BI*C*

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

BIC LIBRARY WEB SERVICES TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP (T&FWG) MEETING – Minutes
Location: GoToMeeting / Conference Call
Date and time: Tuesday 8th August 2017, 2pm
Minutes written by: Alaina-Marie Bassett

Present	Ian Manson, Infor
Graham Barke, BDS	Gwyneth Morgan, Nielsen
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC	Alan Oliver, Ex Libris
Francis Cave, BIC Consultant	Heather Sherman, Dawson Books
Paul Clements, British Library	David Thomas, SirsiDynix
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library	Terry Willan, Capita
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Deputy)	Steven Wright, Bucks County Council
John Garrould, Bertram's (Chair)	
Richard Hurrell, Bertram's	**Apologies**
Graham Jones, Askews & Holts	Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen
Karina Luke, BIC	Joe Schulkins, University of Liverpool

1. **Welcome and apologies**
   The Group was welcomed to the meeting and the apologies were delivered. GB of BDS, PC of the British Library and RH of Bertram's 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. **Review of minutes and follow up on actions from the last meeting**
   The minutes from the previous meeting of this Group were approved without corrections. The actions were discussed as follows:
   - Amending the minutes from the last meeting
     AMB confirmed that the previous set of minutes were amended according to the feedback received at the last meeting and then recirculated on Thursday 8th June 2017. She also confirmed that the name of this Group has now been amended to the BIC Library Web Services T&FWG. JG agreed with this decision.

   - New requirements / functionality
     JG confirmed that a number of suggestions / wish-lists were submitted by the members of this Group following the last meeting; these will be discussed under Item 5.

   - JISC authentication project
     JG noted that, at the last meeting, this Group suggested that further information about JISC's national project should be obtained with a view to establishing whether the project is likely to fulfil this Group's requirements for authentication. TW commented that the requirements identified by this Group, which are primarily for end-users / third

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

party authentication, seem more in scope for the BIC Library Communication Framework (LCF) than this T&FWG. IM suggested that the requirement falls between the remit of LCF and this T&FWG however. JG noted that, at present, this Group does not know how many BIC Library Web Services will require authentication so he suggested that this item should be addressed at a later stage in the project. He noted that it would be best to focus on a limited number of web services at one time, i.e. three maximum, to facilitate the progress of this Group.

- EDItX message formats
  AMB confirmed that FC's email regarding EDItX message formats for library applications was recirculated to the Group on Wednesday 26th July 2017.

- The British Library's On Demand API
  DT reported that SirsiDynix has one, live customer that is using the On Demand API at present. He noted however that to further adoptions it will need to be possible to implement this API on a number of platforms. PC informed the Group that the British Library produced this API approximately 5 years ago but is looking to develop it further soon to ensure that more people are able to access the British Library's catalogue. JG suggested that this API may benefit from a BIC / standardised approach. PC noted that further information about the developments for this API will be released in September 2017. JG noted that it is fundamental that the API is interoperable to ensure as many organisations as possible can use it.
  ➤ **ACTION**: PC to circulate documentation for the On Demand API to this Group, ASAP.
  ➤ **ACTION**: AMB to recirculate AO's email (dated 12th June 2017) on this topic.

- NISO's FASTEN Group
  MD circulated a summary of the work done to date by NISO's FASTEN Group (which is currently in the process of collating information about existing APIs / standards on a global scale) on Tuesday 8th August 2017. KL displayed this email on screen during the meeting, noting that MD believes there are potential areas of the FASTEN Group's work which overlap with both this T&FWG and LCF. MD suggested that it might make sense for this T&FWG to work collaboratively with the FASTEN Group for this reason. SE suggested that a global overview of existing APIs would be useful to ensure a duplication of efforts is avoided. JG suggested that a breakout session to review the documentation provided by MD and to discuss the proposed collaboration should be set up ASAP.
  ➤ **ACTION**: AMB to arrange a face-to-face meeting / breakout session between KL, JG, SE, FC and MD ASAP via Doodle Poll.

- Existing web services
  GM confirmed that information about Nielsen's existing web services was circulated to this Group on Tuesday 8th August 2017. SE noted that the summary provided is high level; he asked whether further information could be provided including the name of each web service, what it does, which organisations are hosting it and which are implementing it. JG noted that the web services listed are all proprietary and it is unclear

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

whether they are for use with ONIX. TW confirmed that information about Capita's existing web services was circulated to this Group on Friday 9th June 2017. JG suggested that this Group should further analyse the common themes of the APIs in existence and how long they have been available. He noted that it is important to carry out this work before this Group can say for certain which requirements are yet to be met.

