



# RadioDNS Project

## 24th Steering Board Meeting Agenda (SB 24/1)

Monday 12th December 2016

19:00 GMT / 20:00 CET / 14:00 EST / 06:00+1 AEDT

### Attendance

Kath BROWN (Commercial Radio Australia)  
Mathias COINCHON (EBU) (Chairperson)  
Floris DAELEMANS (VRT) (Secretary)  
Joe D'ANGELO (DTS)  
John FARRELL (Frontier Silicon)  
Laurent FINET (RTBF)  
Walter HUIJTEN (NPO)  
Sean O'HALPIN (BBC)  
Skip PIZZI (NAB)  
Nick PIGGOTT (RadioDNS) (Project Director)  
Alex ERK (IRT) for Michael REICHERT (ARD)

### Apologies

Nick JURASCHECK (Silver Lining Consultants)

## Agenda

1. Approval of the [Minutes of the 23rd Steering Board Meeting \(Public version\)](#)
  - a. Robin Cooksey Feedback - [added to SB23/2](#)
  - b. [Test Pattern Documentation](#)
  - c. HbbTV - agenda item 4
  - d. Swiss Trademarks - granted for words and logo from October 2013
  - e. New membership fees advised - UK members advised separately
  - f. Recommendations for new SB members - none received to date
  - g. Guidelines - agenda item 2
2. [Fair Use / Terms / Guidelines / Standard Licence activity](#) (D) (SB24/6)
  - a. Letter from WorldDAB Technical Committee (D) (linked from Project Office Update)
3. [Test and Demonstration Platform Update](#) (SB24/2)
  - a. FQDN List on the website
4. [HbbTV Update](#) (SB24/3)
5. [Project Logo Update](#) (SB24/4)
6. [Project Office Update](#) (SB24/5)
  - a. Membership
  - b. Finances
  - c. General Assembly / Steering Board elections
  - d. Other 2017 Events
  - e. Letter from WorldDAB Technical Committee (see 2a) (D)
  - f. 2017 Budget proposal
  - g. Project Director contract renewal (D)
7. Strategy Discussion ([Document](#), [Notes of 17 June Call](#))
8. Any Other Business

1. Minutes were approved

2. Guidelines Discussion

**Nick** - gave the background of the guidelines / standard licence document.

**Alex** - why has it renamed to Standard Licence?

**Kath** - legal proposed to call it a licence, so that it's actually enforceable, and it's a fairly standard activity on-line. Legal suggested that a licence placed on the RadioDNS website and referred in the SI document was a simple and very common approach, and clear enough to be enforceable.

**John** - Nick referenced that it only should apply only to one use case for one manufacturer, but manufacturers currently operate on an implied licence. As soon as you put an explicit licence out there, you have undermined any implied licence that anyone has taken. If we put this out there, then it becomes mandatory, and we have to be sure that these licence terms are no more restrictive than the applied licences that people have already taken, and leave sufficient room for people using the standards, that there's enough room for people to add value and differentiate.

**Sean** - clarification. Is [redacted] driving the time line?

**Nick** - they have the tightest timeline, as they have to sign off on [redacted], and can't demo anything that won't be in the production version.

**Sean** - Kath, did the legal advice suggest that licences could cover standard open metadata, with a potential to target the licence at cars if there's a different set of use cases? Should we get something out there, out to manufacturers who have been working with implied use, and ask how it would affect them. If that causes problems, then it's taken into account. Push it out, see what

happens, and then adjust/adapt as required - without revoking any permissions?

**Sean** - we need to agree terms with the automotive manufacturers.

**Mathias** - what would happen if the licence isn't provided?

**Nick** - the third party suppliers offer data with legal indemnities to manufacturers, so if we can't match that legal surety, it's a significant disadvantage to us

**John** - who is doing that?

**Floris** - [redacted]

**Walter** - the implied licensing situation isn't sustainable, so people are looking to formalise the situation more. We've been discussing these documents for a long time, and in my opinion this version is light and nimble that nobody should be hindered, but formal enough to acknowledge that manufacturers need to recognise broadcasters rights. What kind of document would work for you John, that would cover those needs?

