# RadioDNS

**Third Steering Board Meeting: Agenda and Minutes**
29th September 2011: 16P-18P BST // 17P-19P CEST // 10A-12P MDT // 11A-1P EDT

Apologies: Ben Matthew (Absolute Radio)
Chair: Nick Piggott (Global Radio)
Secretary: James Cridland (Media UK)
Attending: Mathias Coinchon (EBU), John Ousby (vTuner), George Wright (BBC), Richard Morris (Commercial Radio Australia), Skip Pizzi (NAB), Chris Gould (All In Media), Sebastian Kett (SWR), Nick Jurascheck (PURE)

1. 4.00pm Welcome new Steering Board members
   Richard Morris was welcomed by NickP, who briefly introduced himself.

2. 4.05pm Approve agenda for this meeting
   This was approved.

3. 4.08pm Approval of [minutes of previous meeting](minutes of previous meeting)
   These were approved.

4. 4.10pm Financial summary
   GeorgeW asked whether we intend to keep running with the surplus. NickP indicated that investment was needed, and that maintaining this surplus is not desired.
   These were approved.

**Technology**
5. 4.15pm Technology and standards
   a. Support for IP Streaming in RadioDNS, EPG, VIS
   b. Support for broadcast - IP service following in RadioEPG

*This meeting should discuss and approve the overall approach to enabling support for RadioDNS applications alongside IP streamed radio services, and the principle of allowing automated service following between the broadcast and IP domains. **For discussion.***

SkipP noted particular interest in the **service following** feature in the US, and raised questions about its marketing and identity. He felt there was confusion about marketing it as part of the EPG. ChrisG agreed that there are good reasons why we might market this as a separate application. There was general agreement from other members (NickJ, JamesC, GeorgeW).

JohnO agreed that service following is of value. He expressed concern that service following and IP streaming support was not put to the board in advance of public communication, and that he felt it was announced ad-hoc. He asked for more regular steering boards. He raised the issue that RadioDNS should get legal advice to protect issues of anti-trust in the US, and questioned whether the steering board was a rubber-stamping exercise.

MathiasC also requested more steering boards, and wondered how we could ensure this was aligned with other broadcast services. SebastianK also agreed with MathiasC.

JamesC asked whether the work of groups was not sufficient in discussing this work. MathiasC and SebastianK indicated this was not sufficient due to pressure of work and the efficiency of monitoring this work.

NickP asked whether defining three/four meeting dates a year was a good way forward. This was agreed. SkipP offered a physical meeting space at NAB shows, and MathiasC offered similar at EBU.

**ACTION: JamesC to organise dates going forward; NickP to ensure reports from working teams two weeks prior to SB.**

*We have received comments and questions at various events about how IMDA and RadioDNS are aligning their technologies. IMDA data is intended to be ingested by directory service providers/aggregators to their own databases, whereas RadioDNS data is intended to be accessed directly by the radio device, and is focused on the currently received service; the aspect of "discovery" is secondary. Is this an appropriate differentiation, and how do we communicate it?* **For discussion.**

JohnO said there was a need to be clear about the two organisations. He said the above was incorrect. He noted that IMDA SI information was also held on broadcaster servers, and that he felt a more accurate differentiator is that "RadioDNS focuses on what content that media organisations can make available, and IMDA focuses on how devices can best implement streamed media services". Key differentiation, he said, is RadioDNS has a broadcast focus, and IMDA has a device focus. Some projects would definitely benefit from closer collaboration, he says.

GeorgeW noted confusion about the differences of RadioDNS and IMDA internally within the BBC. JamesC noted that he did not recognise JohnO's differentiation. NickJ said he understood JohnO's as being clear. NickP described the differentiators as vertical/horizontal alignment: RadioDNS is radio, IMDA is all IP-delivered streams. SkipP agreed with this.

JohnO questioned whether RadioDNS required a user to be a terrestrial broadcaster. NickP said that no, you can put RadioVIS onto a radio station without a broadcast component. JamesC pointed out that RadioVIS/RadioEPG/RadioTAG works just fine on IP-only streams, without the use of RadioDNS. RadioDNS is only required for hybrid streams.

JamesC asked whether IMDA is producing a different specification for visuals. JohnO and SebastianK clarified that they are, but that they could use the same visual assets.

ChrisG noted that we were not clear what the differentiators were, and requested a clear document. SkipP agreed and asked for a document that both groups could agree on.

**ACTION: NickP to write up a document that explains the interaction between RadioDNS and individual applications like RadioVIS/TAG/EPG - and produce a liason document that both groups can agree.**

**Marketing**
4.25pm RadioDNS Trademarks

The meeting should discuss our approach to registering names and trade marks, and decide what we should do. **For discussion.**

NickP wondered whether we should take an action to discover costings for this before we move forward. MathiasC noted that past experience has been very costly. SkipP noted that Microsoft covered the cost for one of their members. He discussed a conformance statement would also be useful when allowing a logo to appear on a product.

