SB35/5 - Minutes of 35th Steering Board Meeting

Attendance

Joe D'Angelo (Xperi) (joined)
Alexander ERK (IRT)
John FARRELL (Frontier Smart Technologies)
Walter HUIJTEN (NPO)
David LAYER (NAB) (Chair)
Nick PIGGOTT (RadioDNS Project Director)
Ben POOR (EBU) (Secretary)
Nacho SEIRUL-LO (NXP)
Ron WALKER (NPR)
Dave WALTERS (BBC)
Christian WINTER (AUDI)

Apologies

Kath BROWN (Commercial Radio Australia)

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Steering Board Chair remarks (D. Layer)
4. Approval of the Minutes of the 34th Steering Board Meeting
   Accepted, no actions
5. Actions from previous meetings
   a. Regional Websites Trademark Use - DAB+ licensing model
      Update in Project Office
   b. Test and Fault Reporting Platform (NP) - awaiting input from WorldDAB (SB35/6 Copy of proposal to WorldDAB)
6. Technology Group Report (Verbal) - BP
   a. Publication of updated TS 102 818 v3.2.1 - expected 2019-05-30
      ACTION: BP to draft a summary of changes and new functionality so we can publicise around that date.
   b. BP has created a more rigorous schedule of TG meetings and expecting more output. Up until now the group has reacted with limited time and resources, they are working towards supporting teams created and managed by an identifier.
7. Project Office Report (SB35/3) - NP
   a. Budget - NP updated and clarified how the budget was running this year
   b. Membership review - outstanding invoices currently being chased

    c. Events - discussion re event in Detroit and other events in Europe on nearby dates - DL and JD recommended Detroit, NP sorting logistics

    d. Website - NP briefed RK, RK in discussions with designers. Once wire frame is created we will circulate to board.

    e. Agreed WorldDAB's licence is satisfactory.
ACTION: NP contacting websites to acknowledge trademark.

    f. ACTION: NP to clarify with Radioplayer - elements they are using, WRAPI, includes streaming URLs, have all Radioplayer clients been informed, ask to send sample complete docs
ACTION - RK to add item to next agenda to follow up on this.

8. Standard Licence for Metadata and Content Update (SB35/4) - NP[1]

    a. [Version 2](#), [Changes between V2 and V1](#), [Updated Feedback Log](#), [Folder of Received Comments](#)
NP: we would like to circulate V2 as soon as we can as some people responded over a month ago. Most comments on Feedback log are as received, but some are parts of conversations (verbal and email) and have therefore been summarised.
Clarification of amendments and terms used, note the following comments:
JF: can a manufacturer opt out? Is it clearer to say 'broadcaster chooses whether these are the terms they wish to offer their content on'
NP: For added clarity - parties are content provider and radio stations. People in between facilitate, so removed service provider except to state content provider may use a 3rd party.
NP: definition of device manufacturer
JF: for clarification are Audi, Roberts device manufacturer?
NP: yes
JF: Difficult to make unambiguous - 'Whoever puts finished product into the market' might be a better way to put it
(NP will check with legal team)
NP: end user = ultimate human recipient, not a system
NP: Changed definition that metadata covered by these terms is that which has come for use on radio and acquired by using these technical standards
DL: NAB filed that separating text and visual metadata distinguishing.
NP: 'Machine readable metadata' needs to go back in as it has been lost in the process. Originally sat in 3.1. Action.
NP: wanted to make it important that URLs were not readable, so clause said URL not part of text string is not available. Radio – if reproduced on another device, that repro is covered by these terms. To cover back end those processes are subject to the terms as well.
JD: where does a random app sit?
NP not permitted to use these terms. Doesn't stop a radio station to give its own terms.
DL: would this cover what we are doing?
NP: yes
DL: does this need some language
NP: discussed with legal – intermediate parties are either handling and preparing metadata on behalf of content provider or device manu. If we mention one, do we need to mention everyone? Is it relevant for the terms? Everyone is

---

[1] This discussion will focus on comments received since the last Steering Board meeting (on 2019-04-16), and on the results of the manufacturer outreach.

contracted to one or the other... so easier not to list all potential intermediaries as they will be complying by virtue or contractual.

DW: suggests case examples.

NP: We think we will end up with the human readable version of their licence. Paired with legal text.

Action: NP to ask legal if we need to explicitly grant permissions and subgrant before the assertions that anything done needs to be in line with these terms after JF highlighted 2.1 is a restriction not a grant.

3.1.1 removed, adhere to common law in this situation.

DIscussion on how are costs for Hybrid radio covered whilst still keeping radio 'free'

JD: we need to define bandwidth and metadata separately, language so all broadcasters treated equally and then what are legal restrictions and desires of broadcasters, need to acknowledge reality of costs from car companies and restrictions from broadcasters.

WH: statement needs to be broad and generic

NP: let's acknowledge a broad consensus on what we are trying to do but the wording is problematic, take back to lawyer.

3.2 - agreed: delete second sentence

Action: NP to start drafting example cases to discuss.

To be continued at a future meeting.

9. Future meetings
   Action: RK to schedule future meetings.