**John** - it's about being specific about the IPR rights, and what's been granted, and not too prescriptive about a particular user experience. I haven't gone into that level of detail. As an example, "Only use metadata and content to improve the functionality, look and feel of broadcast radio. You can do this on the device directly or on a device (such as a smartphone) paired with the broadcast radio device.". This means that I can't use this data in the cloud, or cache it? I'm not sure that this licence allows manufacturers to? That's the danger. Most licences that I've been involved in, including open source licences, talk about IPR and it's about use, copying, redistribution. If we had something suitably broad and non-prescriptive, I'd be happy with it. It would have not be prescriptive about user experience.

**Joe** - couldn't we look at the tech specs to box these use cases. The point is to enable the functionality of the three specifications? As long as it was used to support one of those implementations.

**Sean** - that would make sense for a RadioDNS licence. If we need to enable an automotive licence, do we need right now to define how a box radio manufacturer can use the metadata, or a mobile phone? Can't we scope this licence just to automotive manufacturers?

**Joe** - I personally wouldn't recommend that, as you'll end up in a matrix of licensing which is very difficult to manage, and what clauses are going to differ across classes, and how you treat them fairly. Maybe go back to the use cases and specifications of functionality?

**Nick** - pointed out that some of the guideline points reiterate requirements from the technical standards, and some define broadcaster expectations of good practice (e.g. content previews v. truncated content).

**Kath** - the standard licence can cover normal cases, but then the broadcaster can move into bilateral agreements if required. The legal words need to be added to it. All frameworks that protect that IPR are enforceable in country of use.

**Nick** - pointed to the comparison with Creative Commons, and the human readable and full legal text versions

**Mathias** - what happens with Slideshow / Visuals currently over broadcast, there is no licence, but it's an implied licence?

**Joe** - this comes up quite a lot. The complexity comes in when you're mixing mediums. The broadcaster takes care of the licensing and content, and they're directly delivering that and distribution. In this mixed medium, the automotive manufacturer is confused by a multitude of people claiming to have rights, and they want a qualified source that they know where broadcasters are providing the information.

**Alex** - automotive also provide systems to access websites and podcasts.

**Mathias** - this proposal seems quite minimal to offer this data, but I don't see how it puts a brake on other activities. What precisely should we change in the current licence to make it acceptable?

**John** - this isn't the licence, but there are lots of things that are restrictive.

**Mathias** - but the licence isn't very strong.

**John** - I think it is quite strong. It's very specific on how you can use the data.

**Nick** - are you concerned that by saying "a is allowed", that prevents you doing b c and d?

**John** - yes.

**Sean** - could we say what you can't do with the data? That's more important to the broadcaster?

**Floris** - yes, that's important.

**Sean** - it's the things that are against the spirit that are problematic, where data is out of date, incomplete, misattributed, etc.

**Mathias** - this seems to be a request from automotive, so if we want RadioDNS in cars, we need to do this?

**Nick** - we're looking to get a balance between manufacturers demands, and what broadcasters want to release to prevent bad things happening.

**Sean** - can't we scope this specifically automotive manufacturers? If we go with a very specific use case? Then it doesn't cover what John's doing? If we're being pragmatic, then we could start at least with scoping it to automotive. They're (licences) not fixed for ever.

**Mathias** - how would you make it? This licence would be on our website?

**Nick** - we could limit it to certain classes of device, just automotive

**John** - that might be workable, and it would be good to have some framework if it was broad and not too prescriptive. Better in the long run to have licence that in the long run that can apply for everything.

**Mathias** - this might work, but the licence can adapt and change.

**Alex** - if we come up with different licences with different markets

**Kath** - the suggestion to limit it to car manufacturers was just to make it tightly enforceable, if there were potentially different use cases. If in the long run we don't see differences in the use case, we can support a standard licence for standard metadata.

**John** - would the standard metadata differ between broadcasters?

Kath - {point missed}

**Sean** - we need an agreed core of metadata

**John** - we do need a baseline

**Nick** - Project Logo?

**Kath** - we'd be comfortable with that.

**Mathias** - we've been discussing this for an hour. Can we agree today that we do proceed with some licensing? We hear that [redacted] is about to implement RadioDNS, which they can't without licensing.

**John** - still little bit curious for their motivation, and what they want? Is it just the legal indemnity issue? Whatever we put in whatever the broadcasters own the intellectual property rights, and can go after the manufacturers.

**Nick** - like Creative Commons, we don't issue the licence.

**Alex** - what does compatible mean for a compatible licence?

**Nick** - it doesn't restrict further than the RadioDNS licence.

**Walter** - we need to get pragmatic at this point, because we know that automotive have asked for this kind of thing, and this is very important for RadioDNS but we need to come to a conclusion and a proposal that we can put forward and see if it's something they can work with. We won't resolve all the of the details now.

