BIC WEB SERVICES TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP MEETING - Minutes
Conference Call
Wednesday 22nd April 2015, 10am

Present
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC
Francis Cave, Consultant
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Deputy)
Richard Elsley, Booksolve
John Garrould, Bertrams (Chair)
Richard Hurrell, Bertrams
Karina Luke, BIC
Ian Manson, Infor
Peter Morley, Publishing Technology
Simon Parker, Batch
Terry Willan, Capita
Jonathan Wraight, Hachette

Apologies
Graham Bell, EDItEUR
George Bogdanovic, Bertrams
Gareth Bradley, Hachette
Andrew Coburn, Essex Libraries
Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen
Katy Gibson, BIC
Jon Green, Bertrams
Matt Holt, Bertrams
Sam Langdon, Hachette
Barry Richardson, Nielsen
Chris Wood, HarperCollins
Tim Wilson, Hachette

1. Introductions & Apologies
JG welcomed the Group to this meeting and introduced Simon Parker of Batch to the Group members. JG noted that all relevant documents for this meeting were circulated to the Group prior to the call.

2. Review minutes and follow up on actions from the last meeting
The Group approved the minutes from the last meeting of this Task & Finish Working Group. JG asked whether Booknet Canada had been approached to determine their implementation of Web Services concerning MARC records. KL informed the Group that she has been in touch with Booknet Canada and will follow this matter up shortly.
ACTION: KL to discuss the use of Web Services concerned with MARC records with Booknet Canada and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

The Group discussed the Web Services forum which will be hosted on the new BIC website. They asked when the launch of this website might be. AB informed them that progress is being made on the new BIC website but a date for the launch has not yet been agreed upon.
ON-GOING ACTION: AB to set up a forum for Web Services on the new BIC website, once it has gone live.

The Group agreed to discuss all other actions from the previous meeting under the corresponding items of this agenda.
3. Feedback from members about any required changes to the existing BIC Web Services

- **Web Services 1.8 and 1.9:** “Get Financial Document List” and “Get Financial Document”
  JG questioned whether any further examples of financial documents or limitations had been found to add to Web Services 1.8 and 1.9. He asked the Group whether they feel that further modifications or formats are needed, noting that copy invoices and missing invoices are frequent issues within the industry and these amended web services could help to resolve these issues by making it possible to request further copies of the financial document in question. He noted that, currently, web services 1.8 and 1.9 only support invoices and credit notes. The Group suggested that remittance notes and statements would be valuable additions to these Web Services.

**ACTION:** FC to include remittance advice notes and statements to the financial document types for Web Services 1.8 and 1.9.

The Group went on to discuss the export formats of Web Services 1.8 and 1.9, and noted that, currently, the format for these documents can be specified as either PDF or XML. FC commented that PDFs would be most attainable for maintenance purposes. The Group suggested that no further work should be done on these Services until alternative formats are available.

**ACTION:** FC to investigate whether other export formats are possible and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

- **Beginner’s Guide to BIC Web Services**
  JG commented that it is too early to create a full draft for this Beginner’s Guide. He noted that SE and FC will collaborate on this document in the near future once further work on the Web Services has been completed.

4. Review Project Deliverables Tracker – and new / revised messages

JG informed the Group that a Deliverables Tracker has now been created and was circulated to the members of this Group prior to this meeting. He noted that one of the purposes of this document is to keep an eye on deliverables that fall out of this Project’s scope which will subsequently form recommendations for future work by BIC. He noted that a document outlining all of these out-of-scope deliverables will be written up at the end of this Project.

- **(1) Review existing suite of BIC Web Services and Update as Required**
  JG informed the Group that Version 2 of the Order Status Request / Report web service has been written and was circulated to the Group prior to this meeting, as was Version 1.1 of the Retrieve ONIX Product Information Web Service. FC noted that he has now gone through all the Web Services that this Group flagged up as candidates for minimal changes to see whether any more obvious changes are required.

