BIC LIBRARIES COMMITTEE MEETING - Minutes
CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount St, London WC1E 7AE
Wednesday 18th March 2015, 2pm.

Present
Mark Allcock, OCLC UK
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries
Paul Dalton, Bibliotheca
Niamh Doran, Civica
Simon Edwards, BIC Consultant (Chair)
Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Deputy Chair)
Katy Gibson, BIC
Eric Green, The BDS Group
Paul Harrison, Norfolk Library and Information Service
Kathryn Pattinson, Askews & Holts
Heather Sherman, Bertrams Group

Apologies
Angela Belham, Bertram Group
Karen Carden, UAL London
Emma House, The Publishers Association
Stuart Hunt, CILIP
Karina Luke, BIC
Barbara Pacut, SirsiDynix
Ian Manson, Infor
Terry Willan, Capita

1. Welcome and Apologies
AB welcomed the Committee to the meeting and delivered the apologies. AB welcomed some new faces to the Committee, including Catherine Cooke from Westminster Libraries, Niamh Doran from Civica and Paul Harrison from Norfolk Library and Information Service. Unfortunately other new Committee Members Angela Belham of Bertrams and Barbara Pacut of SirsiDynix were not able to attend the meeting. (NB: Angela Belham will only attend meetings when HS is unable to attend).

AB informed the Group that she had been in contact with Emma House of The Publisher’s Association. EH informed AB that due to work commitments she, regretfully, cannot commit her attendance to all forthcoming meetings. However, AB noted that EH will still be included in the Committee’s correspondence and that she will be a guest presenter at select meetings rather than a full time Committee member.

AB also called on the Committee to suggest any academic libraries they think would be interested in joining this Committee and noted she had recently been in touch with the University of Sussex Library and Birmingham City University Library. MF noted that he had recently been in contact with the M25 consortium of academic libraries and had promoted BIC to them. MF stated that some of these institutions did seem interested in being involved with BIC and he would pass on their contact details.

ACTION: ALL/MF to provide AB with contact details of any academic libraries that may be interested in joining BIC and becoming a member of this Committee.
2. **New Chair to be elected for the Libraries Committee**

   - **Removal of Consultants as Committee Members**
     Following up on an email sent by KL to this committee ahead of this meeting, AB reminded the Group of the reasons why consultants were no longer going to sit on any of BIC’s 5 Committees. It was a decision made by both the BIC Executive Board and the Operational Board, and both boards agreed that it would overall be a better use of BIC’s resources, and generally better business practice, if going forward, consultants no longer sat on or chaired any BIC committees (which are strategic groups), but were invited instead to apply to run new specific projects/initiatives as and when they’re defined and signed off by each committee.

     MF noted that he had had correspondence with Karina Luke and also Mark Majurey (Chair of the BIC Operational Board) and that the removal of consultants from BIC’s Committees does not mean that ties are severed between the committees, as consultants would from time to time, be invited to attend committee meetings as guests to update on specific projects, where, for example, a written report needed further clarification, or a topic needed an expert view. EG and PD expressed their concerns over this Board decision.

   - **ELECTING A NEW CHAIR FOR THIS COMMITTEE**
     AB informed the Group that she had received nominations for Paul Harrison of Norfolk Library, Heather Shearman of Bertrams Group and Barbara Pacut of SirsiDynix. PH noted that due to lack of time and having only just joined the Committee he felt this was not the right time to be elected to Chair this meeting and HS noted that she would not be able to commit to attend every meeting. AB noted that she had been in contact with BP and that she was willing to take on the role; AB asked the Group for their comments on BP taking on this role. The Group responded that it would be preferable to elect a Member who is a librarian to be Chair of the Committee (not a member of a commercial organisation) to guarantee a level of neutrality, and therefore credibility, in the Committee’s discussions and suggested the position go out to tender again. AB noted that this had been done multiple times and that each time it had been unsuccessful.

     EG nominated Karen Carden of University of the Arts London but AB noted that she has already been in contact with KC and that she currently had too many projects to contribute sufficient time to the role. The Group nominated Catherine Cooke of Westminster Libraries and AB asked her if she would be interested in taking on the role. CC noted that she would like to find out more about the role and AB offered to provide CC with more details as to what the role would entail after the meeting. CC noted that this would also be subject to approval from Westminster Libraries but noted that they were interested in further involvement with BIC’s activities.

