

**LCF REVIEW GROUP MEETING – Minutes****Location:** CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE**Date and time:** Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017, 1:30pm**Minutes taken by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
 Francis Cave, BIC Consultant  
 Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library  
 Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen  
 Neil Johnson, Insight Media  
 Karina Luke, BIC  
 Colin Parker, Bibliotheca  
 David Thomas, SirsiDynix  
 Anthony Whitford, Capita

**Apologies**

Dale Beeton, Axiell  
 James Breakell, D-Tech International  
 Andy Chadbourne, Bibliotheca  
 Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International  
 Paul Crisp, D-Tech International  
 Andrew Daye, SOLUS  
 Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Chair)  
 Ian Manson, Infor  
 Heather Sherman, Dawson Books  
 Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca  
 Ian Young, Axiell

**1. Welcome and apologies**

KL welcomed the Group to the meeting and delivered the apologies. AD and NJ were welcomed to the Group as new members and the Group was informed that David Brett of Bibliotheca and Mike Chambers of 2CQR have now resigned.

*Post-Meeting Update: Philip Farrell of 2CQR will attend forthcoming meetings of this Group.*

**2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder**

The Group was informed about BIC's Competition Law Policy – for further information about this policy, please click here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>

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

KL noted that this Group last met on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016 where it was agreed that there will be no duplication of efforts or crossover between LCF and the forthcoming suite of BIC library web services. She also noted that the second meeting of the EDItX International Steering Committee (ISC) took place on Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at London Book Fair; *BIC Realtime* (both trade and library) web services / APIs may be affected by the future work of this ISC. KL noted that the LCF Review Group will be kept informed regarding the meetings of the EDItX ISC going forwards. The following actions from the last meeting were discussed:

- Carillion

KL noted that she has approached Carillion twice regarding joining both BIC and the LCF Review Group however a response has not been received to date.

➤ **ACTION:** KL to continue liaising with Carillion about BIC Membership and this Group.

- Compliance

It was noted that MD was actioned at the last meeting to compile a list of profiles that

are needed when testing LCF compliance so that this Group can review it. AW commented that this content is required before the Group can discuss / define compliancy further. MD informed the Group that he reinterpreted his action and created an example profile which can be found on the wiki on GitHub, here:

<https://github.com/anthonywhitford/bic-lcf/wiki/LCF-1.0.1-Implementation-Profiles>

- **ACTION:** ALL to review the profile (in the link above) produced by MD and send feedback to MD, AW and FC prior the next meeting of this Group.

- LCF Wording on BIC Website

FC and AW agreed that further work needs to be done to the Patron Authorisation Request (PAR) before the BIC website can be updated. They noted that JISC is particularly interested in this functionality.

- **ACTION:** LCF Technical Panel to ensure that PAR is finalised and documented asap.
- **ACTION:** AMB to add this item to the agenda for the next meeting of the LCF Panel.
- **ACTION:** Once PAR has been stabilised, KL to confirm that the BIC website is aligned with the information present on Github.

- Lorensbergs

KL reported that a response from Lorensbergs has not been received to date.

- **ACTION:** KL to continue liaising with Lorensbergs about BIC Membership and this Group.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with a minor correction from CC.

- **ACTION:** AMB to amend the last set of minutes to read 'Netloan' rather than NetLearn.

#### 4. Update on the BIC LCF Technical Panel

This Panel last met on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The following actions were discussed:

- Amended minutes from the LCF Technical Panel meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2016

MD noted that these minutes should have been amended to reflect the fact that any proposed new functionality in SIP3 would have required a use case before it had been accepted in the current SIP3 specifications. As such any feature in SIP3, but not in LCF, would have been requested due to a real need from a vendor / customer (and in many cases would have been implemented as a non-standard SIP2 extension).

- **ACTION:** AMB to amend the minutes from 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2016 accordingly.

It was agreed that the next meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel should be set up asap.

- **ACTION:** AMB to arrange the next meeting of the LCF Technical Panel via Doodle Poll.

#### 5. Update on and feedback from the second BIC LCF PlugFest, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016

AW reported that the second LCF PlugFest was attended by representatives of the following organisations: 2CQR, Axiell, Bibliotheca, Capita, Ceridwen Ltd, Civica, D-Tech International, Innovative, Lorensbergs, Peters Bookselling Services, SirsiDynix and SOLUS UK. In addition, JISC attended the event as a guest; NB this possibility is only available to non BIC members as a one-off. AW informed the Group that the attendees were split into two groups – one

technical group which focussed on developing / implementing LCF functionality during the event whilst the other group focussed on what is blocking adoption and what functionality is required to encourage adoption going forwards. CP and AW informed the Group that practical testing went ahead during the PlugFest and that a draft schema was put in place for this purpose. MD confirmed that bugs identified during the event were fixed.

