

**BIC RFID PRIVACY TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP MEETING – Minutes**

**Location:** PLS, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Barnard's Inn, 86 Fetter Lane, London EC4A 1EN

**Date and time:** Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016, 2pm

**Minutes taken by:** Sophia Sophocleous

---

**Present**

Mike Chambers, 2CQR (dialling in)  
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries  
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)  
Jim Hopwood, Bibliotheca  
Karina Luke, BIC  
Darren Ratcliffe, Bibliotheca  
Sophia Sophocleous, BIC

**Apologies**

Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC  
Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International  
Karen Carden, Uni. of the Arts, London  
Ian Manson, Infor

**Now resigned from the Group**

David Brett, 3M  
Paul Dalton, Bibliotheca

**1. Welcome to the call and apologies**

SE welcomed the Group to the call and delivered the apologies. SE noted that the last meeting of this Group took place on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2015 and that this meeting will involve looking at the proposed Code of Practice (CoP) document.

**2. Competition Law – Conduct Reminder**

KL reminded the Group about BIC's Competition Law Policy, summarising what constitutes appropriate conduct (in relation to competition law) and noting that this conduct applies to all BIC meetings. Further information about BIC's Competition Law Policy can be found here: <http://www.bic.org.uk/149/BIC-Competition-Law-Policy/>

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

The minutes from the last meeting of this Group were approved without corrections.

**4. Feedback on the BIC Approach to RFID Privacy document**

SE informed the Group that Convergent Software newsletters claim that the same EU rules/mandates will still apply, even with the UK potentially leaving the EU. SE informed the Group that the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) will take effect in May 2018. KL noted that even if the mandates regarding RFID privacy do not become law, the GDPR will, potentially lead to privacy legislation being enacted within data protection.

MC speculated whether the limited amount of data stored on a library RFID tag had been taken into consideration and whether, for example, storing only a barcode would reduce the risk to privacy. SE noted that even a barcode is seen as a risk if there is any possibility that the identity of the item or the borrower can be derived. There is also the issue of tracking i.e. the somewhat unlikely scenario where a citizen's movements are tracked by the RFID tag on the library book in their possession. The Group agreed that a tracking scenario would be unlikely as the individual tracking the RFID tag would need to be very close, and have the ability and intent to read the tag on the library book; it was

agreed that library RFID tags pose much less of a threat than other much more easily trackable devices that individuals voluntarily use (e.g. smart phones, smart watches, fitbits and apps using GPS). SE remarked that this is not a sufficient argument either, as the risk is still present regardless of how unlikely the scenario. SE noted that in the PIA process, due the fact that library tags are “always on” i.e. available to be read, libraries are considered a “high risk” and that BIC’s aim is to show the government that steps are being taken to inform the public about the risk to privacy. SE confirmed that the Code of Practice (CoP) addresses most of the points made in the EU mandates regarding RFID privacy. SE also suggested that a Privacy Policy would outline the risk for customers.

❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that a Privacy Policy needs to be drafted.

➤ **ACTION:** SE to draft a RFID Privacy policy document.

The Group agreed that a CoP and Privacy Policy along with signage and notices throughout libraries and on libraries’ websites should be sufficient. SE noted that there could be an online statement which patrons can choose to accept (along the lines of accepting cookies when accessing websites). As for legal compliance, SE noted that taking these steps will demonstrate that the book industry has done all it can to alert customers to the risk, and that very little can be done at least in the short to medium term to actually reduce the risk, short of banning RFID or closing libraries all together. SE reiterated that the outcome of a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) for any library will always be “high risk”. Mitigation involves deploying new technology or developing some form of encryption which would be effective whilst still enabling interoperability. There is no sign that this is possible or effective at present and any solution which does emerge would probably require new tags to be placed on library books which given the churn on library books would be a very slow or very expensive implementation process.

SE noted that the CoP certificate produced for libraries would indicate compliancy with BIC guidelines in this matter, just as certification with the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) confirms that an organisation is following ISO guidelines. JH noted that Bibliotheca have already implemented the RFID logo and MC noted that 2CQR have also, including a link on their website leading to BIC’s website detailing further information on RFID. SE noted that RFID areas in libraries will have signage and that if a customer would like further information, the library’s Privacy Policy will be available from the library. SE noted that the PIA process envisaged by the EU requires a central authority to be created and for libraries to report their compliance with the PIA process to this authority. SE suggested that the BIC process should identify the organisation responsible for compliance with the CoP e.g. is it a branch library, central library or local authority or even a consortium.

