BI*C*

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

LCF TECHNICAL PANEL MEETING – Minutes
Location: Conference Call / GoToMeeting
Date and time: Wednesday 31st January 2018, 2pm
Minutes taken by: Sophia Sophocleous

Present	Apologies
Francis Cave, Consultant	Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries	Dale Beeton, Axiell
Andrew Daye, SOLUS	James Breakell, D-Tech International
Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen	Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International
Mick Fortune, Consultant (Chair)	Paul Crisp, D-Tech International
Neil Johnson, Insight Media	Phil Farrell, 2CQR
Karina Luke, BIC	Ian Manson, Infor
Colin Parker, Bibliotheca	Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca
Dave Rowe, Somerset County Libraries	Anthony Whitford, Capita
Sophia Sophocleous, BIC	
Ian Young, Axiell	

1. **Apologies and introductions**
   MF welcomed the Group to the meeting and delivered the apologies. The Group welcomed Dave Rowe of Somerset County Libraries to the membership of this Group.

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, 26th September 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
  MF asked the Group for clarification on this Issue, noting that it is flagged as 'waiting for a use case'. The Group agreed to leave Issue #9 as it is for the moment.

- Issue #24: As a self-service device developer I would like to be able to verify that the ID and PIN that a patron has provided are correct.
  CP and MD agreed that this Issue needs to be worked through. MD suggested leaving the Issue open, as a low priority issue for the time being. The Group agreed.

- Issue #54: Add support for family/group patron accounts

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

FC noted that he had made a proposal for this Issue on GitHub and is waiting for the response and input of the Group. IY noted that having an associated patron group is a simple way of dealing with this issue and means very little change to be made to the schema.

➢ **ACTION:** ALL to provide the Group with feedback regarding FC's proposal for Issue #54 on GitHub.

- Issue #58: Patron entity addition - Parental Consent / Internet Flag
NJ noted that the Group had agreed to close this Issue on GitHub, as Issue #55 solves it.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed to close this issue on GitHub.

- Issue #59: Add Notification mechanism
CP noted that he had provided a use case for this Issue on GitHub.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that a new message entity is required, to enable messages and alerts of various kinds to be sent to Patrons.
➢ **ACTION:** FC to submit a suggestion in GitHub of what a message entity in LCF might look like, for Issue #59.

- Issue #60: Two phased transaction process for payment
FC noted that he had recently looked into this Issue. He noted that two elements may be required: one element containing the authorisation from the LMS to go ahead with payment on the specified terms and another containing a transaction reference to include when the LMS creates a new payment entity.
MD noted that the main question is whether there is any other mechanism that other organisations have used to accomplish this and if there are any risks.
➢ **ACTION:** ALL to provide examples of any other mechanisms that have been used to accomplish this Issue.

- Issue #67: Handling loans from a library in a consortium without using inter-library loan
FC noted that there has been recent discussion on this Issue on GitHub and that it is risky to conflate location and authority. FC noted that the Group should consider drafting an authority entity without conflating location and authority. MD suggested that this Issue could be added as a use case to Issue #68: Authority ID.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that this Issue should be closed and used as a use case of Issue #68: Authority ID.

- Issue #69: Out of hours / unmanned site access
MD speculated whether this issue could be used with Issue #55. CP and NJ agreed that this should meet the requirement.
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that this should be added to Issue #55: Patron Authorisations Request.

- Issue #70: Code list IMT (Item media type / format) is not referenced anywhere
The Group agreed that continuing with the IMT code list should be discussed further. FC suggested that another alternative is to use the ONIX code list 150 or 175.

The book industry's supply chain organisation

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

➢ **ACTION:** FC and CP to liaise regarding Issue #70.

- Issue #71: Add Printing to LCF code list CHT Charge Type
  MD noted that this is an uncontroversial addition and FC agreed.
  ➢ **ACTION:** FC to add printing to LCF code list CHT Charge Type, relating to Issue #71.

5. **NISO's FASTEN Group / Project**
   MD noted that BIC had a meeting with NISO on Friday 26th January 2018 to discuss the work of the FASTEN Group and any projects that coincide with those of BIC. He noted that the meeting had gone well and that a number of overlapping areas had been discussed.

