

**BIC REALTIME FOR LIBRARIES TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP (T&FWG) MEETING – Minutes****Location:** CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE**Date and time:** Monday 20<sup>th</sup> February 2017, 2pm**Minutes written by:** Alaina-Marie Bassett**Present**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
 Francis Cave, BIC Consultant  
 Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library  
 Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen (dialled in)  
 Simon Edwards, Consultant  
 John Garrould, Bertram's  
 Gwyneth Morgan, Nielsen  
 Alan Oliver, Ex Libris  
 Joe Schulkins, University of Liverpool  
 Heather Sherman, Dawson Books  
 David Thomas, SirsiDynix  
 Terry Willan, Capita  
 Steven Wright, Bucks County Council

**Apologies**

Graham Jones, Askews & Holts  
 Karina Luke, BIC  
 Ian Manson, Infor

**1. Welcome and apologies**

The Group was welcomed to this inaugural meeting and the apologies were delivered.

**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. Choosing a Chairperson and Deputy**

SE referred to the Terms of Reference (ToR) document for this T&FWG, informing the Group about the expectations of each representative and the responsibilities of the Chairperson and Deputy. He noted that a Chair and Deputy Chair for this project will need to be chosen during this meeting however no nominations / volunteers were forthcoming. The Group agreed to revisit this item towards the end of the meeting.

**4. The Library Web Services Project**

SE noted that this T&FWG was commissioned by the BIC Libraries Committee as a result of the BIC Library Web Services Workshop that took place on Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015.

**- Project Deliverables and/or Desired Outcomes**

SE reported that the purpose of this project is to develop a suite of web services / APIs that can be implemented / adopted quickly by organisations within the library community. He noted that the functionality developed by this Group will go beyond that of SIP / SOAP / REST, etc. FC suggested that it may be beneficial to develop the library APIs using

XML first, with a view to developing them in REST and/or JSON afterwards. MD noted that it will be possible to produce a mapping from REST to JSON providing that the original XML APIs are kept simple.

FC noted that both the BIC Library Communication Framework (LCF) and *BIC Realtime* suite of web services / APIs (for trade organisations) will be used as semantic references whilst developing the library-specific APIs. SE and JG commented that this Group will need to define its priorities and agree on how the information will be consumed / which organisation(s) will host the web services once they've been produced.

The Group discussed the skeleton document of API requirements (which can be found in Item 3.3 of the Project Brief) as follows:

- Enhanced Content  
SE noted that enhanced content functionality already exists for Inter-Library Loans in MARC and for trade organisations via the *BIC Realtime* Price & Availability (P&A) API. MD suggested that REST could be used to retrieve a MARC document however it wouldn't be used for editing that document.
- Inter-Library Loans (ILL)  
SW reported that there has been talk of OCLC providing ILL functionality in the past (although it may be a paid-for service). MD commented that any developments in this area may duplicate the functionality available through the NISO standard, NCIP. AO informed the Group that Ex Libris is in the process of implementing an API for the British Library, the work for which will be completed soon. MD noted that NISO's eContent Working Group is in the process of listing the functionality available through NISO standards to ascertain which areas could be extended. JG noted that a benefit of web services is that they are cheap and relatively easy to implement; he noted that the new BIC suite of library APIs should avoid association with commercial services / other costs for this reason.  
  
❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that research should be carried out to ascertain what functionality currently exists for libraries and which APIs, if any, are already in use within the library sector.
- Financial Authorisation  
HS noted that some in-house, financial authorisation APIs – including those of Dawson Books and Ex Libris – already exist between specific organisations and their customers. SE suggested that it may be possible to adopt these APIs as part of the BIC suite going forwards. AO confirmed that Ex Libris' APIs are open and can be freely accessed / used (without restrictions); the documentation for these APIs can be found on the Ex Libris website. FC noted that this Group will need to agree whether the priority is to develop APIs for B2B (i.e. library-supplier) communication or B2C (i.e. library-consumer/patron) communication or both.

- EDI

JG noted that it will be necessary for this Group to revisit the existing EDI messages in order to see what requirements the library community has for web services. TW noted that speed of supply is not the only issue which needs to be addressed here however a real-time quote message would be of benefit to organisations so they do not wait a day or so for a response. CC noted that some smaller organisations and specialist suppliers may be able to implement APIs faster than larger organisations.

❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that EDI should be a high priority for this project.
- Patron Driven Acquisition (PDA) for eBooks / Digital Books

SW informed the Group that the purchase of eBooks is external to Buckinghamshire County Council Libraries' Library Management System (LMS); he noted that it would be good to address this issue as part of this project so that orders can marry up with / integrate with organisations' LMSs.
- PDA for Print / Physical Books

SE noted that PDA for print books will also need to be addressed by this Group.
- Reading Lists

HS explained that Dawson Books has experienced issues with Quotes which an API may be able to resolve.
- Loan Usage – Public

CC noted that this Group will need to address eBook loans under this item.
- Supplier Selection

CC informed the Group that public libraries are moving away from supplier selection whilst academic libraries are beginning to use it more frequently. HS explained that the increased use of supplier selection means that specialist librarians are not required to make purchase on libraries' behalves.
- Subscriptions

SW noted that this functionality needs to be streamlined. TW commented that the most pressing concern is in regards to acquisitions. The Group suggested that the workflow for subscriptions should be researched further and an effort should be made to liaise with organisations that are already producing functionality in this area. SW suggested that an API to inform organisations about when an order has been despatched / provide an update would be a useful; he noted that this functionality would allow libraries to improve the service to their patrons. JG suggested that this functionality should be prompted by the customer. CC noted that large online retailers are unlikely to provide this information.
- Transformation Layer, Claims Request (e.g. damaged, etc.), Consolidated Invoices, Request Skeleton MARC, and Changes Sync

The Group did not have anything to report for these items.