- Patron Authorisation Request (PAR)

AW reported that a conversation about Patron Authorisation Requests (PAR) came about during the PlugFest. He noted that PAR allows organisations to define what their patrons are permitted to do in the library, e.g. self-service loans, etc. It also helps organisations to define the appropriate structure for Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI) and the kinds of responses that will be accepted; a code list may need to be produced for this purpose in future. AW reported that some testing of PAR and a discussion about which profiles might be applicable to PAR took place during the PlugFest.

- Promotions

This proposed new functionality, which was raised on GitHub, will help organisations to promote services that are available to patrons. AW reported that a use case has not been received for this proposed functionality as yet. CP noted that it may be necessary to identify the device that the promotion is for.

- Selection Criteria

FC noted that Selection Criteria is a long-standing issue on GitHub, although it was not addressed at the second PlugFest. This functionality would help library staff to search for products / patrons by providing a comprehensive description of what information is required / needs to be stored for each. FC noted that there has not been a large response rate from organisations about this functionality so it may not be required any longer or there may not be a suitable use case for it. The Group agreed to discuss this issue at the next meeting of the LCF Technical Panel. FC noted in particular that the way this topic is documented on GitHub will need to be reviewed as it currently forms part of PAR.

- **ACTION:** AMB to add "Selection Criteria" to the agenda for the next meeting of the BIC LCF Technical Panel.

- LCF PlugFest #3

KL asked the Group whether a third LCF PlugFest should be arranged to take place in 2017. CP and AW suggested that further work needs to be done by the LCF Technical Panel first, i.e. developing new functionality that can subsequently be tested during the event. AW noted that the organisations will continue developing LCF as a result of PlugFests and will continue to attend to ensure that they stay informed about their competitors' developments.

- Requests for new functionality

CP informed the Group that Bibliotheca and Civica have received a question about LCF from Norfolk Library and Information Service which they will respond to in due course. AW also noted that MF continues to discuss new functionality that is required for LCF

with the Libraries TaskForce. MD commented that he has received very few queries about LCF in recent months. AW reported that the last interaction on GitHub was received a month ago and prior to that, November 2016.

#### 6. Update on the *BIC Realtime* for Libraries Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG)

The inaugural meeting of this T&FWG took place on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017. FC noted that this project has two strands of work, one supplier-facing (i.e. service transactions) and the other library-facing (i.e. services for patrons (outside of the library) who want to know what they can borrow / order, etc.). DT noted that the British Library's recently-implemented API was also discussed during this meeting and may be used as a point of reference going forwards regarding implementation timescales.

- NISO  
NISO's eContent Working Group is in the process of listing functionality available through NISO standards to ascertain which areas could be extended. MD reported that he participates on this NISO Group alongside the *BIC Realtime* for Libraries T&FWG, and is keen to ensure that the work carried out by each Group is not duplicated.
- Existing Web Services  
FC noted that in order to inform the focus of this project, the members of this T&FWG were actioned to investigate whether other web services are currently available within the book industry supply chain in order to help the Group identify any gaps in functionality for libraries. FC noted that any functionality requirements identified by this T&FWG which are better suited to LCF will be handed across to the LCF Review Group for consideration and vice versa.
- *BIC Realtime* for Libraries APIs and LCF  
MD suggested that LCF could primarily focus on internal functionality (that talks to libraries) and the *BIC Realtime* for Libraries APIs could focus on external functionality which talks to suppliers. The Group noted that this could be messy. FC noted that Short Pick Note is a message from the supplier to a library and if a request was received for this functionality it would (by way of MD's suggestion) have to be implemented in LCF. The Group agreed to split internal and external functionality as per MD's suggestion. FC suggested that if the *BIC Realtime* for Libraries T&FWG identifies new functionality that is required by libraries but is uncertain whether the functionality should be developed in LCF or through *BIC Realtime* for Libraries, the relevant information should be passed to the LCF Technical Panel for them to decide.

#### 7. Promotion of LCF – press, events, lists, email, etc.

- Raising awareness about GitHub  
AW noted that it would be beneficial to raise awareness about GitHub and the LCF Wiki page to increase engagement – he added a request for new ideas / functionality requirements to the Wiki page during the meeting for this purpose. AW suggested that the Wiki page could list how previously submitted use cases have led to the creation of

new functionality so that people can use this information for cross-referencing. MD informed the Group that individuals from the UK, India and Japan have viewed his sourcecode since the PlugFest in November 2016.