   FC suggested setting up a cross-party group (comprising BIC LCF Technical Panel, BIC LCF Review Group, BIC Library Web Services Task & Finish Working Group and the NISO FASTEN Group) comparing NCIP and FASTEN. FC noted that he would like to be involved in such a Group, representing LCF. The Group agreed that once the NISO FASTEN Group and all BIC Groups approve of a cross-party group, Terms of Reference should be written and a meeting set up. MD noted that this cross-party group should take the form of a BIC Task & Finish Working Group. FC agreed, clarifying that the project should run for approximately 6 – 9 months. MD and FC agreed to draft the Terms of Reference by Thursday 15th February 2018. KL informed the Group that examples of BIC's Terms of Reference for other groups are available on Committee pages on the BIC website.
   ➢ **ACTION:** KL to ensure that both the FASTEN Group and the BIC Library Web Services Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG) approve of the proposal to set up a cross-party group comprising members from the BIC LCF Technical Panel / Review Group, BIC Library Web Services T&FWG and FASTEN.
   ➢ **ACTION:** MD and FC to draft the Terms of Reference for the proposed Group by the Thursday 15th February 2018.
     Post-Meeting Update: this has been done and KL is reviewing the document.

6. **UK library data set / SOLUS' requirements (i.e. new elements / possible values) in order to build their app using LCF (NB: this app will be supplied free of charge and as open source)**
   MF informed the Group that the Libraries Government Taskforce had met on Monday 15th January 2018 and that the Taskforce is eager for this work to be done. AD went through his document 'Discussion points for extension of LCF to support Libraries Taskforce open data ambitions', which had been circulated prior to the meeting.

   AD noted that at the moment LCF is not extensible due to proprietary issues but speculated whether this could change. FC noted that this has not been considered by the BIC LCF Technical Panel or BIC LCF Review Group before, and that it would be useful to have examples of the extensions to LCF. AD noted that the anonymization of personal information relates to potential risk associated with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

   FC suggested that the Group annotate AD's documentation with their feedback and send this back to AD. The Group agreed.

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

> **ACTION:** ALL to provide AD with feedback on SOLUS' requirements by annotating his documentation and sending this back him.

7. A.O.B.

The Group agreed that FC's comparison of NCIP and SIP2 should be discussed at the next meeting of this Group.

- eBook harvesting platforms

KL noted that eBook harvesting platforms had been raised at the last meetings of both the BIC Library Suppliers (Government Taskforce) Liaison Group, and the BIC Library Technical Implementation Clinic (LTIC). KL noted that AMB had circulated the discussion from the BIC LTIC meeting to the LCF Technical Panel, and read it out as follows:

AMB informed the Group that this topic was raised at the most recent meeting of the BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group, which took place on Wednesday 29th November 2017. CC noted that libraries each subscribe to multiple eBook platforms but would like to offer a seamless, single-sign on process to their patrons, allowing them access to the whole catalogue without the multiple sign-ons (per platform) which are currently a necessity. ND informed the Group that a single sign-on for eBook platforms is already available via APIs and that this functionality is included in at least three of Civica's LMSs. CC noted that a single sign-on is required for all LMSs for that organisations can implement it.

DT suggested that SirsiDynix is also able to provide some functionality for eBook harvesting to date. CC agreed but noted that, using SirsiDynix's API, patrons still have to set up an account with a third party in order to access their chosen eBook. SE suggested that, by way of a solution, library suppliers could join libraries going forwards to provide the access required. He suggested that this topic should be discussed further by both the BIC LCF Review Group and BIC LCF Technical Panel. CC reported that she has already written a case study for the BIC LCF Review Group / Technical Panel for this purpose.

MD noted that this sounds familiar to the work of NISO's FASTEN Group. KL speculated whether policy relating to eBook harvesting should be added to the TEiLA Accreditation Scheme. She noted that there had been discussion of whether writing policy in this area is within scope for BIC or whether it is too commercial and more of a business concern than a concern for BIC. FC noted that unless BIC would be defining the criteria, he does not think it should be included in the TEiLA Accreditation Scheme.

MF speculated whether CILIP will be endorsing LCF now that Nick Poole (NP) of CILIP has been appointed Chair of the BIC Executive Board. KL noted that she has asked NP to join the next BIC Libraries Committee, as a guest.

8. Date of next meeting

TBC, after meeting of the BIC LCF Review Group on Thursday 22nd February 2018.

The book industry's supply chain organisation