
SB50/6 – Minutes of the 50th Steering Board

Tuesday 22nd February 2022 – 09:00 ET / 14:00 UTC / 15:00 CET

Attendance

Laurence HARRISON (Radioplayer)
Bob HEADS (Frontier)
Walter HUIJTEN (NPO)
Rosie KENDRICK (RadioDNS)
Maximilian KNOP (Konsole Labs)
David LAYER (NAB) (Chair)
Badri MUNIPALLA (NPR)
Nick PIGGOTT (RadioDNS Project Director)
Ben POOR (EBU) (Secretary)
Nacho Seirul-Lo SALAS (NXP)
Dave WALTERS (BBC)
Christian WINTER (AUDI)
John VERMEER (iHeart)

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Agenda approved
3. Meeting Chair remarks

DL introduced the 50th Steering Board meeting. Thanked everyone for bringing new members into the organisation at a constant pace, highlighting Gracenote and TuneIn as well as the 2 members from Korea, broadening the geographical extent of our membership. Also brought attention to the radio station in Seattle that sent out metadata that made some Mazda car radios stop working - story [here](#).

DL is doing a [NAB Pilot Blog](#) on the radio in a new electric vehicle, a Hyundai Ioniq 5, and will send a link to the group for interest. He concluded by saying he hoped all the board would be attending the GA, and also NAB Show where the next SB will be held, in person for those that can make it.

4. Minutes of the 49th Steering Board - approved
5. Action Points Review

48/06 - contact organisations around the world to see if they would like to work together on getting RadioDNS information at a country level publicly available - **country coverage is now almost complete so should be able to move this on at the next meeting**

49/01 - schedule meeting to discuss whether we should continue with the TAB - **complete, report in point 9**

49/01 - Project office to look into the offer from Konsole Labs to work with a client that can show using RadioDNS - **in Project office report**

49/02 - SI data accuracy review: diarise to complete again in April and report back, also keep working with people who have sub-optimal processes. **Report back in next SB**

49/03 - direct to the code we have in GitHub that helps check what is being provided is correct - **this is in GA tomorrow**

49/04 - NP to add in 6 month target to budget - **complete**

6. Approval of "[Roles in RadioDNS](#)" Document

NP explained the purpose of the document was to get a final agreement from everyone that this should be published on the website.

NS queried NXP role and doc was changed to say Service and technology providers

NS - purpose should be more explicitly written in the document. Should the internet also be shown on the diagram?

NP - this is to show the flow of metadata from the broadcaster to the device, not the specific ways it's transferred

DL - Should the document mention RadioDNS does standards and infrastructure, and expand on our infrastructure role?

NP - We can expand key roles to add in.

AP - NP expand key roles to include infrastructure and send it to the Steering Board before putting it on the RadioDNS website.

7. Technical Group Report ([SB50/2](#))

BP - ran through the report, explaining that the ETSI process for the amendments for the standards is almost complete and can then start working on the next set of changes.

NP - we have 3 active working teams. **Metadata Push** is in the final part of the process and we will have a demo tomorrow at the GA, and hopefully be finished by the next TG meeting on 8th March. It's been very helpful having the BBC build a prototype as we didn't see some of the problems in the paper prototype.

Current push portfolio includes text, album art and in the same standard for metadata. Once the working team has decided what they want to present to ETSI, it will be presented to the board.

Analytics - working prototype has been in operation. Anyone interested in being part of this should contact Andy Buckingham directly.

Targeted Audio into Broadcast - agenda item later to discuss the meeting about this project, so this update is about the technical work. There is a viable solution that has appeared. It is a little harder for the broadcaster to implement than for the head unit, and there is some complexity to do with timing. We need to build a prototype to make sure it works the way we think it should and we don't yet have a volunteer to do this. The TAB group were asked to find someone to pick up the paper proposal and give insight into function and effort involved.

DL - Can't share details outside of the working team because of IP and if no prototype is forthcoming, what will happen?

NP - Decision for BP/TG and SB - it could be put on indefinite hold until someone is prepared to prototype, or conclude that the idea is wrong and there needs to be a different approach (but this would be raised by someone who was prepared to prototype it), or the project is stopped. It might be that the member who brought this to us will be able to take the next step.

NS expressed interest in this project for something NXP could work on.

BP - we need to have broadcasters on board and contracting someone might be useful but for the Steering Board to decide rather than the TG.

NP - TAB is complex on the broadcaster side and needs a payout system to test, so the difficulty with prototyping is that we would need to build so much background

infrastructure it would be disproportionately expensive.

BP asked an estimate for costs.

NP - minimum of 20 developer days, plus building a playout system, more expensive than the demo device we are doing with Konsole and that delivers us a lot of demonstrable and endurable value.

DL suggested the NAB Radio Test Bed could be used to provide a playout system, currently installing an RCS product (Zetta Cloud).

NP - There are ways we can put tech into place, the tricky part is populating with content and making it behave like a real radio station. Thanks for the offers, let's ask the TAB group and see if there is a positive response.

