LCF REVIEW GROUP MEETING - Minutes  
CLIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE  
Wednesday 10th December 2014, 10am

Present
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
Francis Cave, BIC Consultant  
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library  
Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Chair)  
Colin Parker, Bibliotheca  
Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca  
Anthony Whitford, Capita  
David Thomas, SirsiDynix

Apologies
Keith Addis, Axiell  
Dale Beeton, Axiell  
David Brett, 3M  
Mike Chambers, 2CQR  
Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International  
Paul Crisp, D-Tech International  
Matthew Dovey, JISC  
Des Kearns, Axiell  
Karina Luke, BIC  
Ian Manson, Infor  
Heather Sherman, Dawson Books

1. Introductions and Apologies
MF welcomed the Group and informed them that, henceforth, he will be chairing both the LCF Review Group and LCF Technical Panel meetings.

MF reminded the Group that the LCF Review Group’s purpose is to manage the ongoing governance of the LCF standard. He noted that this Review Group oversees the work of the LCF Technical Panel, ensuring that the Panel is prioritising its time and work effectively and is therefore doing what it should be doing. FC agreed, noting that the LCF Technical Panel is involved solely with the maintenance of the LCF framework.

MF noted that this meeting should be conducted with a view to signing off all the work done so far at the forthcoming BIC Libraries Committee meeting, which will take place on Thursday 11th December.

2. Review of minutes and actions from the last meeting
MF noted that the last meeting of this Review Group was primarily concerned with establishing the LCF Technical Panel and defining its purpose. He suggested that everything discussed at the previous meeting will be addressed in the items on this meeting’s agenda and will therefore be discussed in this manner.

3. Review Panel Activities Report
- Minutes of the LCF Technical Panel – 12th August, 17th September and 27th October 2014
MF noted that these minutes were circulated to the Group by AB before the meeting. He commented that he hoped the Group had read these minutes and suggested that, as such, they should not need to be checked during this meeting.
- **Recommendations from Technical Panel:**

  - **Software Platform**
    The Group were informed that GitHub has been recommended by the LCF Technical Panel as their choice of software platform. This program will enable the three Technical Editors – Francis Cave, Matthew Dovey and Anthony Whitford – to work, make corrections and carry out amendments together. MF noted that not everyone will know what GitHub is and suggested that an information sheet should be put together for a wider audience so that it is easy for organisations to get involved and send their suggestions / requests. AW noted that there is an “issue tracker” button in GitHub which allows anyone to type in their query / issue / amendment and submit it to the Group.

    **ACTION:** AW to send AB a link to the Issue Tracker webpage to add to the LCF page on the BIC website and to the minutes of this meeting:
    
    [https://github.com/anthonywhitford/bic-lcf/issues](https://github.com/anthonywhitford/bic-lcf/issues)

    FC questioned where there needs to be an alternative, easier way of submitting queries. AW noted that most of the people in any organisation who will submit queries will be very familiar with GitHub. FC agreed, noting that this information will need to be present – alongside some business-level communication – on the BIC website. The current information available on the BIC website (including the above Issue Tracker link) can be found at: [http://www.bic.org.uk/114/LCF/](http://www.bic.org.uk/114/LCF/)

    **ACTION:** ALL to look at the above link and contact AB if anything needs to be added to this webpage / amended on this webpage.

  - **Operational Methodology**
    MF informed the Group that the above mentioned Technical Editors have been appointed. He noted that having three people in this position will help to gain a majority on any decisions made. He also noted that any changes that are made to the LCF framework will be reviewed by this Group but are very much in the hands of the Technical Editors. He commented that there will hopefully be a lot of new requirements being met soon. FC agreed, but noted that this Review Group can also make suggestions for new requirements too.

  - **e4Libraries Accreditation Scheme**
    MF noted that the e4Libraries accreditations scheme is in the process of being updated to reflect modern libraries as they currently stand. He noted that this accreditation scheme should acknowledge LCF compliant organisations. AB noted that the new scheme will ask organisations about their LCF compliancy but this information will not go towards the accreditation scoring until LCF’s usage is more widespread; the scheme will simply monitor which organisations are compliant.

    MF questioned how compliancy can be measured and therefore accredited in the future. CP noted that it is important to ensure that organisations who are not LCF
compliant do not feel excluded or at a disadvantage in their application. AW commented that 3M have a simulator for testing a different program. He suggested that this Group might be able to produce something similar for testing the compliance to LCF frameworks. The Group agreed that both a client- and server-based testing server will be necessary. FC suggested that a matrix could facilitate this process and AW agreed, noting that MD has begun work on this already.

MF commented that any testing program cannot check a level of compliance. He noted that it is up to customers to ascertain if the system is genuinely compliant. CC agreed but noted that libraries will not be able to test this to any large extent unless issues arise when using it. PS agreed but suggested that the accreditation scheme can help them to ask the right questions and inform them about what can be achieved and what to ask for. FC commented that ‘Open Standards’ is a key phrase in the promotion of LCF usage. He noted that the public sector is looking for Open Standards; which LCF is.

**ACTION:** PS to put together a one-page information sheet for LCF.

PS noted that libraries purchase systems for their functionality, but the purchased system may not work alongside their current system or may even override it. He noted that functionality is key to the accreditation scheme and assessing the functionality of LCF since this is essentially what the library has paid for. FC agreed, noting that systems need to be able to inter-operate as other technologies can.

- **Membership & Governance**

  MF noted that he believes there is a good representation of organisations on both the Review Group and the Technical Panel. He noted that this Group needs to ensure that anyone who wants to be involved can be, though the Group agreed that each person needs to have sufficient knowledge to bring to the table in order to be involved.

