

**LCF REVIEW GROUP MEETING - Minutes**

**Location:** CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE

**Date and time:** Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> September 2017, 2pm

**Minutes taken by:** Sophia Sophocleous

---

**Present**

Francis Cave, BIC Consultant  
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library  
Andrew Daye, Solus  
Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Chair)  
Neil Johnson, Insight Media  
Karina Luke, BIC  
Colin Parker, Bibliotheca  
Sophia Sophocleous, BIC  
David Thomas, SirsiDynix

**Apologies**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
James Breakell, D-Tech International  
Dale Beeton, Axiell  
Andy Chadbourne, Bibliotheca  
Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International  
Paul Crisp, D-Tech International  
Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen  
Ian Manson, Infor  
Heather Sherman, Dawson Books  
Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca  
Anthony Whitford, Capita  
Ian Young, Axiell

**1. Welcome and apologies**

MF welcomed the Group to the meeting and delivered the apologies.

**2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder**

The Group was informed about BIC's Competition Law Policy – for further information about this policy, please click here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>

**3. Review of minutes and follow up on actions from the last meeting**

The minutes from the last meeting of this Group on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2017 were approved without correction and the actions were discussed as follows:

- Profiles needed when testing LCF compliance

MF noted that IM had looked at the profiles needed when testing compliancy. CC noted that libraries would require some sort of accreditation for using LCF. FC suggested that organisations would have to comply with data formats in order to comply with LCF. FC noted that in order to achieve compliancy, an organisation would have to be able to provide a specification of how they have implemented LCF. FC suggested that Web Services Description Language (WSDL) could be used to check whether data complies, and stated that initially there would be a lot of manual checks but eventually this could become automated. KL speculated who would decide whether an organisation is compliant or not. MF and CC agreed that BIC would, through BIC an accreditation style process. AD suggested that a third party should also be involved in the accreditation process.

FC noted that a RESTful implementation had been decided on as it is the most simple, and speculated what a SIP2 or EDIFACT implementation would look like. FC suggested that focusing on extensions to SIP2 might be the place to start and that there must be examples of extensions that suppliers believe are LCF compliant. FC volunteered to make a spreadsheet of message elements that are in LCF but not in SIP2 and proprietary extensions to SIP2.

- **ACTION:** FC to create a spreadsheet of message elements that are in LCF and not in SIP2 and proprietary extensions to SIP2.

- NCIP and LCF

FC noted that he has started to make a comparison between NCIP and LCF, and has found that so far there are a few similarities. FC noted that there are some things are not in LCF and that he has not yet made a comparison of data, but that he has compared NCIP and LCF in terms of functionality.

**4. Update on the BIC LCF Technical Panel**

The Group agreed that the minutes from the last meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2017 will be discussed at the next meeting of this Group, as they had not yet been circulated.

**5. LCF Consortium Funds**

KL provided the Group with an update of the remaining amount left in the LCF Consortium Fund.

**6. Update on BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group**

MF informed the Group that the BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group had last met on Friday 21<sup>st</sup> July 2017. MF noted that the Liaison Group had discussed its governance and that a meeting between BIC and LCF members on Tuesday 17th October 2017 will take place to discuss this further, with a meeting with the BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group to follow in November 2017.

MF reported that the British Library (BL) is now working on a UK Government project concerning a single digital library presence. MF noted that KS had suggested that the BL is aware of the work BIC and LCF members are currently doing in relation to single digital library presence and may be willing to work collaboratively.

AD suggested that LCF could represent e-content as well as physical content. MF noted that this is ambitious and CP suggested AD add this to the LCF page on GitHub.

- **ACTION:** AD to add his question relating to LCF representing e-content as well as physical content to GitHub.

## 7. Update on BIC Library Web Services Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG)

FC noted that the BIC Library Web Services T&FWG is focusing on what is in scope for both their Group and the BIC LCF Review Group to ensure there is no overlap.

CC noted that LCF is largely concerned with internal messages and web services with external supply chain/operational messages. CC noted that there are times when both web services and LCF are needed (i.e. when a patron moves address, as this will be connected to the council tax record). FC suggested that this particular example would most likely fall outside the remit of LCF and MF suggested that it sounds more like a single sign on presence item.

The group agreed to add 'Update on BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group' to agenda of forthcoming meetings of the BIC Library Web Services T&FWG.

- **ACTION:** AMB to add 'BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group' as an item to the agenda of forthcoming meetings of the BIC Library and Web Services T&FWG.

## 8. Promotion of LCF

### - LCF flyer

CC noted that she had written a case study on what LCF could do regarding library patron bills. KL noted that the case study will be used as a flyer to promote LCF, and that there will be a series of flyers on what LCF can do. The Group agreed that this would be very useful. KL speculated whether some of the wording in the flyer was misleading and implied that the case study had already been implemented (which is not the case). CC and KL agreed to amend the wording of the flyer.

- **ACTION:** KL / CC to amend the wording of CC's flyer.

### - NISO FASTEN

MF read out MD's email concerning the NISO FASTEN Group. The NISO FASTEN Group has now split into 4 working groups as follows: i) search and discovery requirements; ii) business and authorisation; iii) user interface and experience; and iv) best practice. The intent (as MD understands it), is that the latter will take input from the other three and identify where existing practice\standards exist and where there are gaps. MD noted that he has agreed to lead this group and that part of the work involved will be mapping out existing standards / APIs which is something the BIC Library Web Services T&FWG would also benefit from. MD suggested a joint meeting between BIC and FASTEN to discuss this further. KL agreed that she will circulate the notes from this NISO meeting.

- **ACTION:** KL to circulate notes from the NISO FASTEN Group's meeting.

MF noted that he has received requests from Scottish organisations to talk about BIC, LCF and RFID. KL stated that it would be useful to have flyers created in time for events, in order to promote LCF. KL agreed to approach Nick Poole (NP) of CILIP regarding LCF and RFID privacy promotion.

- **ACTION:** KL to talk to Nick Poole regarding LCF promotion.

**9. A.O.B.**

CC speculated whether any funding from the Government Task Force would be available for a single digital presence. MF noted that until the British Library's role in this is known, he remains unsure.

**10. Date of next meeting**

Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018.