AP - ask TAB group for a broadcaster volunteer to create prototype and report back to SB

NP started a discussion on the role of RadioDNS as this project advances. The benefits to the manufacturer of logging in the listener (or knowing who the listener is) still need to be worked out. The weight of implementation will lie with the broadcaster, but the broadcasters need to make this attractive to the manufacturers. Does RadioDNS need to get involved in making this case to manufacturers and do we need to start the conversation about listener log in? Could RadioDNS play a different role? This is a question for the Steering Board to discuss as it is more business focused - should we formally set up a SB group to answer these questions?

Discussion from board included:

DW - from RadioDNS point of view it is a set of standards for broadcasters and manufacturers to achieve an end role. From the BBC point of view we are publicly starting to say we are pulling back our feeds to be behind logins, so perhaps make the assumption that somewhere between content production and consumption, RadioDNS be in that space?

BH - as a manufacturer I don't want to see every broadcaster coming up with their own way of doing this. If there was an independent organisation that would be better.

NP - from a technological point of view we can achieve listener login, but what are the business and agreements that sit around that? For example, with Metadata provision, we identified a standard template early on, based mostly common sense, but the harmonisation of approach is a business cost saving for everybody, it doesn't compromise anybody and keeps bad actors at bay; a mutual, trusted central point where everything can be contracted once and get the benefits to the whole network. There is a benefit functionally and cost wise, but what are the implications of RadioDNS taking up a role more in the middle? A coordination role or set up a central point to get more involved? We discussed this last and the problem isn't lessening. If we could work this out, we could help with it.

DW - is there a way of using this particular technical point to agree on a way of authenticating and sharing data, but not standardise uses as that is between the broadcaster and manufacturer.

NP - RadioDNS has involvement, but we could become too involved and that is not our role. We need to judge the right level of intervention to get this going and no more than that. With the Metadata terms, we were slow to get going, and then only after we were in the process of putting it to bed, once it became a reality for people, we started getting lots of feedback. My learning is we shouldn't start softly, let's speed up our first proposal and allow people to come at it earlier.

DW - We should decide what the first proposal is, but as an approach I agree.

NP - We could create a group to come up with a broad proposal, and know we will catch criticism and use that to work from.

NS - What is the best case scenario?

NP – As a driver I get into my car, tune to a radio station and am given a simple prompt that says ‘do you want to log in’, and if I say yes the details are passed to the radio station and I get enhanced experience. Behind that there is a framework that allows the car manufacturer to consent to pass info to the broadcaster. Typically they want to know if the broadcaster is going to be secure and use personal info in an agreed way.

BP – there will be tech solutions that sit fine and work but there needs to be another element which is justification to implement. In lieu of lots of broadcasters and manufacturers that are positive about it. This could be a comms exercise and the TG could come up with why this is a good idea, there needs to be a justification for the business case, linked to why RadioDNS exists.

NP – A Steering Board derived group would work out the business case. When we started to talk about Client ID, most broadcasters were still happy to share all their metadata openly, but we had detected the early signs this might change, so we developed Client ID ahead of it being needed. Now we have seen a change on the broadcast side regarding freely available metadata, and we have a solution in place, but it is not implemented on the manufacturers’ side as the change was not yet being made at the same speed. The reason we are developing this is because the need for it is coming, it will need to be dealt with and this is a solution that will work. However, we need to have some broadcasters willing to say that this is their direction of travel. First step would be to narrow down our first proposal and have people not say no because of legalities, and we have some business and data sharing cases to help.

DL-- no one objected to group studying this further, so let’s arrange a meeting.

AP - RK to arrange meeting to discuss SB derived group to work out business case for the role RadioDNS could take within the TAB/listener log in ecosystem

NP - John Kean has started discussions about matching streaming and broadcast audio so it is more consistent. We will pursue this and suspect guidelines will be an outline.

8. Project Office Report ([SB50/3](#))

NP ran through financials - as per request added 6 month target and highlighted there will be some legal costs to renew trademarks in the US this year. Underspend on promotion is just because we haven’t had any promotions.

Membership update - those that haven’t paid don’t look to be a concern.

VRT have asked to stop their membership, we are hoping to re-engage.

Update on upcoming events, there have been no events since the last SB. Plan to have Android head unit x 2 for demo for NAB, we will also be at Radiodays Europe, but it is looking more expensive.

BP - how does cost for RadioDays compare to Lausanne?

NP - not directly comparable, but we are hoping for a discount on Malmo.

CW - can Cariad help at NAB?

NP - we have lots of space, so would be great to talk.

AP - schedule meeting for CW and NP to talk about Cariad on our stand at NAB

Demo created with Konsole update:

NP - This is implemented with an Android head unit, MK and his team have worked brilliantly to create this that we can demo and others can buy a head unit and test themselves.

NS - which tuner does it use?

NP - it's generic Android head unit, which runs Android 10 and the DAB is a plugin USB device.

CW - it works - we know many people who are using the DAB plugin.

