

BIC LIBRARY WEB SERVICES TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP (T&FWG) MEETING – Minutes**Location:** GoToMeeting / Conference Call**Date and time:** Thursday 15th February 2018, 10am**Minutes written by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett**Present**

Graham Barke, BDS
 Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
 Marcus Blackburn, Civica
 Francis Cave, BIC Consultant
 Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library
 Simon Edwards, Consultant (Deputy)
 John Garrould, Bertram's (Chair)
 Richard Hurrell, Bertram's
 Graham Jones, Askews & Holts
 Ian Manson, Infor
 Gwyneth Morgan, Nielsen
 Alan Oliver, Ex Libris

Joe Schulkins, University of Liverpool
 Heather Sherman, Dawson Books
 David Thomas, SirsiDynix
 Terry Willan, Capita

Apologies

Colin Carter, Innovative
 Paul Clements, British Library
 Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen
 Karina Luke, BIC
 Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca
 Steven Wright, Bucks County Council

1. Welcome and apologies

The Group was welcomed to the meeting and the apologies were delivered. MB of Civica, and CC of Innovative and PS of Bibliotheca (in absentia), were welcomed to the Group as new members.

2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder

The Group were reminded about BIC's Competition Law Policy – for more information regarding this policy, click here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>

3. Project Re-Cap

JG reminded the Group that APIs are faster and easier to develop and implement than EDI. APIs also have a lower cost technology stack, use machine readable schema, and can validate messages before they are sent and on receipt; a worked example in the *BIC Realtime Implementation Guide* shows that an EDI implementation costing £37k would cost £10k for the same implementation using APIs. JG noted that real-time processing has become an expectation / requirement in many industries due to recent improvements in technology.

JG explained the difference between the BIC Library Communication Framework (LCF) and library APIs / web services, noting that LCF deals primarily with communications that are internal to libraries (i.e. connecting a Library Management System (LMS) to other systems within a library's own network) whereas library APIs / web services are primarily for external communications (i.e. connecting a library's LMS with external suppliers of content for digital and physical products, and metadata).

JG noted that the purpose of this project is to create a suite of library-specific APIs which provide functionality that is equivalent to (if not better than) the current EDI messages which are in use across the library sector and which address the needs of digital supply, to arrive at a single consolidated workflow for physical and digital products and services; this work will be carried out with a view to extending the range of functionality / messages available in due course. JG explained that the suite of APIs which BIC produced for the trade in 2017, *BIC Realtime*, will be used as a starting point for the development of this project's library-specific APIs; *BIC Realtime* is based on the EDItX standard.

JG noted that proprietary APIs (including the potential for standardising existing APIs) and potential synergies between this Group and others (such as the NISO FASTEN Group) will be taken into account during this project. He noted that the specifications produced will need to be specific about what each message supports, e.g. JSON, SOAP, etc.

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

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved. The actions were discussed as follows:

- The British Library's (BL's) On Demand API

At the last meeting of this Group, PC reported that a BL initiative would be announced in September 2017; DT confirmed that this announcement has not been released as yet.

- **ACTION:** AMB to liaise with PC regarding the circulation of the BL's On Demand API documentation to this Group, ASAP.

Post-Meeting Update: Documentation for the BL's On Demand API can be found here: <https://apitest.bldss.bl.uk/docs/>. We note that this set of APIs include an Order and Order Cancellation API. The project should review these APIs to ensure that when a future BIC Standard Order and Cancellation is produced BL could easily migrate to a standard message.

- Existing APIs / web services

GM confirmed that an overview of Nielsen's existing APIs was circulated to this Group on Wednesday 14th February 2018. FC and JG agreed that it would be useful to know where APIs feature in delivering Nielsen's future plans for the purpose of this Group. AMB confirmed that TW's email, containing information about Capita's existing APIs, was circulated to this Group on Tuesday 8th August 2017. TW commented that Capita's APIs may be more relevant to LCF. He noted that Capita has only implemented web services that provide internal communications at present.

- **ACTION:** ALL to send feedback on / requests for further clarification about Nielsen's existing APIs to GM, ASAP.

- Representation from further organisations / organisation types on this project

It was noted that both Bibliotheca and Innovative are now represented on this Group. AMB reported that a response from Heritage has not been received to date. IM informed the Group that Heritage will be attending the forthcoming CILIP LMS Showcase on Friday 9th March 2018.