- Frequency of meetings  
SE noted that forthcoming meetings of this Group will take place via GoToMeeting / conference call. He suggested that the meetings should take place on a monthly basis; depending on the Group's availability.
- Governance  
SE informed the Group that, once this T&FWG has completed its work and has been disbanded, the governance of the finished library web services will be passed over to the BIC Library Technical Implementation Clinic (LTIC).
- Branding  
JG asked whether the APIs produced should be branded as *BIC Realtime for Libraries*. SE agreed that this would help with future marketing / promotion of the BIC APIs.
  - **ACTION:** AMB to amend the name of this T&FWG accordingly going forwards.

#### 5. Agree first actions and owners, with reference to the Project Brief

SE noted that this Group will produce a suite of web services to address / resolve the identified issues (above); producing documentation, including an FAQ document, is part of this deliverable. SE noted that the priorities of this project will need to be agreed upon and it will be important to ensure that this Group secures representation for all the relevant sectors / organisation types under discussion. He noted that this Group will continue to liaise with the British Library to ensure that there is not a duplication of efforts. AO and DT volunteered to investigate the British Library's APIs further.

- **ACTION:** AO to find out more about the British Library's API and report back.
- **ACTION:** DT to find out more about the British Library's Supply Service API in Boston Spa and report back to the Group.

It was agreed that further information is required regarding NISO standards and Capita's and Nielsen's web services to ascertain if there is any overlap with this project.

- **ACTION:** MD to produce a summary for both NSIP and the eContent Working Group.
- **ACTION:** GM to find out more about Nielsen's available web services and report back.
- **ACTION:** TW to find out more about Capita's available web services and report back.
- **ACTION:** ALL to investigate whether other web services are currently available / in existence within the book industry supply chain to help us identify any requirements / gaps in functionality, and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

FC noted that the relationship between *BIC Realtime for Libraries* and LCF needs to be kept in mind throughout this project. He noted that any gaps in functionality that are identified by this Group will only be fitted into LCF retrospectively if it is appropriate to do so. SE agreed, noting that LCF is internal within libraries whereas EDI is between libraries and external partners. FC noted that a Quotes message format in EDItX (EDItEUR's set of

standard transactional XML message formats) currently exists but is in draft format only, i.e. it has not been published to date.

- UBL versus EDItX

JG noted that he been liaising with FC regarding the use of <http://ubl.xml.org> as a basis for *BIC Realtime for Libraries*. He noted that UBL has been adopted by the EU and in the UK by the NHS with the support of GS1; it is also the standard message format on PEPPOL which is mandatory now when supplying publicly funded organisations in Europe. JG noted that EDItX was used as the backbone for the development of the trade *BIC Realtime* APIs and asked if this relationship should be carried forwards for *BIC Realtime for Libraries*.

FC reported that, while the book trade uses both TRADACOMS and EDIFACT, some messages are not entirely suitable for trade use and these have had to be modified as a result; this is what had led to the need for both BIC and EDItEUR to maintain book trade-specific profiles of these formats. He noted that EDItX is a leaner XML solution but this has made it necessary to develop different sets of messages for the trade and library supply chains: libraries' requirements are different to those of trade organisations which is why a niche set of APIs are needed. JG noted that the library APIs would need to interoperate with OASIS UBL – he suggested that an Interoperability Guidelines document should be produced for this project as a result.

The Group agreed that UBL and EDItX should be investigated further. It was noted that EDItX is not yet a global standard. SE suggested that research should also be carried out to ascertain whether organisations are using UBL, EDItX or whether another standard is available to / suitable for libraries. FC noted that EDItX Sales Formats may be necessary for the expression of tax information.

- **ACTION:** FC to investigate UBL and EDItX further and ascertain whether there are other options available to libraries.

- Public Lending Rights

DT commented that Public Lending Rights (PLR) may need to be addressed by the project. It was noted that PLR will be discussed in relation to eBooks. DT also suggested that local taxes, the fields currently available to record this information and how to plug the gaps (i.e. using MARC) should be reviewed. CC noted that mixed-rate VAT products also cause libraries an array of issues.

JG suggested that BIC should request information about the APIs / functionality that is in use within the book industry via its monthly newsletter. He noted that in-house APIs could be standardised for future use by the industry at large. AMB suggested that BIC's *What's Happening* newsletter may not be the best route to request this sort of information but agreed to liaise with KL about it.

- **ACTION:** AMB to liaise with KL regarding requesting information about in-house web services that currently exist within the industry.

**6. Choosing a Chairperson and Deputy (continued)**

A member of the Group did not come forward to volunteer for either position.

- **ACTION:** ALL to consider who should be the Chair for this Group. Submit your nomination or volunteer for this position by emailing AMB by **Friday 10th March 2017**.
- **ACTION:** GJ and IM (who were absent from this meeting) to consider chairing this Group.

**7. A.O.B.**

The Group did not have anything further to report.

**8. Date of next meeting**

Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> June 2017.