- ➢ **ACTION**: GM to provide further information about Nielsen's web services, ASAP.
- ➢ **ACTION**: AMB to recirculate TW's email to this Group, ASAP.
- ➢ **ACTION**: ALL to gain a better understanding of the work which FASTEN is carrying out before deciding the next steps for this Group in relation to the common themes / requirements that are fulfilled by existing APIs.

- Methodology

  DT suggested that it would be easier to develop BIC's library web services for JSON than SOAP. JG thanked DT for this feedback.

4. **The Library Web Services Project**
   - Representation from organisations / organisation types on this project

     JG suggested that having a representative from Innovative on this Group would be beneficial as the organisation has a number of proprietary APIs. KL reported that Innovative has expressed interest in joining BIC recently. JG suggested that Innovative could be invited to the next meeting of this Group as a guest. IM also suggested that Heritage should be approached.
     - ➢ **ACTION**: KL to liaise with Innovative about BIC membership / joining this T&FWG.
     - ➢ **ACTION**: AMB to approach Innovative about attending the next meeting of this Group as a guest. NB, this will be a one-off opportunity.
     - ➢ **ACTION**: IM to provide contact information for Heritage to KL, ASAP.

   - Frequency of meetings

     It was agreed that the meetings of this T&FWG should take place on a monthly basis going forwards.

   - Terms of Reference (ToR)
     - ➢ **ACTION**: AMB to remove this item from the agenda for the next meeting.

5. **Feedback from the Group on the functionality that currently exists for libraries and which APIs, if any, are already in use within the library sector**
   - Authorisation

     CC noted that Westminster Libraries requires an API which will integrate with its Customer Relationship Management (CRM) platform. She noted that patrons want to log into their account on Westminster Libraries' corporate system and be able to stay on that account (rather than continually switching from one platform to another) to perform a variety of actions; thus avoiding multiple logins. CC and DT reported that at least two libraries have implemented an API of this nature already however DT suggested that one was not successful. CC noted that Westminster Libraries had been pointed towards an open

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

source API that would work with the LMS even though it had been developed for a different CRM provider; Westminster felt linking the CRM 'My Westminster Account' and the LMS account would provide a better public service. She suggested that its implementation may be a good use case for this T&FWG, even if the API is not a BIC Library Web Service / standardised. JG agreed.

JG suggested that a specification should be produced to establish which web services could make use of this type of authorisation. TW suggested that this requirement should be dealt with from a CRM perspective because the authorisation process will take place on the CRM platform and will therefore be dependent on the CRM interface; third parties (i.e. libraries) will simply need to integrate with the API thereafter. The Group disagreed however, primarily due to the limited number of CRMs currently in use. SW commented that many authorities are experiencing issues (in relation to authorisation) with the interoperability of their Library Management Systems (LMS).

FC noted that he is having difficulty discerning the remit of LCF and BIC library web services in relation to this topic however in terms of user experience he suggested that the two should be reasonably similar. SW commented that any requirements identified by this Group which are customer-facing should be in the remit of LCF, whereas supply chain orientated requirements should be addressed by web services. The Group agreed. JG stated that Westminster Libraries' API therefore falls into the remit of LCF.
- ➢ **ACTION**: KL to add information into the ToR document for the BIC LCF Review Group regarding the remit of its work, i.e. customer-facing.

- Library Acquisitions
  TW noted that the development of a library acquisitions API will be of most benefit to Capita; especially eBook acquisitions and real-time delivery. HS agreed. She noted that being able to disseminate information about eBook licences / platforms would also be of use, as the BIC Library Technical Implementation Clinic (LTIC) discussed previously. JG noted that the trade has a good process in place for eBooks which this T&FWG should strive to match however the BIC web service will need to work for both print and digital products. HS noted that there are a number of APIs in existence / in use that deal with acquisitions and suggested that it would be beneficial to standardise these, if possible.

  FC informed the Group that he liaised with Graham Bell of EDItEUR regarding EDI, as it cannot currently deal with the complexities required for eBook ordering. JG suggested that the use of UBL has merit for this reason / purpose. FC agreed, at least in relation to credit notes and invoicing. TW noted that his colleagues will be willing to pinpoint further requirements for library acquisitions for this project. He suggested that this web service should be made a top priority for this T&FWG.