     **Post-Meeting Update:** Catherine Cooke of Westminster Libraries has agreed to take the role of Chair of this Committee and will consequently do so for all meetings henceforth.

3. **Review minutes and actions from last meeting**
   The Group approved the previous minutes and SE noted that most of the actions were for AB and had been completed, including getting in contact with Emma House of The Publisher’s Association.
who would now provide updates to the Group on an *ad hoc* basis.

4. **Update from Review Groups**
   - **LCF Review Group and Technical Panel**
     MF noted that there was nothing new to report here as there had been no further meetings since the last Libraries Committee meeting. AB noted that the last meeting discussed the term compliance in relation to LCF and that there would be a survey to establish the degree of adoption of LCF. SE further noted that the Group looked at including this in the e4libraries Accreditation Scheme but the Group agreed this would be too complex. Current questions surround the commitment of institutions to LCF and SE commented that praise is due for any institutions that have a prototype for LCF. MF noted that librarians must comprehend why they need it for promotion of the system to be effective. MF commented that he had been speaking to Scottish Public Libraries, Scottish Academic Libraries, CILIP Wales and 4 other organisations for SCC to generate interest for LCF and more widely for BIC.

SE noted it may be helpful to collate MF’s meeting dates in case any Members had anything to add and comment to other institutions that MF could pass on. However, MF noted how LCF discussion has been turned down by the CILIP Conference in Liverpool as it does not fit with their digitally focussed programme.

AB noted there was further potential promotional activity in the pipeline at the NAG conference in York which may take the form as part of the Conference or as a BIC Breakfast during the Conference. MF also noted he had spoken to Nick Stopforth at SCL who now have a new website, RL UK for academic institutions and SCONUL.

**ACTION**: MF to provide Group with contacts at RL UK (Research Libraries UK).

5. **Update from Task & Finish Working Groups**
   - **e4Libraries Accreditation Scheme Task & Finish Working Group**
     SE informed the Committee that the Group were still working on completing the deliverables and if the Committee had any changes it wanted to make, it was not too late to do so. He noted that the planned finish date of the project was the 31st March 2015.

SE noted that the process of the deliverables of this Group has been to look at the old scheme and update it accordingly in line with current practices and challenges in the Libraries industry. This new, updated Scheme will be established and promoted to encourage its adoption as widely as possible. The Scheme will be in the format of a questionnaire with methods of scoring; the system itself will be flexible to incorporate any future changes to variables and will be reflective of commercial practices. MA asked whether the online format of the questionnaire was one of the deliverables and therefore suggested that the Project could not yet be signed off as promotion and adoption of this online tool was critical to the Project. SE responded that it would be delivered once the new BIC website was live. The questionnaire would then be built and included on the website. Unfortunately due to unforeseen delays surrounding the BIC website this deliverable was not yet live. AB noted that the content of the Project Briefing...
Document could be signed off, even if the final format of the presentation of the accreditation scheme could not due to technical reasons. SE agreed and noted that the overall Scheme could be signed off, even if the actual delivery mechanism couldn’t.

SE informed the Group that there would also be a “User Guide” for the online form.

The Group discussed that it was worth looking at why Library membership for BIC was relatively low as increasing membership here was key to promoting the Scheme; a compelling reason for joining BIC needs presenting to the Library community. SE noted that vendor feedback was critical, particularly for EDI trading partners. EG noted that, if only 25 out of 150 public libraries are BIC Members, then is the Libraries sector fully engaged with BIC. However, SE identified that budget cuts were having a great effect here.

Post-Meeting Update: 43 libraries are BIC members.

AB noted that organisations did not need to be BIC Members to be accredited and therefore promotion industry wide would occur after the online questionnaire went live on the BIC website.

The Group agreed that the process of Accreditation was critical to form a “health-check” for libraries, and it was vital not to undermine the Accreditation process by lowering standards to attract more up-take. SE noted that further senior input from the Libraries industries would be very useful here.

MF suggested that a potential name change from e4libraries to “Best Practice” may be more suitable. SE noted that the name of the Scheme could be easily changed to cut ties with the previous scheme and to re-promote the new scheme. PD commented that any draft statements to accompany the Scheme need to clarify the benefits of Accreditation, both the process and its consequent results; EG noted that the marketing of this was critical. KP commented that it would be difficult to prove the Scheme is vital to attract contracts, as a supplier would not refuse custom purely on the basis that the other party is not accredited.