- **ACTION:** ALL to inform their business associates and/or customers about the LCF page on GitHub to encourage further engagement.
- **ACTION:** AMB to tweet about the GitHub Wiki page and how to submit a request / raise an issue via the webpage: <https://github.com/anthonywhitford/bic-lcf/wiki>

#### - BIC Bite

KL noted that there isn't currently a BIC Bite for LCF although a flyer was produced previously; she noted that the flyer is a marketing tool whereas BIC Bites aim to educate readers about the key aspects of LCF, i.e. what its purpose is, what it involves and where to go for further information. MD noted that some of this information is on GitHub already. He also noted that he wrote an article about LCF being a REST service for NISO previously. KL suggested that a BIC Bite would be a useful resource to refer interested parties to. FC commented that organisations need to be provided with somewhere to go to understand what LCF does and what it could do in future.

- **ACTION:** AMB to liaise with MF, AW, FC + MD regarding the creation of this BIC Bite.

#### - Ensuring that LCF is specified in libraries' tenders

MD noted that the more LCF is promoted, the more organisations will ask about which systems support it. He noted that the key is ensuring that organisations are asking for LCF / putting it into their tenders and reported that some organisations are now beginning to do so. KL noted that CILIP has, to date, declined to include a presentation about LCF at their conferences due to a lack of use cases. It was agreed that this Group should ascertain what is required, in terms of a use case, in order to be able to present about LCF at CILIP's next conference.

#### - Proposed use case for a future CILIP Conference

CC reported that Westminster Libraries requires an implementation which could form the necessary use case for LCF. She noted that Westminster Libraries has kiosks and WiFi printing and as a result its patrons require a way to add a cash deposit to Symphony and Netloan in order to choose and pay for the services they use. AW agreed that this would be a good example of functionality powered by LCF. NJ noted that Insight Media has explored providing functionality of this nature to its customers previously.

CC noted that there is a requirement for crediting money to an account as well as paying fines / for services. NJ agreed to investigate the 101 schema to see whether it has the functionality that service providers require. He also suggested that Insight Media could provide the necessary use case with another library should Westminster Libraries be unable to do so. FC noted that LCF currently provides patron payment functionality, funds for which can be used against a charge. He noted that he will investigate whether patrons could add money regardless of whether there is an actual charge showing on the account. CP noted that it could be difficult to specify that the funds should not be used for current

finer. NJ noted that the system will need to inform the patron that a charge exists against their account; if they accept the payment of the charge, the funds will settle the fine and a charge ID will be raised; if they decline the payment of the charge, the money will not be used in this way and a charge ID will not be raised on the LMS.

- **ACTION:** LCF Technical Panel to investigate whether it is possible to provide functionality in LCF for crediting funds to an individual patron's account, allowing them to decide how the funds should be spent, and report back to this Group.
- **ACTION:** AMB to add Crediting Funds to Patrons' Accounts to the agenda for the next meeting of the LCF Technical Panel.
- **ACTION:** NJ to look at the 101 schema to see whether it provides the necessary functionality for system providers to be able to credit accounts and report back.
- **ACTION:** CC to investigate whether Westminster Libraries is willing to provide a use case for crediting functionality for a future CILIP conference presentation on LCF.

*Post-Meeting Update: NJ has confirmed that the 101 schema appears to provide the level of functionality that Insight Media / providers would require to create a charge against a patron and subsequently pay those charges. He suggested that most providers would want to have a solution to Issue 24 (PIN validation) in place and that there may be a benefit in adding Printing to the LCF code list (CHT) so that charge limits can be managed separately in the same way as computer access charges.*

## 8. A.O.B.

- BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group  
This Liaison Group last met on Friday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2017. CC informed the Group that BIBFRAME and linked data were discussed during this meeting. Mark Allcock also provided a demonstration for Axiell's virtual book club for eBooks. Kathy Settle (Gov TaskForce) and Ayub Khan (SCL) provided a positive update on the Department for Culture, Media & Sport's Single Library Digital Presence pilot – the proof of concept for which has now been sent to the Board for consideration; CC reported that this pilot works for 80% of eContent. The Group was informed that work is progressing on the Single Sign-On (SSO), and publishers are being approached to ensure that they can work with libraries on this.
  - **ACTION:** AMB to add "Update on the BIC Library Suppliers (Government TaskForce) Liaison Group" to the agenda for the next meeting of this Group.
- BIC & NISO LCF Webinar, Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017  
KL reminded the Group that this webinar will begin at 4pm. She noted that attendees from both the UK and the US will be in attendance. Due to MF's absence, KL reported that AW will introduce LCF to the webinar attendees followed by his presentation about the technical progress that has been made to date. A Q&A session will follow regarding next steps and LCF's relationship to SIP 2 in future.

## 9. Date of next meeting

Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> June 2017.