JamesC asked NickJ whether PURE/IMG might have any costings that can help around registering a trademark. NickJ indicated that he might. JamesC asked whether self-certification was something that the IMDA could work with RadioDNS.

ACTION: NickJ to discover costings for trademark registrations
JohnO to examine whether IMDA and RadioDNS can work together around self-certification

4.40pm Website Update

This work is proving difficult to complete on discretionary time, so we need to discuss if we should fund a project to rework the website as James has recommended, and in particular if we should fund a copy writer, and a developer to help recode it. **To be discussed.**

JamesC explained that he envisages the improvements in the way communicate online would largely come from improving the copy on the site, rather than re-coding it.

MathiasC said that we should get more content into the News section, mentioning people doing work elsewhere (CRC Canada, EBU), but recognised that we don't have the time to do this. Should the News feed be opened up to other people to write into? The tools page has disappeared on the new site design, and it should be put back in again.

ACTION: JamesC to add new users for publishing more information

JamesC explained that he thinks we need to pay a copywriter. NickJ asked what the level of costs was likely to be? JamesC thought somewhere around GBP400-GBP500. GeorgeW thought that might be an under estimate.

6. 4.50pm Improving our resources for manufacturers and broadcasters
   a. Marketing and educational documents
   b. Test tools and tutorials

In conjunction with the website project, we need to agree how we would fund this work and its extent. **To be discussed.**

7. 5.05pm Marketing strategy
   a. What has worked and not worked to date. Observations on the clarity and breadth of understanding of the RadioDNS project.
   b. Proposals to fix that in 2011/2012
   c. Recent Events - IBC, NAB Radioshow

Is our appearance good enough? Do our marketing materials, stands, exhibits meet the standards that people expect of RadioDNS? Is our "spartan/homespun" approach acceptable? What do people think when they "see" us. **To be discussed.**

JohnO mentioned that using RadioDNS brand as one catch-all service was confusing, since RadioEPG/RadioVIS etc are different.

SkipP mentions confusion that RadioDNS is the organisation, and also one of the specs. He recommended changing the organisation to "RadioDNS Organisation/Organization" or similar. Additionally, he was keen to see more professional video assets, rather than the homespun YouTube versions. Keen to be able to arrange live demos, rather than canned ones.

GeorgeW said they could help with demonstration videos from the point of the BBC. MathiasC also offered to assist with videos.

JamesC asked for approval, which was given, that we call ourselves the **RadioDNS Project**.

NickP asked whether we should bring plans of enlarging the Project from a financial basis to cover costs of a permanent project manager and the above assets.

JamesC mentioned the sliding membership fee scale of other organisations, and asked if this was appropriate? He said he thought we should look at a more comprehensive business plan, including the cost of a part-time project manager, and a sliding membership fee.

SkipP agreed that we did have the right level of interest to move forward to the next stage, and would support the proposal to put a plan to the SB. People move from specification to implementation, and the barriers to implementation are low.

Should we draw up a marketing plan that schedules us to be at key events throughout the year, and budgets for them accordingly? **To be discussed.**

(This was deferred)

How can we make it easier for broadcasters to start RadioDNS services? Should we more actively put software or solution providers in contact with broadcasters? On what basis should we promote those people to broadcasters? Should we only promote people with a "freemium" model, where they will provide initial services for free? What is a fair and balanced approach? **To be discussed.**

JamesC pointed out http://radiodns.org/software-solution-providers/ contains a list of "everyone who produces public RadioDNS-enabled services".

*ACTION: JamesC to formulate and circulate policy. - DONE 3 Oct*

What message are we asking supporters to spread to broadcasters and manufacturers? Who should be talking with global electronics manufacturers to lobby them for including RadioDNS? **To be discussed.**

(this was deferred)

James and I discussed and committed the organisation to those events at short notice, and in the absence of a marketing plan, having concluded it would be good value for money. We would like the Steering Board to ratify this decision. **To be discussed.**

JohnO reiterated that the steering board should "steer, not rubber stamp" and asked to ratify announcements before they are made publicly and at conferences.

**Future planning**
8. 5.25pm Project priorities for 2011/2012
    a. Service following broadcast - IP
    b. RadioTAG
    c. More device implementations
    d. Establishment of the DNS registrar

1. Are these the right priorities for the project? Are there other activities we should be more actively supporting in 2011/2012? How can we encourage other supporters to contribute more actively to development? **To be discussed.**

(This was deferred.)

9. 5.45pm Resourcing the project

(This was covered above)

5.55pm: Close

(We discovered that Global Radio's online system chucks everyone off after two hours).