9. TAB (Targeted Audio Into Broadcast) Group Review ([SB50/4](#))

Decided at SB49 that we wanted to check if strategically this was the most appropriate thing for us to be doing. Notes have been circulated.

Summation is we shouldn't let it be an open ended task and as earlier in TG section, if we don't have more enthusiasm then we need to question continuing. Conclusion from the meeting we had is to give the team 6 months to demonstrate this is something we should be doing. Commitment, resource and enthusiasm from broadcasters and manufacturers who are interested in implementing it is necessary. NS - key is direction of industry. Are we going to enable it as an organisation, or let different standards and ways of doing it be completely out of our hands? Direction of integration is clear, either we provide a solution or someone else will, so what is the role?

NP - counter view, could be if we can't demonstrate the enthusiasm to do this within RadioDNS then why would there be enthusiasm anywhere else, however take your point that we could have a role of coordinating.

LH - we are at the natural evolution of the project, there was enough interest for the working group, so we need to look at business and use cases and bring it to life through prototypes as the next step, so really asking if the group is able to take the next steps.

It was agreed that the Board will let the group continue for the next 6 months. Some concerns were voiced and it was agreed that as it isn't costing RadioDNS anything then a review in 6 months would be a good time to assess the direction of travel.

NP will work out reasonable criteria including working prototype and possibly number of broadcasters and manufacturers interested in implementing.

From DW in chat *if this was agile software development, this work stream would be de-prioritised... so question is do we have a prioritisation process across all our work streams... which would naturally let this stream fall away*

It was agreed that RadioDNS should have a process for logging and stopping working groups and projects.

10. 2023 Membership Fee Discussion ([SB50/5](#))

NP introduced the document by saying that when RadioDNS started it was hoped that there would be lots of members paying small amounts of money, and members would number in the 100s. For many reasons that hasn't happened. How elastic is our membership fee? Would dropping or raising the fee affect the amount of members or revenue? What is our plan if we were to propose a bigger budget and what would we do with that money?

DL - we have had a hard time spending the money we allocate, seems like raising it now might be bad timing. Great bringing this up now, maybe have a solid proposal for the April meeting and we would decide in July.

LH - if we raise the fee we must be very clear about why we are doing it and what we are investing the money in, and that would be for the SB to develop.

NP - we have operated as an organisation for around £80,000-100,000 for about a decade and we know what we achieve for that. To £120,000 would be an inflation raise. So, do we turn into a WorldDAB £800,000 organisation, or a £200,000 business plan and a one size fits all fee?

DL - NAB member fees are sliding scales based upon revenue, so could be a valid approach.

BP - EBU is the same, and should have a plan of what we could do with the extra money - more communications, more projects.

WH - this was discussed in the past, and would be an issue if we had a larger fee - £3,000 seems to be a sweet spot. Question is if we were a £10,000 organisation what

would we do with the money?

NP - I talk to organisations who might become members - ie VAUnet, they are similar to NAB in Germany, and for them the issue isn't about the cash cost, more that their members feel they are adequately represented by Radioplayer Germany, so it wouldn't matter what the cost was.

It was suggested this might not be the best year to raise fees, and to discuss at the next meeting.

AP - add review of membership fee to agenda for SB51

11. Removing Obstacles to Implementation

NP said the intention is to stimulate thought and discussion and to wrap up earlier discussions. What we should be doing is removing all obstacles to implementing RadioDNS so it is happening more cheaply and easily for everyone. Are we missing a trick? Thoughts and observations welcome now or on email afterwards.

DL asked for an example

NP - referencing listener login, is there sufficient legal framework or can we help by defining one? Value other pairs of eyes and ask the board to get in touch with any ideas, we all have different perspectives and experiences for a better view of the landscape

AP - all Steering Board to feedback on RadioDNS and if there are any obstacles to implement

12. Any Other Business

Feedback - NS and CW asked for PDF version of agenda for GA.

13. Next Meeting Dates

Suggested dates: Tuesday 26th April 2022 (at/during NAB Show)
 Tuesday 12th July 2022
 Tuesday 13th September 2022
 Tuesday 18th October 2022 (adjacent to NAB Show NY)
 Tuesday 6th December 2022
 (all meetings scheduled for US morning, European afternoon)

Outstanding action items:

48/06 - contact organisations around the world to see if they would like to work together on getting RadioDNS information at a country level publicly available - **country coverage is now almost complete so should be able to move this on at the next meeting**

49/02 - SI data accuracy review: diarise to complete again in April and report back, also keep working with people who have sub-optimal processes. Complete again in April

50/01 - NP to expand key roles to include infrastructure and send it to the Steering Board before putting it on the RadioDNS website.

50/02 - AP - ask TAB group for a broadcaster volunteer to create prototype and report back to SB

50/03 - RK to arrange meeting to discuss SB derived group to work out business case for the role RadioDNS could take within the TAB/listener log-in ecosystem

50/04 - add review of membership fee to agenda for SB51

50/05 - all Steering Board to feedback on RadioDNS and if there are any obstacles to implement