

LCF TECHNICAL PANEL MEETING – Minutes**Location:** Conference Call / GoToMeeting**Date and time:** Tuesday 26th September 2017, 10am**Minutes taken by:** Sophia Sophocleous**Present**

Dale Beeton, Axiell
Francis Cave, Consultant
Andrew Daye, SOLUS
Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen
Mick Fortune, Consultant (Chair)
Neil Johnson, Insight Media
Ian Manson, Infor
Colin Parker, Bibliotheca
Sophia Sophocleous, BIC
Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca

Apologies

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
James Breakell, D-Tech International
Andy Chadbourne, Bibliotheca
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries
Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International
Paul Crisp, D-Tech International
Phil Farrell, 2CQR
Karina Luke, BIC
Anthony Whitford, Capita
Ian Young, Axiell

1. Apologies and introductions

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

2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder

The Group was reminded about BIC's Competition Law Policy, and what constitutes appropriate conduct (in relation to competition law) and that this conduct applies to all BIC meetings. Further information about BIC's Competition Law Policy can be found here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>

3. Review of minutes and follow up on actions from the last meeting, 3rd May 2017.

The minutes from the last meeting of this Group were approved without corrections.

4. Review of activity and issues raised on GitHub

- Issue #9: Explain "selection criterion" (filtering???) on "Retrieve entity instance list" section in "LCF 1.0 REST Web Service Specification" document

FC suggested merging Issue #9 and #36 (Selection Criteria Use Case - Offline Kiosk Patron Validation). MD clarified that although the two issues are connected issue #9 concerns various issues and requires use cases. Issue #36 is one of these use cases, but as there may be others, it may be worth keeping issues #9 and #36 separate.

❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to keep issue #9 and #36 separate.

- Issue #11: Exception conditions

MF noted that this issue is tagged as a low priority as it requires a use case. MD noted that if the issue is closed, it can be raised again in GitHub, should this be required.

❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to close this issue on GitHub.

- Issue #17: Investigate vCard support for Patron/Contact entity
MF noted that this issue is tagged as a low priority as it requires use case. MD recommended keeping the issue open as a low priority.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to keep this issue open, as a low priority.

- Issue #54: Add support for family/group patron accounts
MF noted that CP had been assigned the task of providing a use case for this issue. MD noted that the issue concerned how the multiple 'lead' patrons relate to each other. CP provided the Group with some scenarios such as a care worker using the library on behalf of their patient and teachers of children, who will not usually be family members etc. AD suggested creating a list of other patron accounts that each patron has access to. FC noted that some patrons will have different rights, e.g. a child would not have access to other patrons' accounts. AD agreed stating that a child's account could be limited. IM noted that a child could be returning a book on behalf of their parents. FC and AD discussed that only the lead patron and other patrons the lead patron has responsibility for could view the group's activity. MF noted that a proposal for a new structure is needed. FC agreed to propose a new structure for this issue.
➤ **ACTION:** FC to propose a new structure for Issue #54: 'Add support for family/group patron accounts'.

- Issue #55: Patron Authorisations Request
FC informed the Group that he had defined a new authorisation entity. The Group agreed that they were satisfied with these changes. MD stated that he will update the schema.
➤ **ACTION:** MD to update the schema for Issue #55: 'Patron Authorisations Request'.

- Issue #58: Patron entity addition - Parental Consent / Internet Flag
The Group discussed issue #55 being created as a solution to issue #58. NJ agreed that Issue #55 solves this issue.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to close this issue on GitHub.

- Issue #59: Add Notification mechanism
MF noted that the Group had wanted confirmation from CP that there is a real need for this. FC noted that a short write up of what the requirements are is needed. He stated that there are 3 alerts: generic alert, alert to a particular category of people, alert to an individual. MD noted the distinction between an alert (which pops up) versus a note (which a patron goes to read).
➤ **ACTION:** CP to add notes to Issue #59 on GitHub.