EG noted that the critical challenge is how the new Scheme will be marketed and that potential accreditors will need a compelling reason to apply. MA noted that it may be worth targeting suppliers in marketing the Scheme to make it an attractive asset for an organisation seeking contractual relationships with suppliers; it will indicate the efficiencies of their systems and processes.

The Group agreed that the marketing was critical and needs communicating beyond just BIC members. HS suggested that further engagement and perhaps even an alliance with NAG may help to communicate the Scheme’s aims across the industry. The Group did note that due to cut backs in the library sector, even membership of NAG was declining. The Group discussed involvement of senior figures such as those at SCL (Society of Chief Librarians) to encourage senior adoption and belief in the Scheme and for it to consequently filter down to libraries.
themselves. SE noted that BIC has had contact with NAG in relation to LCF and there may be opportunities for further collaboration and consequent promotion of the work and aims of this Scheme. SE noted that a brief would be sent to the BIC Training, Events and Communication Committee to promote the Scheme. If suppliers commit to acknowledging the Scheme, perhaps using Consortia to do this, then the benefits for libraries will present themselves.

Following the above discussion SE called on the Committee to establish where they wanted to take the Project from here and whether they thought that it could now be signed off. MA noted that perhaps the Project needs to be broken into three separate strands. The first, involving the process of reviewing the Scheme is now complete. However, the second, to make the new Scheme available on the BIC website, is not yet complete nor is the final strand which involves promotion of the new Accreditation tool on the BIC website. AB noted that the final two stages will be the last of the work completed by the Task & Finish Working Group. CC noted that this online facility is key to marketing the Scheme as it will make the process easier. SE also noted that another selling point is the new panel involved in the process, which will prove valuable in gaining traction among the targeted market.

AB asked the Group their opinions on the logo designs for the Scheme. The Group agreed the first logo was the most suitable for e-mail signatures etc.

**ACTION:** ALL to provide written feedback to both KL and SE on the Scheme (if there are comments to give) by 14th May 2015 at the latest.

**ACTION:** ALL to consider outlining a comprehensive and compelling argument to explain why this Scheme is valuable to libraries. Please bring to next committee meeting.

**ACTION:** Above discussion to be reported back by SE to the e4libraries T&FW Group for them to establish a marketing plan to implement after the online Accreditation tool goes live.

- **RFID & Privacy Task & Finish Working Group: Review and sign off advisories EN 16570 and EN16571**

SE informed the Group that the two advisories were well received by the Task & Finish Working Group and that he was currently working to revise and reduce the amount of content in the documents so that the final published advisories will not contain any uncertainties and have a clear “Don’t panic” message. SE noted that the EU mandates over privacy issue with RFID are not yet UK law. The first concerns signage alerting library patrons as to the use of RFID. The essential problem here is that RFID tags could lead to an invasion of privacy as the tags can track movements and information can be inferred from the data left on the tag.

SE noted that as an EU mandate the work of BIC’s RFID & Privacy Task and Finish Working Group was to prepare libraries and be at the forefront of discussions that will determine how to address compliance with these mandates. The practical implications of this becoming law is at the forefront of discussions as is how to minimise any potential costs that being compliant may mean for libraries. MF noted that the mandates had been issued to standards agencies and that currently the BIC Working Group’s message to libraries was not to panic as the BIC Working Group is also communicating with the ICO to track developments. CC commented that the
6. Watching Briefs
   - Near Field Communication (NFC)
     MF noted that this involves smart phone reading and communication with library tags when they are in close proximity. MF noted that he had covered this in his blog. Recent developments have included a patent application on the technology which had not yet been granted and was being investigated. MF noted that it was unlikely such a patent application would be granted.
   - Update from JISC Bibliographic Data Roadmap Group
     Stuart Hunt of CILIP was unable to attend the meeting but provided the following meeting update from the JISC Bibliographic Data Roadmap Group meeting from 12\textsuperscript{th} December 2014:
     AB noted that the membership of this group comprises of exclusively academic libraries; both RLUK and non-RLUK members, and SCONUL. Discussions at the meeting covered a range of topics, including strategy, data formats, coverage, access, record quality, identifiers and national licensing. AB further noted that the outcomes of the meeting are that JISC will be funding work to take forward planning on Copac and its data strategy. Also, within JISC, the responsibility for taking forward the outcomes of the National Monographs Strategy has been passed over to the JISC Digital Futures Directorate, with some internal funding. Furthermore, it was noted that a draft roadmap will be released shortly.