- Buckinghamshire County Council and the SELMS Consortium
  SW noted that Buckinghamshire County Council and the SELMS Consortium's preferred areas of development for web services are: EDI; Inter-Library Loans (ILL); and purchasing /

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

renewing loans (etc.) via the Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC). IM reported that viewing loans / charges on a single platform (without being redirected to multiple, external screens) is being addressed by the work of the UK Government's Library TaskForce and the Society of Chief Librarians (SCL). CC noted that it is possible to integrate eBooks into libraries' catalogues as well as OPAC however this is dependent on which eBook supplier is used and their APIs. IM noted that some suppliers encourage libraries to use their own platform for a better experience. The Group agreed that it would be good to have representative from eBook suppliers on this T&FWG for this reason.

➢ **ACTION**: AMB to approach Darren Ratcliffe of Bibliotheca regarding joining this T&FWG.
➢ **ACTION**: SW and IM to forward contact information for OverDrive to KL, ASAP.
➢ **ACTION**: KL to liaise with OverDrive regarding BIC Membership and joining this T&FWG going forwards.

- Open Plus
  SE asked whether Open Plus libraries (i.e. those which are unmanned) fall under the remit of LCF. He noted that patrons have to be accepted / authorised as Open Plus members before using this service.

- Requesting bibliographic metadata
  RH noted that Nielsen has a proprietary search service where organisations enter an ISBN in order to retrieve bibliographic data. The Group agreed that it would not be possible to standardise this process because data aggregators receive differing metadata, especially Price & Availability (P&A) information. JG suggested that a request for basic information (which all data aggregators receive) could be developed in future. FC noted that this requirement was put on hold by the LCF Technical Panel.

- Inter-Library Loans (ILL)
  FC noted that ILL could lie between the remit of this T&FWG and LCF. He commented that, just because ILLs are performed by library staff does not mean that it should be a web service. SW agreed, noting that the communication for ILL takes place between two libraries. TW reported that NISO has a protocol in place for ILL which he suggested this Group could review and develop. The Group noted that this topic is under discussion by the Library TaskForce and may be addressed going forwards.

➢ **ACTION**: FC to liaise with MD regarding LCF and NCIP.
➢ **ACTION**: FC to compare LCF and NCIP for the LCF Review Group and report back on this comparison to this T&FWG at its next meeting.

- Amazon's APIs
  JG noted that Amazon currently has proprietary APIs in place for authentications, validations, requesting downloads, etc.

6. **Producing a clear list of the LMSs in use in the UK (and the vendors' details)**
   JG commented that this Group has adequate representation of the UK supply chain in order to produce this definitive list of LMSs. SE noted that the members of this Group will need to

LIBRARIES
@BIC1UK
www.bic.org.uk
info@bic.org.uk

ascertain which version of each LMS is currently in use. He also suggested that information about eBook providers should be incorporated. TW noted that Ken Chad's website (which lists LMS and supplier information) may be of use for this exercise.

➢ **ACTION**: SE to compile a draft list of UK LMSs and circulate it to this Group, ASAP.
➢ **ACTION**: ALL to review SE's initial list and add any missing LMSs / vendor information.

7. **This Group's top 3 priorities and plans for the necessary development work**
   JG noted that, from this meeting, the following topics have been identified as priorities:
   - Order and order response
   - P&A (for print and digital products)
   - Quotes (including invoices)

   SE suggested that quotes and order response could be combined into a single web service. The Group reviewed the priorities / requirements that were identified at the BIC Library Web Services Workshop (which took place in June 2015) which include:
   - EDI message sets re-implement as real-time web-services
   - eBooks in real time
   - Patron-Driven Acquisition (PDA)
   - Reading Lists
   - Trade Order message
   - Library Order format
   - ILL

8. **Update on UBL and EDItX**
   FC noted that there is nothing further to report in relation to UBL / EDItX at this time.
   ➢ **ACTION**: FC to provide an update on this topic at the next meeting of this Group.

9. **A.O.B.**
   The Group did not have anything further to report.

10. **Date of next meeting**
    It was agreed that the next meeting of this Group should take place in September 2017.
    Post-Meeting Update: Due to an unforeseen issue with Doodle Poll, the next meeting of this Group will take place on Thursday 23rd November 2017.