**Joe** - I completely agree. They've asked for it, if we don't give it to them, they're going to question the legality of using any data.

**Mathias** - how do we make a first proposal that is acceptable to both parties?

**Kath** - why don't we draft up a licence and put it out, and if there are specific things, we can work on it? Everyone wants to see the car industry.

**Mathias** - we have already three iterations, and would a further iteration make it different? Do we vote, or do we give up? I think we have to move on.

**Nick** - as a board, can we commit to delivering an automotive focused licence, based on the guidelines that have already been circulated?

**John** - why do we think that it's appropriate that we fund the legal costs of the automotive costs.

**Nick** - as long as we're fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory for sharing the costs. I can ask for some input.

**Nick** - Does the board commit to producing an automotive focused licence?

**John** - is there any possibility of using an off-the-shelf licence, to minimise costs?

**Nick** - yes, we could adapt the Creative Commons licence potentially.

**Board decided to commit to producing a licence for the automotive industry for metadata use.**

#### 2.a. Letter from Lindsay Cornell and Nick's reply

**Nick** - I don't have any suggestions to change the text.

**John** - I made some comments.

**Mathias** - does the letter answer Lindsay's queries?

**Alex** - yes, but it also opens up other issues? It was not clear at the TC meeting that the Guidelines and Client ID were separate things, and it wasn't clear about the implications of putting extra security into devices. The addition of the clarification about not targeting discrete devices, but it needs to be written into the standard. It's very confusing what we're talking about.

**Nick** - would my response reduce some of those concerns?

**Sean** - it could be made clearer that the implication of the requirement is B2B?

**Nick** - it's intended to go between systems and not to end devices.

**John** - would that architecture to be mandated?

**Sean** - it's not required to be implemented by end devices? Isn't that the point that the technical committee was worried about?

**John** - it's very confusing. It feels like the arguments are being moved to suit the objections. We're ending up with a very fragmented system. If that's useful functionality, then there will be a whole class of second class devices that can't access this data?

**Sean** - would you want it to be required by end user devices to implement that

**John** - I don't think it belongs in the standard

**Sean** - I agree. It can be implemented separately.

**Kath** - the proposal here was to put a place where people could, if they wanted to, add in a key and if they wanted to add some bespoke content for particular manufacturers, then they create a key, and [redacted] has an agreement to access that file as a trusted part, but RadioDNS isn't involved. We simply add the capability.

**Nick** - explained the need to suppress pre-roll audio on streams for service following.

**John** - what's the minimum data for clients without an API key

**Nick** - there is no mandatory minimum currently, but we consider Project Logo to be baseline.

**Mathias** - can we take another day to review this and then potentially send this back.

**Kath** - to happy work on this if it helps

**John** - I felt there were things in the letter that were inaccurate

#### 3. Test and Demonstration Environment

**Mathias** - it's live now?

**Nick** - yes

**Mathias** - can we demo at the GA?

**Nick** - yes

#### 4. HbbTV Update

**Kath** - will it cost us more to provide this service to HbbTV

**Nick** - it's well covered in our existing resource, and we have mechanisms to reclaim costs if they become excessive

**Kath** - it's important that we do some publicity

**Nick** - we will when we're agreed with HbbTV that it's all working ok

#### 5. Project Logo

**Kath** - the Australian industry app launch has got the all the logos together so we'll get discussing an implementation of Project Logo internally. We're hoping to demo broadcasters' Project Logo implementations at the Asian DBS using Sydney stations.

#### 6. Project Office Report

##### *Events*

**Joe** - Will you be at CES?

**Nick** - We hadn't planned to as it's primarily a consumer event, but can probably get there if a member requests it.

**Joe** - I'll contact you about that

##### *RadioDays Europe*

**Nick** - I have concerns about the cost

**Walter** - I wonder if NPO could help discuss with the organisers?

**Nick** - if you could help, that would be great, because it will currently pull out 25% of our budget

**Joe** - we will have a pretty big presence there, so might be able to help out

##### *PD Contract Renewal*

**Mathias** - is Nick happy with 6 months?

**Nick** - happy with either 6 or 12 months.

**Kath** - happy to suggest 12 months.

**Walter / Floris / Sean / Joe** - agree to offer 12 months

**Board decision to agree PD contract extension for 12 months.**

#### 7. Strategy Discussion

Deferred to next meeting