

LCF REVIEW GROUP MEETING - Minutes**Location:** The Publishers Association, 29b Montague Street, London WC1B 5BW**Date and time:** Thursday 12th May 2016, 2pm**Minutes taken by:** Sophia Sophocleous**Present**

Francis Cave, BIC Consultant
 Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library
 Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Chair)
 Karina Luke, BIC
 Ian Manson, Infor
 Colin Parker, Bibliotheca
 Sophia Sophocleous, BIC
 David Thomas, SirsiDynix
 Anthony Whitford, Capita
 Ian Young, Axiell

Apologies

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
 Dale Beeton, Axiell
 James Breakell, D-Tech International
 David Brett, Bibliotheca
 Andy Chadbourne, Bibliotheca
 Mike Chambers, 2CQR
 Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International
 Paul Crisp, D-Tech International
 Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen
 Heather Sherman, Dawson Books
 Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca

1. Welcome and apologies

MF welcomed the Group to the meeting and delivered the apologies. MF noted that the order of the agenda will be altered as it would be beneficial to discuss any updates before tackling the issue of LCF compliancy.

2. Any other urgent matters arising- Update on LCF and Library Web Services

CC noted that the question of whether LCF and Library Web Services would cover the same ground had been raised. CC informed the Group that following a discussion with KL, MF and John Garrould (JG) of Bertrams, the outcome was that the two groups are separate but that they should work in tandem. MF noted that following a conversation with MD he is not sure of the remit of Library Web Services but is confident that there will not be any crossover between the two groups, since LCF is largely concerned with internal messages and web services with external messages.

CP noted that MD will be involved in the UK Government Libraries Task Force Steering Group meeting at the beginning of June 2016. MF noted that he is unable to attend it and KL volunteered to go in MF's place, diary permitting. MF noted that suppliers may have something to contribute to this meeting and suggested the possibility of BIC creating a Supplier Liaison Group in the future, with Kathy Settle (CEO of the Libraries Taskforce) invited as a speaker to the initial meeting.

It was noted that Carillion are running four library systems now and that they have commissioned the University of Sheffield to look at issues facing these systems. It was suggested that it may be worth having Carillion involved in the work the Group.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that there will not be any crossover between LCF and Library Web Services, and that it is the responsibility of members of each group to guard against this.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that a representative from Carillion would be beneficial to this Group.
- **ACTION:** KL to contact Neil Simpson of Carillion regarding joining BIC and subsequently working with the LCF Review Group.

- LCF Plugfest

AW was asked to discuss the LCF authentication question raised in GitHub. AW noted that an issue was raised on GitHub which asks whether another authentication device should be used rather than HTTP Basic authentication. AW noted that using OAuth2 or OpenID Connect as an authentication device is more secure. AW explained that with OpenID Connect, the self-service system would request a token to authenticate access which could then be refreshed. FC added that one token would authenticate the machine, the user and the location at the same time.

FC noted that a proposal for implementing this in LCF is to conduct a trial implementation. AW added that the Plugfest could be used as an implementation workshop and the theme could be 'authentication' and speculated whether any vendors would be willing to attempt trial implementation, considering the effort involved. AW noted that this may not be for LCF but a solution for LMS.

MF noted that there is no set date for the next Plugfest yet and asked the Group how they could prepare for it. CP noted that preparation will depend on resources available. AW noted that some OpenID Connect implementations are already available and work could be done in advance if the Group have the relevant resources. DT noted that the more international, the better.

MF noted that 'compliance' is an alternative potential theme for the forthcoming Plugfest and that MD is interested in creating profiles for it. DT expressed his definition of 'profiles' as including user profiles and functional profiles. MF suggested the theme of 'how to build a profile' as a Plugfest topic. MF suggested discussing LCF compliance before returning to the topic of Plugfest.