FC informed the Group that one of the changes to Version 2.0 of the Order Status Request / Report Web Service had included adding ‘01’ for “Proprietary” for order status
request identification (especially for locations and party IDs), and deprecating '02'. He noted that this will affect all Web Services. He also suggested that, when references are included in the date, these will now allow for a date and time to be included across all Web Services.

FC noted that other changes to these Web Services primarily involved the correction of minor typos but that he is currently in discussion with SE regarding the Get ONIX Product Information web service; a new version of which will be circulated shortly.

ACTION: FC and SE to continue work on the Get ONIX Product Information Web Service.

RH raised concerns about Password Security Requests. He noted the fact that the Web Service documents call for the password to be encrypted, but suggested that this is rather pointless since anyone wanting to make malicious use of the information, if they intercepted a request, could just send the same encrypted password in a request they had created; unless something else about the request was included in the encryption process, so that the encrypted value wasn’t the same each time. After some discussion the Group agreed that passwords should not be encoded henceforth but the whole message should be submitted over HTTPS instead of HTTP. FC asked whether implementing HTTPS rather than HTTP would cause difficulties. The Group suggested that this would not be cause difficulties except to the capabilities of the Password parameter.

ACTION: FC and JG to document the changes to Passwords and BIC best practice advice to exchange messages over HTTPS and circulate to the Group for their comment.

ACTION: FC to review options for optionally signing messages with a digital signature or similar so that recipients can be sure the message has not been modified in transit.

FC noted that an additional feature has been added to the ONIX Product Information message – the option to specify and use block-level updates. He noted that this choice will be indicated in the response message and can only be used in ONIX 3.0. JG asked whether Graham Bell (GB) has seen the revision to this Web Service. FC informed the Group that GB has not seen the changes as yet, expect for a brief discussion about ONIX Acknowledgement Messages, but he noted that GB is content for this Group to collate its suggestions for changes / additions to the ONIX related Web Service and will subsequently review them as a whole, once they have been put together. FC noted that ONIX Acknowledgement Messages provide a way for data recipients to include a message in their response; this can contain positive feedback or provide details of any issues experienced. He commented that an alternative might be to have a separate response message which would be sent alongside the acknowledgement, but suggested that this would be too complicated. He noted that work is currently being carried out to add an extra pair to this Web Service in order to extend it.

ACTION: FC to extend the ONIX Product Information Message Web Service to make use of the ONIX Acknowledgement Message.
JG/RH/FC noted that Retrieve MARC Record needs to state which character set the encoded MARC record was in, so that it can be decoded correctly.

JG commented that further recommendations may include changes to the Get Order List and Get Backorder Summary Web Services, though no further changes are needed at present. JG commented that he is happy to sign these amended Web Services off during this meeting. FC commented that the only other change needed is to ensure that the version numbers of the published standards (i.e. after the dot) have been incremented, as all the new drafts contain additional code values and other features that are backwards-compatible with the current published versions.

**ACTION:** FC to ensure that the version numbers of the files are amended accordingly.

The Group discussed whether to publish this Project’s work at the end of the process or whether to publish each Web Service as soon as it is finished. FC commented that it would be best to publish all work at the end of the process so that this Group has more time to review the drafts before they are signed off.

The Group went on to discuss the Shipment Details Change Web Service. RH commented how FC had spotted that a CDF (Consumer Direct Delivery – generally Internet fulfilment) Order Message format allows for the address to be specified at line level. This means the draft previously circulated needs more work. FC & RH noted that the updated draft will be circulated to the Group before the next meeting.

The Group were informed that changes have also been made to the ONIX Product Information Request / Response Web Services, with the addition of coded response codes. JG asked if the Group had any feedback on Version 1.1 of this document, which was circulated to the Group prior to this meeting. None was forthcoming.

**ACTION:** ALL to provide any feedback on this document directly to JG and FC, asap.

FC went on to discuss the Get Order List, noting that no work has been done on this Web Service. He informed the Group that this Web Service had been overlooked in the initial technical review. He noted that, after carrying out a review of this Web Service, his recommendation is that no changes are needed.

