
SB31/1 - Minutes of 31st Steering Board Meeting

Tuesday 4th September 2018

12:00 UTC / 13:00 BST / 14:00 CEST / 08:00 EDT / 22:00 AEST

Attendance

Nicolas BRESOU (maRadio)
Joe D'ANGELO (DTS)
Alexander ERK (IRT for ARD)
Walter HUIJTEN (NPO) (Chair)
David LAYER (NAB)
Nick PIGGOTT (RadioDNS Project Director)
Ben POOR (EBU) (Secretary)
Dave WALTERS (BBC)
Christian WINTER (AUDI)

Absent

Nacho SEIRUL-LO (NXP)

Apologies

Kath BROWN (Commercial Radio Australia)
John FARRELL (Frontier Silicon)

Meeting started at 13:05

Agenda

1. Approval of the Minutes of the [30th Steering Board Meeting](#)
Approved.
2. Actions from previous meetings
 - a. BP to notify members when revision of TS 103 270 is ready for board approval
Not yet completed, because TS 103 270 isn't quite ready. More in the technical report to follow.
 - b. NP to circulate GDPR Compliance Review (and updated Data Security Policy) to board - Distributed on 23rd May 2018
Completed.
3. Standard Licence for Metadata and Content Update ([SB31/2](#)) - NP
How do we define the "end device" - the final seller? Agreed that the car company is responsible for adhering to the terms.
DW - what about after-market devices?
ER - then it's the after-market manufacturer is responsible.
DW - we need to consider that scenario of the after-market responsibility.

NP - if I'm buying a car, then I expect all its component parts to be functioning correctly
DW - what happens if the provision is a software service, software component? What about jail-broken devices and implement my own system? Is this covered under invalidation of mfr warranty.

JD - The licensee is the car company, and then implied service performance? What happens if something changes in the radio functionality? The licence does not cover quality of provision, and that could create expensive service issues for the mfr.

NP - land the responsibility on the car mfr because they have contractual control over the hardware and software manufacturers.

Whoever is agreeing to this licence must ensure that they have sufficient control over their suppliers to make sure it is adhered. If not, then falls outside the terms of the standard. This licence doesn't

JD - require the OEM to put this in their specification to suppliers?

NP - mfr requires suppliers to adhere to the licences offered by broadcasters?

NP - will work with Mike to properly define the "end licensor" to cover vehicles and other situations.

NP - 1.3, definition of Radio, and how it works with "companion apps".

AE - there are some pure IP apps that use RadioDNS data, and I expect them to work in the same way. They're using the RadioDNS data, and this should be included.

NP - should this licence apply to all data, regardless of end use?

JD - particularly in the US, once you move into the IP world there is a completely different dynamic. It could open up a set of very complicated use cases that could delay the rollout.

NP - the constraint of "radio" was to reassure broadcasters that the licence was only to allow use in hardware devices, and not to have to offer the same licence for pure IP functionality.

AE - it's clear that this licence covers broadcast radio enriched with metadata, but broadcasters may offer the same metadata using the same standards but under different or bilateral contracts. Yes, this is OK.

NP - will tidy up the definition to be clearer that it's "companion apps" not "apps" when associated with broadcast radio.

DW - do we need clarification of "free to air" or "free to the consumer", to help define the scenario better?

NP - maybe the clause 3.1.3 covers this ok?

DW - a good definition of "radio" is required here. We're attempting to define a EMF reception of a sound service.

NP - would specific definition of the radio standards work?

DW - it might be required?

NP - I'm relaxed about adding FM, HD, DAB/DAB+, DRM

JD - I wouldn't want to preclude subscription services - either Sirrus/XM, or Conditional Access via terrestrial radio services.

NP - I think we should avoid that at this stage.

NP - 1.6 - I think we should remove because it's unnecessary

DW - probably can be removed / should be removed. Depends on the purpose. If you're trying to shield RadioDNS from complaints, then it's valuable.

BP - loosely defined, and not very practical. Should be clearer "if there is a problem you should report it and it should be rectified".