  CC commented that there isn’t a PC booking company represented on the panel and suggested Lorensbergs (who use SIP) would be a good candidate though they would need to become BIC members in order to engage in this project. iCam and Info Technology Supply (ITS) Ltd were also named as PC Print Management Solutions (PMS) who should be approached.

  **ACTION:** ALL to send contact information for the above mentioned organisations to MF and AB.

  **ACTION:** MF to contact the above-mentioned organisations to encourage them to take part in this Review Group (and join BIC, where necessary).

PS noted that this Group is primarily UK-based but suggested that international organisations and vendors may want to get involved. He suggested that promotion may help to encourage more engagement and that an open invite should be sent out. CC suggested that she could collate a list of global PMSs who may be interested in participating. AB informed the Group that any organisation can feed into this Review
Group with requests / amendments / issues but they would need to join BIC in order to have a seat on the Review Group or Technical Panel. FC noted that it is normal procedure to have to join a body in order to influence the work done.

4. Promotion

MF informed the Group that, since the last Technical Panel meeting on 27th October 2014, he has spoken to Nick Stopforth (NS) about both LCF and BIC’s relationship with the Society of Chief Librarians (SCL). He noted that NS was very enthusiastic about this collaboration and is prepared to run seminars on LCF and simultaneously promote BIC membership too. MF also noted that he has held similar discussions with Heads of Public Libraries in Scotland (HOPLS) but has received no response from the Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL). MF informed the Group that he and Karina Luke will be meeting NS at the British Library on 11th December to discuss how LCF can be promoted and thus drum up interest in its adoption.

MF suggested that this Group now needs to work on promotion and questioned who should be approached. CC suggested that user groups should be approached, by attending their meetings, in order to promote LCF. She noted that the meetings tend to take place annually and suggested that BIC should pay for a stand or else include information packs for distribution during this event.

**ACTION:** CC to provide AB with contact information for these user groups meetings.

**ACTION:** AB to look into the cost of a stand at this event and feedback to the Group.

MF suggested that more promotional pieces should be written for online journals, though he noted the reduction in their number of late. He informed the Group that AW is in the process of writing a piece on LCF for the forthcoming edition of Capita’s Panlibus.

*Post-Meeting Update: AW’s article can be found here:*
http://issuu.com/panlibus/docs/panlibus_34_l-r/6

PS suggested that reusable content may prove to be more useful long term and suggested that a webinar or document of this variety should inform readers why they should use LCF and why they should request it / increase demand for it. He noted that this reusable format should explain to readers what LCF is capable of and what it does that other systems do not. He also suggested that user groups could be very useful in this documentation’s dissemination. AW agreed, noting that the framework’s inter-operability and cross-production is its key feature. He noted that the secure sockets layer, that is free in LCF, is also a good selling point – organisations will not need a Virtual Private Network (VPN) to be able to set it up. He noted that, in short, LCF is cheaper and does more than other systems and this is precisely why it needs to be promoted appropriately.

MF raised the issue of social media, noting that we have an LCF twitter account but questioning whether a Facebook account or LinkedIn page is also required. The Group were not certain but suggested that the Twitter account may be enough for now. PS suggested that white papers might be a more targeted way of informing organisations about LCF.
MF suggested that blogs could be a good way of raising awareness about LCF. Forums were also suggested. CC suggested that there is a lack of forums available but commented that email lists would also be a viable option. She noted that libraries might then raise potential developments of the LCF framework as a crowd-funded opportunity. In this way, email lists could raise awareness to ascertain if there is a need for said development, and then it could be funded collectively if necessary. PS noted that demand is essential to this process and suggested that this issue should be raised with the Libraries Committee to see how this Group should approach the matter. He suggested that directly contacting end users might be the best approach. MF agreed but noted that this may be a few steps ahead of where the project currently stands. He also noted that meetings with user groups could lead to discussions about functionality which doesn’t yet exist. PS noted that it is almost a year since LCF was launched and suggested that, if this Group does not talk about functionality and begin to create a demand for LCF, the opportunity will be missed. AW commented that one of Capita’s customers maintains a mailing list which might be used. FC also suggested that webinars to select groups could help.

**ACTION:** AB to add the discussion about raising demand for LCF to the agenda for the next Libraries Committee meeting.

5. **Control / Ownership**

MF advised the Group that, since someone needs to own it, BIC should be the owner of the LCF framework. He noted that no one had challenged this assumption but suggested that they may in the future. He suggested that collaborating with other organisations could lead to this discussion. The Group agreed that this discussion can be abandoned until such a time arises. FC agreed but suggested that this Group should write a declaration to say that any organisation that does not want to share its work should not contribute. The Group agreed that this declaration should be signed by the LCF Review Group, the LCF Technical Panel and any new organisations participating in these two Groups.

**ACTION:** FC to write this declaration.

**ACTION:** AB to circulate the finished declaration to the Review Group and Technical Panel.

6. **A.O.B.**

**Proprietary Application Program Interfaces (API)**

PS informed the Group that Bibliotheca is opening up functionality for API that may only work from a proprietary point of view. AW commented that mappings can be done via proprietary web services but noted that the issue is the level of commitment or resources that the organisation can dedicate to it. He noted that maintenance could also prove to be an issue long term. PS questioned whether Library Management Systems (LMS) could provide this or whether it would need to be a third party. AW commented that it depends on who is funding the project. PS agreed and suggesting that this should be readdressed in the future.

7. **Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 10th June 2015.