- **(2) New BIC Web Services for 2015**
  JG informed the Group that work has been begun on the CDF Despatch Authorisation and Despatch Address Change Web Services. He noted that Despatch Authorisation now includes an order reference and that the Financial Document List can now be filtered.

- **(3) New Library Web Services**
  JG informed the Group that MH is currently working through the straw model for real-time library communication, which will use Web Services as an alternative to batch EDI. He noted that, once finished, this model will be sent to SE and FC to feed back on, and
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will subsequently be published to a wider audience for review before the next meeting.

JG informed the Group that a call will take place on Thursday 30th April, between JG and KL, to discuss this straw model at length. The Library Systems Vendors Workshop will be organised after this call.

Regarding the Libraries Workshop, JG noted that this Group will need to discuss who to invite to attend this workshop, and questioned whether the workshop should be held as a face-to-face meeting or whether it could take place as a conference call. The Group agreed that a face-to-face meeting would be more beneficial and would encourage the attendees to speak to one another. JG noted that the scope of the workshop will include both print books and eBooks. The Group noted that any new Library Web Services that are created as a result of this workshop will need to operate in real-time so that customers can lend eBooks they have purchased as quickly as possible.

**(4) Beginner’s Guide to BIC Web Services**

JG reaffirmed that a Beginner’s Guide to BIC Web Services will be created by this Group. This document will be collaborated on by SE and FC. JG noted that this Guide will explain both what Web Services are and what they do / are used for. JG suggested that it would be beneficial to see a skeleton document so that the outline of the document can be agreed upon before it is fleshed out with content. The Group agreed.

**ACTION**: SE to create a skeleton document of the Beginner’s Guide and circulate it to this Group before the next meeting.

JG noted that the Implementation Checklist for BIC Web Services will be more detailed than the Beginner’s Guide. He suggested that this Group should discuss which questions should be included in the FAQ section which will be included within the Checklist.

**ACTION**: ALL to consider which questions should be included in the FAQ section of the Implementation Checklist and send suggestions directly to SE and FC.

It was suggested that a document outlining the benefits of using BIC Web Services should be created too. The Group agreed that this would be useful for promotional purposes.

**ACTION**: JG to add a Benefits Document to Section 3 of the Project Deliverables Tracker.

**(5) Monitoring usage of BIC Web Services**

FC noted that the Web Services Questionnaire had been created originally as a grid but informed the Group that it will be produced for distribution on an online questionnaire creator, such as SurveyMonkey. He noted that the Questionnaire will need to be made as linier as possible to encourage more responses / fuller responses.

JG noted that the Web Services Questionnaire will need to be piloted before it can be disseminated widely across the whole of the book industry. He noted that this Group will review the questionnaire fully once it has been created on SurveyMonkey.
ACTION: ALL to consider who should pilot the questionnaire and report back to the Group at the next meeting.

JG noted that – once it has been launched – an Implementation Directory will be created on, and subsequently maintained on, the new BIC Website. This Directory will detail appropriate contacts to speak to regarding the implementation of specific Web Services, and will include a matrix of Web Services. SE volunteered to put this directory and matrix together. JG questioned who will keep this information up-to-date. AB noted that she can make any changes to contact details as and when required. JG noted that the appropriate contacts’ details will be needed to populate this Directory. He suggested that the Web Services Questionnaire should include a tick box to indicate whether each participant is willing to be contacted about their questionnaire answers once the form has been submitted. SP questioned whether this could lead to friction, especially if organisations offer different levels of services. The Group also noted that there may need to be two Directories; one for tenders / implementing queries and the other for queries of a more technical nature.

ACTION: SE to create a draft, unpopulated Implementation Directory in time for the next meeting of this Group.