NP - clause 2.1 - sense that we need more manufacturers input to see if these constraints are OK, need tactical relaxation or general omission.

DW - will any car companies want to aggregate data, but then buffering / caching it elsewhere before passing it to the device. I don't mind caching, but what about

middleware caching.

JD - isn't that how Audi runs the service now?

CW - when the first car finds a new station, which triggers acquisition of metadata from that station (using RadioDNS, getting SPI file) and aggregate it in the station database (with a timestamp). This is then used as a cache for other vehicles, and the servers will periodically (daily) check the data to see if it's changed, and refresh accordingly. This solution has a small delay for changes (1 day) but we are having thousands of cars going directly to the broadcasters. This helps with QoS because we rely on our servers, and reduce traffic on IP side.

NP - I think this behaviour is OK - the relaxation in 4.2 allows mfrs to do what they need to do to make their systems work well, but doesn't compromise the broadcasters' control?

CW - it's possible that the caches will apply a value consistently across all metadata. Doing it on a per service provider basis would be more complicated. We should not restrict the system too much, and make the burden too high, the mfrs won't properly implement.

NP - is it OK for mfrs to cache content, if there is a way of controlling it from the broadcaster.

DW - 2.1 restricts the purpose to appearing on radios, and not use it for any other means.

NP - does 2.1 constrain and 4.2 relax?

DW - I don't like the construct of them - which one of them "wins" in one paragraph

NP - do we need to explicitly refer to the relaxation in 2.1?

DW / CW / WH - that would work.

NP - yes, if car goes offline for a "long time", then broadcaster do expect logos to be removed.

CW - this makes it hard for the user

WH - we need to differentiate between what's technical provided for and the users. If you take the car offline for 60-90 days, but when it comes on-line the logos will be updated.

NP - at the end of the caching time, you should delete the data?

WH - is this a very small edge case?

CW - not necessarily. And if the logo database has to be bulk updated after a cache purge, who is paying for the data transfer to do that? It's possible. Don't make it too complicated to implement.

DW - if you want the benefits of a connected device, you should keep it connected. If you don't keep it connected, then you shouldn't have the benefits.

NP - our feedback is that if a broadcaster becomes disconnect from control of their assets they want them removed

WH - the current wording would cover that scenario

NP - drivers won't understand when 30 days later all the logos disappear from their vehicle

CW - yes, this is a problem. Normally logos are updated daily.

JD - if the car is offline for 60 days, it's going to ask for any updates.

NP - one mfr said they would replace deleted logos with an icon explaining that they had been deleted because the car had been disconnected from the internet.

JD - is this an edge case of an edge case? With DAB/HD you have some ability to keep the logo cache updated over the air.

NP - broadcasters are saying they want deletion, CW is saying he doesn't want logos to disappear and they user doesn't understand why

JD - what's the lesser of two evils - no logo or wrong logo?

AE - CW's concern is that drivers don't understand why logos disappear.

NP - does the special station logo showing that the cache has been purged help inform drivers?

CW - or the driver goes to factory reset and sees that they need the SIM for logos. And that tells the driver that they need to keep the SIM in for station data.

DW - I understand the challenge - are there other features that get disabled for the user in fully private mode. Can you share what happens with other features when the car gets disconnected?

CW - Can't give detail because I don't have it for other stations.

DW - can we write a caveat phrase that if a device is off-line for n days, and what the rest is. Where a device is principally on line and working as expected, we want logos to disappear as expected at the end of the cache period. Do we need to think about an offline scenario, with potentially a different outcome?

NB - can we force to have no logo at all, after the off-line period?

NP - The broadcaster can either set a cache period of n days (at which time the logo is deleted) or a cache time of infinity, which means keep using it forever and never delete.

DW - can we provide an alternate logo, caching an alternate to default if the cached logo hasn't been refreshed? E.g. a Black logo or greyed logo saying "refreshed logo".

CW - technically yes, but no customer would understand this. It might not solve the problem.