- **ACTION:** KL to continue liaising with Heritage regarding this Group and also BIC membership, reporting back on the progress made at the next meeting.
- **ACTION:** AMB to approach Heritage directly about this Group at CILIP's LMS Showcase.
- LCF and NCIP analysis
FC noted that the comparison of LCF and NCIP – both their similarities and differences – is more within the remit of the BIC LCF Review Group than this project. He reported however that the analytical work has been carried out.
 - **ACTION:** AMB to ensure that the LCF / NCIP analysis is addressed by, and is included on the agenda for, the BIC LCF Review Group.

5. The Library Web Services Project

- Representation from organisations / organisation types on this project
The Group agreed that the representation on this Group is good. See also item 4, above.
- Should OverDrive be invited to attend a meeting of this Group as a guest?
JG suggested that BIC meet with OverDrive (possibly via conference call) to explain the necessity of their involvement in this project. He also recommended that OverDrive should be invited to attend a meeting of this Group as a guest (one-off). The Group agreed.
 - **ACTION:** KL to approach OverDrive regarding a conference call where this Group and BIC membership can be discussed, reporting back on progress at the next meeting.

6. Update on NISO FASTEN Group activities and opportunities for partnership

FC reported that a meeting between BIC and NISO's FASTEN Group took place on Friday 26th January 2018 to exchange information regarding both their respective goals and to discuss the opportunities for partnership, including the identification of any overlap in interests / workloads, between the 2 Groups. FC explained that, in comparison to this T&FWG, the FASTEN Group has a broader remit (aiming to provide a seamless service for library patrons) and will move at a faster pace than BIC, aiming to complete its work by the end of 2018. FC reported that the FASTEN Group is currently discussing whether to adopt LCF or NCIP for its implementations however both BIC and the FASTEN Group agree that standardising the language used for all forthcoming implementations (both BIC's and NISO's) will be beneficial.

- Liaison Group
FC noted that a proposal has been put forward to form a Liaison Group which will consist of a select number of representatives from all of the following Groups: the NISO FASTEN Group, the BIC LCF Review Group and the BIC Library Web Services T&FWG; this proposal is currently being reviewed by KL.
- Areas of commonality
FC noted that the APIs proposed by NISO will provide better communications between suppliers, LMSs and Patrons. For example, suppliers will be able to check a patron's current standing with the library – via its communications with the library's LMS – prior to lending the eBook. SE displayed a diagram onscreen during the meeting, showing the

respective areas of interest for each of the 3 Groups (listed above) and where these interests overlap. FC noted that all 3 Groups will need to consider what kinds of APIs (i.e. XML or JSON) need to be delivered. He commented that both the remit of the FASTEN Group and the BIC LCF Review Group focus on patron to library communications. It was agreed that the commonality between this T&FWG and the BIC LCF Review Group should be identified in due course. JS advised that the NISO FASTEN Group, which he participates on, aims to produce a recommendation as its output, rather than a standard; the recommendation will include the profiling of existing APIs.

TW asked whether the NISO FASTEN Group intends to profile APIs which are already well established in the book industry. JG noted that the proposed Liaison Group will need to be very clear about the deliverables for each Group. FC and JS agreed, noting that the NISO FASTEN Group consists of 5 sub-groups which meet every 2 weeks. FC noted that a record of the APIs developed by NISO will also need to be kept by this T&FWG. FC noted that, despite working at a different pace to NISO, this Group can nonetheless try to influence / steer the NISO FASTEN Group's work to some extent.

- **ACTION:** AMB to send out a Doodle Poll ASAP to arrange a Sub-Group meeting (inviting JG, FC, SE, MD and KL) where an update on NISO's FASTEN Group can be obtained and next steps can be agreed.

7. Agree plan for developing the first set of APIs

JG suggested that this Group should begin developing its first API as soon as possible. He suggested that an API for Price & Availability (P&A) or Order Messages may be the best place to start. FC agreed, noting that the *BIC Realtime* (trade) API messages for these areas will help the library API to be developed quickly, although the additions / changes required by libraries will need to be identified initially. FC noted that an API for Quotes could also be developed as part of Order Messages.