- Issue #60: Two phased transaction process for payment
MD noted that this is an interesting but complicated issue and that there does not seem to be a way of having a two phased transaction process for payment via REST. MD stated that help would be required as this is a complicated technical issue. He added that as this issue is

not much of a problem at the moment, implementing anything without a use case would be unnecessary.

- Issue #64: How to return an empty list of entities
MD noted that he has updated the schema.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to close this issue on GitHub.
- Issue #65: Deprecate use of HTTP Response Code 207
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to close this issue on GitHub.
- Issue #67: Handling loans from a library in a consortium without using inter-library loan
MF asked the Group if they had any comments on FC's response to Steve Wright of Buckinghamshire County Council Libraries regarding this issue on GitHub. MD stated that, as FC outlined on GitHub, it would be assumed that the lending library would be the library owning the item, and that this would cover all eventualities.

MD excused himself from the meeting.

- **ACTION:** FC to respond to Steve Wright regarding Issue #67: 'Handling loans from a library in a consortium without using inter-library loan'.

5. A.O.B.

MF stated that at their last meeting, the BIC Library Web Services Task & Finish Working Group had discussed a requirement raised by CC which the Group agreed would be better placed for LCF / the consideration of the BIC LCF Technical Panel. MF noted that AMB had circulated this information to the LCF Technical Panel, and read it out as follows:

In the last meeting of the BIC Library Web Services Task & Finish Working Group CC noted that Westminster Libraries requires an API which will integrate with its Customer Relationship Management (CRM) platform. She noted that patrons want to log into their account on Westminster Libraries' corporate system and be able to stay on that account (rather than continually switching from one platform to another) to perform a variety of actions; thus avoiding multiple logins. CC and David Thomas (DT) of SirsiDynix reported that at least two libraries have implemented an API of this nature already however DT suggested that one was not successful. CC noted that Westminster Libraries had been pointed towards an open source API that would work with the LMS even though it had been developed for a different CRM provider; Westminster felt linking the CRM 'My Westminster Account' and the LMS account would provide a better public service. She suggested that its implementation may be a good use case for this T&FWG, even if the API is not a BIC Library Web Service / standardised. John Garrould (JG) of Bertrams agreed.

JG suggested that a specification should be produced to establish which web services could make use of this type of authorisation. Terry Willan (TW) of Capita suggested that this requirement should be dealt with from a CRM perspective because the authorisation process

will take place on the CRM platform and will therefore be dependent on the CRM interface; third parties (i.e. libraries) will simply need to integrate with the API thereafter. The Group disagreed however, primarily due to the limited number of CRMs currently in use. Steven Wright (SW) of Buckinghamshire County Council commented that many authorities are experiencing issues (in relation to authorisation) with the interoperability of their Library Management Systems (LMS).

FC noted that he is having difficulty discerning the remit of LCF and BIC library web services in relation to this topic however in terms of user experience he suggested that the two should be reasonably similar. SW commented that any requirements identified by this Group which are customer-facing should be in the remit of LCF, whereas supply chain orientated requirements should be addressed by web services. The Group agreed. JG stated that Westminster Libraries' API therefore falls into the remit of LCF.

- **ACTION:** KL to add information into the ToR document for the BIC LCF Review Group regarding the remit of its work, i.e. customer-facing.

Regarding this topic, JG noted the following:

This requirement could very easily be affected by the SAP-Diageo licensing judgment. (See <https://www.dentons.com/en/insights/articles/2017/may/17/the-sap-v-diageo-decision-a-realistic-approach-to-indirect-access>) CC would need to make sure that the LMS / OPAC suppliers clearly license the API's for use by all the registered users on the CRM platform.

The Group noted that they did not understand JG's comment. FC noted that in principle, this is an LCF issue but more clarity is needed. The Group agreed that this should be raised and discussed at the next meeting of the BIC LCF Review Group on 28th September 2017.

- **ACTION:** Take to BIC LCF Review Group meeting on 28th September 2017.

6. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 31st January 2018.