

**LCF REVIEW GROUP MEETING – Minutes****Location:** CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE**Date and time:** Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018, 10am**Minutes taken by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
 James Breakell, D-Tech International  
 Francis Cave, BIC Consultant  
 Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library  
 Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Chair)  
 Neil Johnson, Insight Media  
 Karina Luke, BIC  
 Colin Parker, Bibliotheca  
 David Thomas, SirsiDynix  
 Anthony Whitford, Capita

**Apologies**

Dale Beeton, Axiell  
 Andy Chadbourne, Bibliotheca  
 Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International  
 Paul Crisp, D-Tech International  
 Andrew Daye, Solus  
 Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen  
 Phil Farrell, 2CQR  
 Ian Manson, Infor  
 Heather Sherman, Dawson Books  
 Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca  
 Ian Young, Axiell

**1. Welcome and apologies**

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

**2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder**

The Group was reminded 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 previous meeting of this Group were approved without corrections. MF noted that the majority of actions from the previous meeting will be dealt with under the items on this meeting's agenda. The following action was discussed however:

- LCF Consortium Funds

MF and KL reported that there are still funds available for LCF, if / when required.

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

- Review of minutes and follow up on actions from the last meeting

MF reminded the Group that the issues being discussed by the LCF Technical Panel are recorded on GitHub, here: <https://github.com/anthonywhitford/bic-lcf/issues> The Group confirmed that it is happy with the work carried out by the LCF Technical Panel to date.

- NISO's FASTEN Group

MF reported that a meeting between BIC and NISO's FASTEN Group took place on Friday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2018 in order to exchange information regarding both their respective goals and to discuss the opportunities for collaboration. Any overlap in terms of interests /

workloads was also identified to reduce the potential for a duplication of efforts. FC noted that both BIC and the NISO FASTEN Group agree that standardising the language / terminology used for all forthcoming implementations (both BIC's and NISO's) will be beneficial in helping to ensure a continual dialogue between the 2 organisations and their output. He noted however that the FASTEN Group will be working at a faster pace than BIC, aiming to complete its work by June 2018, and will be producing a recommendation (rather than a standard) by profiling existing standards and technical solutions.

- BIC & NISO FASTEN Group Liaison Group

KL noted that an agreement has not been reached between BIC and NISO as yet however a proposal has been put forward to form a Liaison Group which will consist of a select number of representatives from the following Groups: the NISO FASTEN Group, the BIC LCF Review Group and the BIC Library Web Services Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG). A meeting between BIC and NISO will be held in due course to discuss the Terms of Reference (ToR) document (KL is currently reviewing FC's draft ToR) and to decide on next steps. It was noted that FC and other technical representatives will need to participate in this Liaison Group.

➤ **ACTION:** KL to circulate the ToR for the proposed Liaison Group to NISO, ASAP.

- eBook harvesting

The Group was advised that a question regarding eBook harvesting will not be included in the BIC Technology Excellence in Libraries Award (TEiLA) Accreditation Scheme.

**5. Feedback from the Spydus Library Management System (LMS) User Group meeting**

NJ reported back on the November 2017 Spydus LMS User Group meeting, noting that, unfortunately, the majority of the attendees had not heard of LCF so they were instead encouraged to engage with it, via GitHub. A BIC leaflet on LCF was distributed during the meeting by Civica. It was noted that library staff are unlikely to be well informed about LCF at present. The Group agreed to discuss how to reach the right people under item 9, below.

**6. UK library data set / SOLUS' requirements in order to build its app (which will be free of charge and open source) using LCF**

MF reported that, at the January 2018 meeting of the Government's Libraries TaskForce SOLUS proposed that it could expand the core library data set which was previously published by the Libraries TaskForce. Both SOLUS and the Libraries TaskForce are of the opinion that LCF could be used for this work. MF noted that once the work has been carried out the Local Government Association (LGA) will incorporate it into their system. SOLUS' list of additions for the library data set was discussed by the BIC LCF Technical Panel at its most recent meeting; no issues with the proposals have been identified to date. MF noted that Kathy Settle is stepping down from her position as Chief Executive of the Libraries TaskForce in March 2018.

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to circulate SOLUS' library data set document to this Group, ASAP.

*Post-Meeting Update: SOLUS' document was circulated to this Group on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2018 alongside the actions from this meeting.*

## 7. Update on BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group

This BIC Liaison Group last met in November 2017; the next meeting will take place on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> April 2018.

### - Tender for LMS procurement

A tender will be produced for the Libraries TaskForce in due course detailing the necessary LMS procurement work – it was suggested that BIC could write this tender with input from CILIP and the British Library. DT noted that many system vendors will only choose to engage with the tender once it has been finalised however he suggested that BIC may be able to influence the necessary work and its proposed 2-year timescale. It was noted that the Society of Chief Librarians (SCL) is keen to have BIC's involvement in the LMS procurement tender. Through the tender, BIC has a real opportunity to raise awareness about LCF. FC suggested that this Group should agree on its next steps for raising LCF's profile, ASAP.

### - Extensions to LCF

CP noted that one organisation has already produced an extension for LCF although it is not RESTful. It was agreed that while REST should be encouraged, this Group cannot enforce its use. FC suggested that examples should be provided to inform organisations about what could be developed using LCF. CP also suggested that a way to submit implementations for use in LCF should be devised for organisations' future use.

