concern around how quickly would vendors would be able to turn around pre-authorization document.

MT – If we are looking at prioritization we could look at breaking up problem into list of steps and then go through process of prioritization. Document selection and specification would result from that prioritization.

Group agreement.

Next steps:
A process map will be created for the returns process.
A "straw" version of the document will be available for the next committee meeting.
Meeting to take place with BNC and John Wright prior to returns process working group meeting.

Returns process working group: Hamish Cameron, Melanie Britton, Bill McCarty – First meeting Tuesday October 21st 1:00.

Meeting Wrap-up

Next EDI committee meeting Nov. 18 – 1:00

Adjourned 3:35