

---

## SB54/5 - Minutes for the 54th Steering Board

Tuesday 6th December 2022 - 09:00 ET / 14:00 GMT / 15:00 CET

### Attendance

Laurence HARRISON (Radioplayer)  
Walter HUIJTEN (NPO)  
Rosie KENDRICK (RadioDNS)  
Maximilian KNOP (Konsole Labs)  
David LAYER (NAB) (Chair)  
Nick PIGGOTT (RadioDNS Project Director)  
Nacho Seirul-Lo SALAS (NXP)  
Dave WALTERS (BBC)  
Christian WINTER (AUDI)  
John VERMEER (iHeart)

### Apologies

Ben POOR (EBU) (Secretary)  
Badri MUNIPALLA (NPR)  
Bob HEADS (Frontier)

### Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Meeting Chair remarks - DL shared photos of the arrival of mass market cars with hybrid radio in them, powered by DTS Autostage. Compared the photos of the difference before and after the upgrade in a Hyundai Ioniq 5. CW asked if the amount of text was a distraction. DL replied not really as he only really looks for the logos, but CW said the Cariad designers are concerned with having too much distracting info. DL asked how much of the content came through RadioDNS? Feel positive about the direction hybrid radio is going in.  
NP said it was interesting to see the design change and heartened that change is possible. Nice to see a car company picking up a fresh UI for radio. We know Xperi can import radio through RadioDNS and we know broadcasters think it is the best way of getting data to Xperi, displaying our influence on standardising metadata.
4. Approved the minutes of the [53rd Steering Board](#)  
Nacho asked about an article on Metadata Push in RadioWorld, NP replied it will be the next article he writes for Radio World.
5. Action Points Review  
**ACTION - NP to construct a short list of options for for providing FQDN information**

to review prior to putting it to the members for AGM in February - complete  
**ACTION - NP - write up and circulate a proposal to board for presentation to members based on £4500 fee point - complete**  
**ACTION - NP - create document regarding FDQN and client ID - complete**  
**ACTION - NP - to create a report to include additional data for the integrity check - complete.**

6. Technical Group Report ([SB54/2](#))

NP talked through the document:

Metadata Push - this is almost ready, has been a minor reversion but otherwise this is ready to be sent to ETSI, we just need approval from the Steering Board.

NS asked to see it and there was discussion on the approval. DL asked for time for approval. NP said there is a grey area as not all the Steering Board has signed our IPR policy, he needs to check with Ben Poor, as Chair of Technical Group. NS clarified he is prepared to approve it, but wants it as soon as possible to share with his organisation.

DL asked about the process and making changes at a later date, then asked the board who is happy to submit without reviewing it as many are already in the Technical Group. DW said he thought he should see it before he approves the submission.

DL suggested circulating it and asking for any questions before a week has lapsed.

NP said no reason to hide the document, an interesting question as this is the first time and we want to make sure this is consistently the right way to handle it. It was decided to circulate the doc to the steering board but any changes that are suggested by the steering board needs to be submitted to the technical group.

In future these will be attached to the board papers for review before the meeting.

**AP - Circulate papers for review and approval with a deadline of 13th Dec.**

NP gave an update on merging analytics and tagging and also TAB (Targeted Audio into Broadcast) which is paused at the moment due to lack of commercial interest. He also updated on listener log in and languages - there is no description available for the language of a radio station, only the language of a programme.

DW said the BBC has looked at this data, NP said he thinks the TG has a fix.

7. Publishing FQDN lists / Coordination of Client ID ([SB54/3](#))

NP summarised that this is making RadioDNS data more accessible outside the frame of hybrid radio. We need to put this to our members as it is a fairly different direction for RadioDNS. Want to communicate with the members about a decision to make at the AGM and make sure they are informed and engaged so we know the vote is what our members want.