AE - yes

NB - but it will not happen for all the stations?

WH - that could be even more confusing.

CW - fall back to broadcast, and if no logos over the air, then we delete it.

AE - require manufacturers to have a different display of the invalid logo to say that refresh is required. Grey the logo out.

NP - Logical, but not sure how we say it legally.

AE - that's the lawyers job

DW - a notification that the driver needs to reconnect to get station logs. What other notifications are given to the driver if they disconnect the car.

NP - this restriction isn't specific to RadioDNS, it will be applied globally to broadcaster assets regardless of delivery channel.

DW - similar to a copyright licence.

WH - on point 5.3 "except on terms agreed directly with" - should be deleted.

ACTION: NP - will update this version with Mike, and circulate to mfrs and via WorldDAB.

4. Technology Group Report ([SB31/3](#)) - BP

BP hopes to finish the update to 102 818 and 103 270 shortly after IBC. Will rejig the workplan, and we haven't had as many volunteers on the work as hoped for. Therefore going to extend the workplan.

BP would like people with DASH/HLS experience to get involved with the updates to 103 270 to support newer streaming formats.

WH are you saying we don't have enough resources?

BP the people involved in the client identifier work were good, but we haven't had lots of contributions from other people. We are relying on a "core" of "common contributors" and would like to get more broadcasters and service providers involved.

DW - will catch up with you with BBC thoughts.

5. Project Office Report ([SB31/4](#)) - NP

- a. Financial Review
- b. Membership Review
- c. Final Quarter Events
- d. HbbTV DNS Project Update
- e. Project Logo Update

NB - will try and raise this issue again the RP WW.

NP - most UK radio stations do not use RadioPlayer for RadioDNS, so this affects stations outside of the UK mainly.

NB - is the EBU service only accessible for public stations?

BP - in general we should provide services only to our members, but we are looking at how we can provide our platform to others.

NP - we need to explain that there are better ways of doing RadioDNS than using RadioPlayer.

NB - this should be easy for RadioPlayer to translate to RadioDNS.

NP - it's not clear how important this is to them

WH - let us know how that goes.

f. General Assembly 2019

WH - Geneva is an ideal time to discuss strategy, because we are there face to face.

ACTION: NP to plan February meeting schedule to include face to face strategy discussion.

g. February Strategy Meeting Review

ACTION: All to review our notes and discussions from February.

6. Test and Certification Programme Update ([SB31/5](#)) - NP

WH - are you talking about the regular registration?

NP - we are changing to accept SI file for registrations.

AE - this would be very welcome!

ACTION: NP to progress work on T&D and Registration platform

7. Report on RadioDNS Activities from Ben Poor (EBU) and David Layer (NAB) - BP/DL

BP - Have been working to get NAB and EBU working more closely together, and get some tangible collaborative projects going. Voice activated devices are very relevant at the moment, but current smart speakers don't support broadcast radio, only streaming. DL and BP have been working to create a device that is a voice controlled broadcast radio, which chooses between broadcast and streaming according to broadcaster preference. Will switch transparently between broadcast and IP reception. A prototype device to demonstrate that voice control can be adapted to use RadioDNS metadata to enable broadcast.

DL - The plan is to demonstrate this at IBC (EBU stand) and at the NAB Radio Show (in Orlando).

JD - is this an alternative or complementary to the DRUK report?

BP - we weren't involved with the DRUK report. Our approach uses open metadata / RadioDNS.

AE - we have a similar use case in HRadio, using the voice controlled device. We can ask Alexa to switch to a certain station and use broadcast or IP.

JD - Does the device support analogue and digital radio?

BP - yes, in the first version it supports FM and DAB+?

DL - we'll only be demonstrating analogue FM. Have intent to add the HD Radio functionality, but the timescale for IBC was FM and DAB.

JD - Can you tell me the chipset supplier?

BP - it's Frontier Smart Technologies providing the chipset / module.

WH - that's exciting news.

8. Any Other Business

Meeting ended at 15:05