- Quotes / Order Messages for Libraries

FC noted that the EDItX order message (which the *BIC Realtime* API was based on) will be useful in producing an API for libraries. JG suggested that this Group should contact / canvass all library suppliers to ensure that the forthcoming BIC library API addresses / fulfils all new requirements they might have and takes existing APIs into consideration. Once this exercise has been completed, both the *BIC Realtime* (trade) API and EDItX order message should then be reviewed in light of the library suppliers' requirements in order to produce this Group's proposed API model. It was agreed that this API should be the first focus for this Group.

- **ACTION:** FC to liaise with Graham Bell of EDItEUR in order to gain permission to use / circulate EDItX documentation for the purpose of this project.
- **ACTION:** FC and JG to liaise offline to produce an email that will request information to support the development of a BIC Library Web Service API for Quotes and Orders.
- **ACTION:** FC and JG to send the agreed text to AMB and KL, ASAP with a view to the email / statement being circulated on or before Thursday 1st March 2018.

Post-Meeting Update: This communication was disseminated to the library suppliers on Thursday 1st March 2018, with a deadline for responses by Friday 16th March 2018.

- eBook ordering

SE commented that all of the information which is currently added into text fields in EDI will need to be addressed by this T&FWG; in particular, an API solution for eBook ordering is a requirement for the BIC Library Technical Implementation Clinic (LTIC). JG noted that he is keen to align this proposed API with ONIX Price Types, since ONIX appears to include all the required functionality in its latest code list version. The Group agreed that it would be beneficial for this API to interact with ONIX and MARC, and be able to communicate the relevant information with P&A feeds. The Group agreed that this API is a priority.

8. Update on LMSs in use in the UK

AMB confirmed that the draft list of UK LMSs (which SE kindly compiled) was circulated to this Group for feedback on Wednesday 23rd August 2017; this list shows which organisations are contributing to / suppliers of APIs to date. SE noted that all of the information included in this document is available in the public domain.

- **ACTION:** AMB to recirculate SE's lists of LMS vendors to this Group, ASAP.
- **ACTION:** ALL to provide feedback on SE's List of LMS vendors to SE, KL and AMB by Monday 5th March 2018.
- **ACTION:** AMB to attend the CILIP LMS showcase on Friday 9th March 2018 to liaise with LMS vendors regarding their future involvement in this project (and joining BIC).

9. eBook Harvesting (and CC's case study)

CC informed the Group that library patrons currently require an account / login for all third party website in order to access / loan eBooks; this means that patrons are redirected from the library's system to the third parties' websites and have to sign up for a login to each website respectively – which libraries would like to avoid going forwards. CC noted that a single sign-on would be preferable. FC noted that this requirement is being investigated by the NISO FASTEN Group too.

CC and JG agreed that public libraries often order only a selection of eBooks from their suppliers (i.e. not the full catalogue) so each user would need to be authenticated and allocated a token by the LMS in order to obtain the book they want. TW commented that this requirement can already be catered for by existing, proprietary APIs. CC agreed but noted that these APIs will need to be standardised going forwards, if at all possible. She noted that this requirement was also raised at recent meetings of the Government's Libraries TaskForce in addition to the British Library's ongoing Single Digital Presence project. FC commented that the FASTEN Group may deliver on this requirement before this T&FWG is able to. He suggested that this Group should review the FASTEN Group's current documentation for eBook harvesting to gain an oversight of their progress to date.

- **ACTION:** FC to circulate a link to the NISO FASTEN Group documentation regarding eBook harvesting, which this Group should review before the next meeting.

- **ACTION:** ALL to provide feedback on the FASTEN Group's documentation to FC and JG before the next meeting.

Post-Meeting Update: The NISO FASTEN Group's documentation was circulated to this Group by FC on Tuesday 20th February 2018.

10. Update on UBL and EDItX

FC noted that there is nothing further to report in relation to UBL / EDItX at this time. He informed the Group that EDItX's main focus at present is on sales and inventory reporting for trade organisations, especially for digital products i.e. how to report sales under differing price models. EDItEUR is updating EDItX to be in-line with ONIX in this respect. FC noted that the EDItX International Steering Committee met most recently at Frankfurt Book Fair 2017 on Wednesday 11th October 2017, and will meet again shortly at London Book Fair 2018.

- **ACTION:** FC to provide an update on this topic at the next meeting following LBF.

11. A.O.B.

The Group did not have anything further to report.

12. Date of next meeting

It was agreed that the next 3 meetings of this Group should be scheduled ASAP; monthly meetings of this Group are required going forwards in order to make sufficient progress.

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 20th March 2018.