Compliance

MF went through his notes on compliance for the Group, giving an overview of what LCF is and is not, the LCF Charter and proposals for defining compliance. CP suggested creating a questionnaire (with a yes/no format) asking organisations what functionality they are

providing. AW suggested that the Group (and Plugfest) could use automated testing techniques and provide the test scripts through GitHub. This would allow any implementer to make use of the same automated test to guarantee compatibility. The automated test should exercise an entity from within the LCF standard, and ensure that each LCF operation can be correctly performed, including asserting the correct responses and data fields have been received. AW suggested that the Group could use the output from the definitions of Profiles to ensure that the test cases were well understood and complied with the LCF agreed compliance mechanism. There was brief discussion over which tools might be appropriate for all vendors, and AW stated that while the Microsoft toolset is in use with some vendors, Apache JMeter is freely available to all and can be used from all platforms. The tentative agreement of the Group was that Apache JMeter should be used to drive the automated tests.

IM suggested testing this and if it does not work, going ahead with compliance as LCF is only in its early stages, there may be no need to push for compliance yet. CC agreed stating that at the moment there is no reason to distrust organisations and added that a simple test could be run to see whether the organisation's system still works even when the supplier is changed at the other end. MF agreed that there does not seem to be much else to do but trust organisations, especially with resources limited as they are. FC noted that MD's proposition is reasonable while things are small but that vendors will have to demonstrate that they interoperate at Plugfest. KL added that this could be an annual opportunity. The Group agreed that this would be a good driver for compliancy and that it would need to be publicised more widely through the Libraries Committee. FC added that the questionnaire could precede this.

AW noted that profiles fit well together as a basis for automated testing. AW added that there would need to be automated test harnesses to drive the LMS end of the LCF connection, which could prove that all LMS LCF implementations were equal or at least have recognised differences. The Group would then have confidence that if a self-service client could work with one LMS vendor system, it would work equally well with another LMS vendor system if they both passed the LCF tests in the same manner.

MF noted that organisations are going to want to read the steps of how the compliance process runs. MF noted that the first step should be to identify the profiles needed.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that automated testing would be a good driver for compliancy.
- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that it would be beneficial to identify the profiles needed when testing LCF compliance.

- **ACTION:** MD to define a list of profiles needed when testing LCF compliance and add to Dropbox for this Group to review.

- LCF Plugfest

The Group returned to discussion around the next Plugfest. MF noted that OpenID Connect as a topic has a higher impact. AW noted that if profiles are used as the first topic, then getting interoperability with the LCF name on it will be easier. AW added that OpenID Connect will require a longer conversation. MF suggested testing one profile and asked the Group what resources would be needed. AW noted that technical editors would be required, then the test could be circulated to LCF participants.

The Group discussed the best date for the upcoming Plugfest.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that September would be an appropriate time for the next Plugfest. AW noted that he will confirm an exact date when the Capita office would be available to use.
- **ACTION:** AW to confirm appropriate dates for LCF Plugfest around the first half of September 2016. SS to set up a Doodle Poll once this has been done.

Post meeting update: The date of the next LCF Plugfest has been provisionally booked for the 1st November 2016, depending on the response rate.

3. A.O.B.

CP noted that he would be able to work collaboratively with AW and IY on automated testing.

CC raised issues with cash management and Netloan. CC noted that she had spoken to Lorensbergs (who are supportive of LCF). MF suggested approaching Lorensbergs to join BIC and as such join in with the work of the Review Group. MF pointed out that there are large organisations interested in LCF that are unable to participate and suggested liaising with SirsiDynix.

FC noted that information on both GitHub and BIC must be aligned once documentation is more stable on GitHub.

- **ACTION:** DT to update Barbara Pacut of SirsiDynix on the work of this Group.
- **ACTION:** KL to confirm the wording on the BIC website regarding LCF, with a view to aligning what is said with the documentation on GitHub once this information is stable.
- **ACTION:** KL to approach Lorensbergs about joining BIC and participating in the LCF Review Group.

4. Date of next meeting

As required – TBC.