JG noted that the addition of Web Services Implementation questions to both the Trade and Library BIC Accreditation Schemes was documented on this Project Deliverables Tracker as a recommendation. SE informed the Group that both the BIC Supply Chain Excellence (Trade) and e4Libraries (Libraries) accreditation schemes already ask for information regarding each organisation’s use of Web Services. He noted that the questions on these schemes have to be meaningful and concise he raised his concerns about how long-winded and potentially obscuring detailed questions about Web Services could be to the rest of the schemes’ questions. JG agreed but suggested that the schemes could include a question or tick boxes to confirm whether each organisation’s contact information on the Implementation Directory is featured and whether it is up-to-date. This will help to ensure that the information displaced on the Directory will be correct. SE noted that a revision of the e4Libraries accreditation scheme has recently been completed and signed off but suggested that this could be added in if this Group decides that should be the case.

SE commented that the Implementation Directory and the implementation questions in BIC accreditation schemes go hand-in-hand. The Group agreed to add an additional question into the Web Services Questionnaire to ask each participant whether any additional Web Services not covered by existing BIC standards are implemented in their organisation. It was noted that the questionnaire format provides this Group with the capability to ask questions that could not be asked in a grid format.

FC commented that there is a section for each Web Service that has been defined but SE suggested that a separate questionnaire could be created to explore non-BIC Web
Services, if this should be deemed necessary. The Group agreed that this questionnaire will flag up the processes that have to be carried out manually, time and time again, so that these issues can be resolved or automated wherever possible.

SE suggested that this Group should also investigate how many implemented Web Services do the same job. RH noted that the public sector have their own standards to which JG agreed, commenting that they may be too large to tackle under the remit of this Group. RH suggested that the work may not be necessary since the public sector’s standards are already in place and successfully do the job they were intended to do. SE commented that most organisations will not be exposed to public sector processes and noted that the remit of this Group lies within the UK. He noted that all systems vendors have procurement models which are disseminated into Europe for use with public spending, etc. The Group suggested that BIC will need to find a way to integrate with these systems in the future.

**ACTION:** JG to add Public Sector Standards & European Government hubs to the Future Requirements document.

The Group agreed that a questionnaire to ascertain the areas for future work for BIC regarding BIC Web Services should be created; meaning that 3 questionnaires should be created in total, all as separate documents. JG commented that the questionnaires need to be as attractive as possible and two questionnaires sent out together may hinder the number of responses. He suggested referring to the data received from the first questionnaire and contacting suitable contacts to fill in the second questionnaire if it is relevant to them.

The Group questioned whether to send the questionnaires to public and academic libraries. The Group agreed this should be the case. CC noted that the majority of libraries do not know how the orders are processed as long as the order arrives. She noted that libraries themselves do not use Web Services. SE agreed, noting a level of instancy is required so that orders are processed in real-time (for the provisioning of digital media). The Group noted that special libraries and collections libraries will also want to take part. The Group agreed to send out the first / screening, high level questionnaire and then tailor the second questionnaire to address any queries raised by the first, sending it to targeted people only.

**ACTION:** JG to produce a set of questions for the first / screening questionnaire and send to FC and SE for their feedback.

- **(6) Future Web Service Projects**

Some suggestions for future Web Services work were discussed in Section 5 of the Project Deliverables Tracker section in these minutes (directly above). FC also suggested that JG should speak to Graham Bell about this item.

**ACTION:** JG to liaise with GB regarding future work on BIC Web Services and any requirements that he might be aware of.
5. **Update on the Libraries Web Services Workshop**
   JG noted that, as previously stated, an internal call will take place on Thursday 30th April to discuss the straw model for real-time Library communications using Web Services as an alternative to batch EDI. He informed the Group that, after the straw model has been finalised, the Libraries Web Services Workshop will then take place in late May or June. JG suggested that this Group should review the list of invited parties to ensure the right people are targeted within the library community. CC and TW expressed their interest in attending this workshop.

   **ACTION:** AB to distribute a list of those being invited to the workshop to this Group alongside the minutes.

   **ACTION:** ALL to send any further suggestions for suitable attendees to AB and JG, asap.

   **ACTION:** AB to invite CC and TW to the workshop, once it has been scheduled.

6. **A.O.B.**
   None.

7. **Date of next meeting**
   Thursday 21st May 2015.