LH asked what the problem is that we are fixing. NP replied that streaming radio services metadata is more difficult to find, so it was requested for RadioDNS to provide the list of things they would get from using FDQNs. This is moving towards being a directory which was not the vision of RadioDNS when we launched. Members like TuneIn are interested because so many people are adopting RadioDNS standards with an automated flow of data. TuneIn can contact all streaming partners and can request RadioDNS details from them. They have the resources to do this, but it has been asked that RadioDNS can provide the fully qualified domain names. There are 3 options suggested in the paper and we are asking the board to decide which option, or come up with another one, to put forward to members at the AGM in February. Option 1 is to do nothing, option 2 is to create a list with bilateral agreements and option 3 is to publish a list, publicly available but no agreement.

JV said he thinks without providing an opt in or an opt out, this might mean iHeart removes their service from RadioDNS.

LH said in the Radioplayer community they would prefer to do nothing or opt-in to this list. NP clarified that opting out is always available, but the lists would be either part of an agreement or public.

CW said he preferred option 1 and leave it as it is. WH asked why he prefers it, and CW replied that the RadioDNS core look-up specification and you can do some programming, you can get this information in a couple of hours, so why go to the trouble when people can find this information anyway.

DL added that this is what the pilot app for the US does. NP agreed and said the FCC publishes a list of all of the radio stations in the USA, those then get a PI code and you can work your way through the list. Similar in the UK. Other countries can be more difficult, but it is possible. Computationally this is expensive and needs to be run regularly to ensure it is up to date. There is also no agreement with RadioDNS.

DW - said he thinks we should think more about this. DL said he thinks that option 3 might not be agreed to, WH said it might be good to give 3 options, NS said he thinks 2 options is more simple, and could present 2, recommending one of the options.

NP said that we can say we looked at option 3 but didn't think it was a viable option.

JV said we could take the technical bit out of this and say RadioDNS is evolving to support non broadcast systems, and this is the strategic question we are asking - to move away from being a broadcast company and into a streaming one. NP said he agreed, DL added that it benefits our standard and database if it is used more. NP said he agreed that the network effect comes into play - the more people who are using it, the more people will use it. Places where engagement has been low are places where the radio industry is focused on broadcast or the industry isn't in a great shape so it might help us in those spaces. So if this is done and doesn't undermine our fundamentals, it would be of benefit to all if more broadcasters metadata was used.

CW said he can see standardised metadata helps in a lot of ways, the document needs to be made more specific. Some members (radio stations) want to be everywhere and be correct in those places, others want to know where their content is. The document needs to be clearer so everyone understands.

DL asked if NP could provide more detail but less technical specificity in the next version. NP said he would include the ethos of evolving RadioDNS's role in the metadata world and put the technical detail in an appendix. Should it focus on option 1 and 2, leave 3 out or add it in or reference it.

DL asked if it could be recirculated again after amending, and Nick agreed. DL added that option 3 is a distraction and said let's focus on the ones we would support.

**AP - NP to redraft the options to put to the board, referencing option 3, for review by the board.**

8. 2023 Membership Fee Update ([example letter](#))

NP said we have had no one say they won't continue to be members because of the fee increase, although we do have a member leaving us due to other reasons. Roughly half have confirmed they will continue to be members, but we will find out when we send the invoices, but feeling positive about it.

9. Project Office Report ([SB54/4](#))

NP summarised the financials for this year. We planned to overspend by £30,000 this year, and managed to overspend by £13,000 partly because we wanted to have 2 more members than we do, but we did spend more on technology. Not as much as we wanted to spend, but we are making progress.

DL asked how it compares with last year. NP replied that last year we underspent by £18,000. DL noted this was a significant improvement over last year, as we are striving to draw down our cash reserves.

Membership invoices will go out at the end of the week, due before the middle of January.

The Steering Board is up for re-election in 2023, Steering Board to let us know if you would like to continue or not, and for all members to make nominations.

DL added that he wasn't intending to stand for Chair again as he has done 2 terms and asked about the Secretary role too. NP replied they provide leadership to the board. As