7. Update from BIC Library Technical Implementation Clinic meeting, 14\textsuperscript{th} January 2015
   - Library representation in Price & Availability Task and Finish Working Group
     SE noted the lack of library representation on the P&A Task and Finish Working Group and asked this Group if anyone was interested in joining the Group who had a particular interest in the metadata used by the industry.
**ACTION:** If anyone is interested in joining the Group, get in touch with AB.

- **EDI/UNICODE**
  SE noted that issues surrounding EDI messaging and UNICODE were raised and covered. The Group discussed e-books ordered on EDI and were awaiting the Digital Supply Chain Committee’s response on the matter.

- **UK SLC Subject Scheme**
  It was noted that some duplications were in the Scheme but that solutions had been found for websites and that three letter acronyms were being allocated for those duplications.

- **Next Meeting**
  SE noted that the next conference call will be on 22nd April 2015 if anyone was interested in joining.

8. **Update from BIC Library Metadata Group (Terry Willan, Capita)**
TW was not able to attend the meeting but provided the following meeting updates:

**ISBNs:** a long-standing problem area has been the way ISBNs are recorded in MARC cataloguing, particularly a lack of clarity on distinguishing between those identifying the product and others given on/in it. BDS raised it again last year and the outcome is that the RDA Joint Steering Committee has it as an action to review the RDA instructions on recording ISBNs.

**MARC:** We reviewed the papers for the forthcoming (now past) MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) meeting, proposing changes to the MARC format. Most involve highly specific changes or new elements of interest to particular communities. A code to identify leased resources, in the MARC 21 Holdings format, may be of wider interest, since many e-resources are leased.

**Bibframe monitoring:** Some fundamental issues remain and continue to be debated on the email list, including whether a Bibframe entity, such as person, should refer to some further Bibframe item such as Authority, or whether it should simply represent the real world item; and, whether to model items (e.g. physical copies of a resource) as annotations of an instance (i.e. a FRBR manifestation) or to treat them as the item itself. Meanwhile, a group of libraries in the US is experimenting with creating data in Bibframe and the Library of Congress is preparing pilot activities with a view to live production of Bibframe data at the LC starting this year.

It was also noted that the next meeting of the LMG will be on 18th June 2015 and that there have also been two recent retirees: Margaret Rowley and Ewa Lipniacka.

9. **Update from BIC Training, Events and Communication Committee**
- **Including an update on BIC Breakfasts for libraries**
  AB informed the Group that there were currently a range of BIC Bites under testing which would be published on the BIC website in the coming months. AB also noted that the date for the BIC
Breakfast on LCF would be finalised by the next Libraries Committee meeting. 
**ACTION:** ALL to let AB know if they have any ideas for what could be on the agenda for this Breakfast.

10. **Update on the Public Library eBook Project**
AB informed the Group that BIC’s LBF Supply Chain Seminar on Thursday 16th April was going to have a discussion led by Emma House of The Publisher’s Association on the Public Library ebook Project entitled “Libraries e-Lending Pilot: How might Library e-lending affect the book industry?”. However, it was noted that there had been a delay in the final meeting on this Project thus the content of the seminar will not include the final findings of the Project but will nevertheless explore what Library e-lending means for the book industry.

11. **Discussion surrounding linked data and surrounding KBART files (Knowledge Based and Related Technologies)**
MA noted that KBART files stands for Knowledge Based and Related Technologies. Linked data here can see end users linked directly to e-book users. MA noted that it was an issue worth looking into and noted that he can provide the Committee with the information which already exists about KBART files and it is a system valued at OCLC UK. MA and HS noted that as the use of e-books increases, particularly by libraries, the Committee should be aware of such technologies that will affect their use.

12. **Round the table update from all Committee members on areas of interest for BIC Libraries**
This was covered throughout the meeting.

13. **A.O.B.**
The Committee had no other business to discuss.

14. **Date of next meeting**
Wednesday 3rd June 2015.