FC noted that this Group will need to agree on its policy for diversity (in terms of the languages that LCF functionality is developed in) ASAP. FC commented that the need for the creation of extensions should be avoided wherever possible, but where necessary, organisations should be encouraged to create extensions and inform this Group about them.

❖ **DECISION:** Any extensions for LCF must be controlled as much as possible by asking organisations to submit their extensions to the LCF Technical Panel.

❖ **DECISION:** This Group should provide guidance on how to develop / request extensions, ASAP.

➤ **ACTION:** AMB to add "Providing guidance to organisations for how to develop LCF extensions" to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel.

### - Authentication

AW noted that the elements included in LCF extensions need to be clearly identifiable. FC noted that Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) also need to be distinct. AW suggested that proprietary authentication functionality could be used as a case study for LCF.

## 8. Promotion of LCF – press, events, lists, email, etc.

NJ commented that SOLUS's app (see item 5, above) is the best way to promote LCF to the Libraries TaskForce. He noted however that another organisation intends to develop LCF to help with the forthcoming legislation for General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) due to LCF's encryption; as such here may be more implementers of LCF by Friday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018 (when GDPR comes into effect).

- ❖ **DECISION:** LCF developments to facilitate GDPR should be prioritised.
- **ACTION:** AMB to add “GDPR as a top priority for LCF developments” to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel.
- LCF BIC Bite
  - **ACTION:** AMB + MD to liaise regarding the Bite with a view to it being produced ASAP.
- CILIP Conference, July 2018

CC reported that she may present on LCF at CILIP’s forthcoming conference although she has not received a formal invitation from CILIP to speak as yet. She noted that CILIP would like the presentation to explain what can be done when using LCF which cannot be done using other frameworks. CC commented that Nick Poole of CILIP had been particularly interested in LCF encryption when they initially spoke. AW noted that there are less costs involved for organisations when implementing LCF compared to other frameworks; he suggested that this point should be referred to during CC’s presentation. The Group discussed whether the presentation should focus on how LCF can help libraries with GDPR or the work being carried out by SOLUS in relation to the Libraries TaskForce. MF noted that he has also been invited to speak about LCF at a forthcoming event in Dundee, June 2018.
- BIC LCF webinar

KL suggested that a BIC webinar could be held in due course to allow organisations to ask any questions they might have about LCF. At least one technical representative would need to be in attendance. The Group agreed that a webinar is not necessary at this time.
- BIC LCF newsletter

MF suggested that BIC could produce a newsletter going forwards to raise the profile of LCF and that, if permission is granted, the Libraries TaskForce may allow BIC to promote its endorsement of LCF in this newsletter. This newsletter will be aimed at non-technical representatives to generate interest in LCF and to inform them about what it does / what functionality LCF can provide.

  - **ACTION:** MF to write a draft BIC LCF newsletter for this Group’s review, ASAP.
  - **ACTION:** MF to liaise with the Libraries TaskForce to ascertain whether it would be happy for BIC to promote its endorsement of LCF.
  - **ACTION:** AMB to set up a BIC mailing list for LCF, ASAP.

*Post-Meeting Update: This mailing list has been created. Sign up using the following link to remain informed about BIC LCF news and events: <http://eepurl.com/dlPM1n>*
- BIC LCF PlugFest #3

It was noted that MD and Civica have both produced a sandbox to date, however the framework for each is limited. MF suggested that an LCF PlugFest should be arranged shortly and AW confirmed that Capita would be willing to host. The BIC LCF Technical Panel should resolve a select number of issues (on GitHub), prior to this event taking place.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that the issues regarding authentication, charges and payments should be resolved ASAP.
- ❖ **DECISION:** Once these issues have been resolved, a BIC PlugFest (and possibly a BIC webinar also) should be scheduled.
- **ACTION:** AMB to add this item to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel.

The BIC LCF Technical Editors should begin work on the issues listed in the decision, above ASAP. It was noted that MD has already begun work on Patron Authorisations Request (Issue #55 on GitHub).

- **ACTION:** AW and MD to circulate the Patron Authorisations Request solution, ASAP.
- **ACTION:** ALL to sign off on the proposed Patron Authorisations Request solution.

Entities for charges and payments are not yet clearly defined. FC suggested that a use case and guidance document should be produced to detail the implementation process / how to use the functionality.

- **ACTION:** NJ to log an issue on Github for charges and/or payments, i.e. “how do I raise a charge?”

- BIC’s LCF Twitter account

- **ACTION:** AMB to continue tweeting using the dedicated twitter handle: @BIC\_LCF.

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

- LCF / NCIP comparison

FC informed the Group that he has carried out a line-by-line comparison of LCF and NCIP messages. His analysis concluded that there is evident overlap between the messages despite the fact that the two frameworks take different approaches. FC noted that NCIP tries to be all-encompassing whereas LCF is more selective in the functionality that is developed.

- **ACTION:** AMB to re-circulate FC’s LCF / NCIP analysis document to this Group, ASAP.
- **ACTION:** ALL to review the analysis ASAP, sending feedback to FC, KL and AMB.

*Post-Meeting Update: FC’s analysis document was circulated to this Group on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2018 alongside the actions from this meeting.*

**10. Date of next meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel should take place face-to-face.

*Post-Meeting Update: The next BIC LCF Technical Panel meeting will take place on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2018.*

The next meeting of this Review Group will take place on Thursday 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018.