KL noted that a CoP may be necessary for different types of organisations (i.e. public libraries and academic libraries). SE agreed and noted, for example, if an item with RFID tagging is sent to a library which does not use RFID, then the responsibility cannot lie with the receiving library but with the library stock supplier. SE noted that academic libraries are even higher risk as they issue smart cards with RFID tagging to students. He speculated that once the GDPR takes effect, universities will have to sign up to it and that in this case, a more evolved CoP may be necessary for academic libraries. SE added that there should also be a separate CoP for library stock suppliers. CC stated that “special”

libraries (e.g. Royal College of Nursing) are different from academic libraries and as such should also have a separate CoP. SE suggested that another step could be to undertake a full Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) for the a public library to establish the costs and to demonstrate to non-public libraries that if a public library comes out as “high risk”, the outcome for them could be even higher. CC suggested using Westminster Libraries as the example public library. KL stated that this could require a lot of work and expense if BIC needed to buy the necessary software for a PIA. The alternative would be to undertake a manual PIA as the Convergent Software solution is supposed to exist to assist with a PIA not to be the only way of doing a PIA. SE noted that this would prove to the government / local authority just how difficult and expensive the whole process might be. If this is quantified by all of the libraries, universities, schools and colleges using RFID, it would demonstrate how unreasonable it would be to repeat the process when the outcome is already known.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that there should be separate Codes of Practice for different types of organisations.
- **ACTION:** SE to draft the RFID Privacy Code of Practice to each of the following: public libraries, library stock suppliers.
- **ACTION:** CC to liaise with her “specials” (e.g. The Royal College of Nursing) for their input into the Code of Practice so that a “specials” version is created.

KL noted that she would prefer to have the CoP and Privacy Policy drawn up first, to lessen any panic, and to then look at the PIA and other steps that have been parked. CC noted that a BIC Breakfast on RFID Privacy should follow. SE speculated what other countries are doing with regards to RFID Privacy. JH suggested there was very little movement on this internationally. CC noted that the San Francisco government had not wanted to implement RFID at all and JH agreed, noting that in the early 2000s there was a global pushback against RFID because of privacy concerns.

CC suggested liaising with the data protection department at Westminster Libraries regarding RFID Privacy and PIA. KL suggested that there should be an accompanying blurb to the CoP (e.g. a summary or user’s guide), detailing the reasons to sign it. SE noted that it is also important to state that signing up to the CoP will not necessarily cover the library but may mean they will not have to conduct a PIA since the assumption is being made from the start that the library is high risk. SE noted that the only things included in the EU mandates that are not covered by the steps outlined in the CoP are:

- the PIA itself,
- an initial report on what each library plans to do and a follow up report

SE noted that The Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) has not taken steps toward RFID Privacy yet and that it may be unlikely with Brexit. He added that the issue for ICO at the moment concerns data protection but it is possible that privacy might be implemented as part of data protection and without full understanding of the implications for libraries.

KL noted that the aim will be to get the CoPs and Privacy Policy out within the next 3 months with supporting documentation requesting that the CoP be printed out, filled in and displayed prominently and publicly in the library. SE noted that a certificate stating that the library is compliant would be useful. KL noted that it should be named BIC’s CoP and Privacy Policy and avoid referencing the EU legislation. SE agreed, stating that libraries would be complying with BIC

recommendations and, not EU law. CC suggested that working this into the Technology Excellence in Libraries Award (TEiLA) may be useful.

- **ACTION:** CC to liaise with data protection department at Westminster Libraries.
- **ACTION:** SE to write a summary introduction to the RFID Privacy Code of Practice.

SE noted that the EU mandate specifies that the job role of the person responsible should be “Privacy Officer” which SE stated could be unfeasible. KL noted that the library should report to BIC on points 7 & 8 of the draft CoP. Regarding point 7, SE suggested that steps taken to reduce risk in academic libraries could take the form of selling (or giving away) RFID shielded Faraday wallets for student cards. He also speculated how taking steps to reduce risk would work in practice and how BIC would be able to monitor that the organisation in question has actually monitored technological progress, talked with RFID suppliers etc. SE asked SS to ask KC to check over the CoP and pass it on to colleagues, to gauge their opinion on any steps missing, from the academic library perspective. SE noted that he will contact Heather Sherman of Bertrams regarding the library stock supplier perspective and CC volunteered to liaise with her contacts at the Royal College of Nursing regarding the perspective from “special” libraries.

- **ACTION:** SS to ask for feedback on the Code of Practice (once amended by SE) from Karen Carden from the academic library perspective, so that an academic libraries version can be created.
- **ACTION:** SE to ask for feedback on the Code of Practice from Heather Sherman of Bertrams from the library stock supplier perspective.

DR speculated whether point 5 on the CoP discriminates against existing customers, as only new members being issued with their library card will be informed of the RFID risk to privacy. CC suggested that existing members could also be informed when they renew their membership. SE agreed and added that points 1 and 6 of the CoP attempt to inform existing customers of the risk. CC noted that some library customers do not even borrow books, but are members in order to use the PCs available and/or other services. SE suggested that upon logging into the library’s PC a notice could warn users that the library uses RFID. SE noted that although not 100% of members can be reached with the warning, new members and membership renewals can be as they sign up to Terms & Conditions (T&Cs) and visitors to the library can be informed via library signage. SE stated that the key is to be able to demonstrate that appropriate action is being taken to inform customers and he stressed that “appropriate” is the key word here. CC noted that “emails and other communications” should be added to point 6.

- **ACTION:** SE to amend step 5 of the Code of Practice to inform both new members and existing members renewing their membership of the RFID risk.
- **ACTION:** SE to amend step 6 of the Code of Practice to read as ‘appropriate emails **and other communications** sent out to customers’.

The Group agreed that there should only be one generic Privacy Policy. KL noted that SE’s Privacy Policy should also highlight the potential risks to patrons and what they mean. The Group agreed. KL asked whether a poster for library signage should be designed. CC noted that it would be helpful to give libraries a template poster to which they could add their own website URL etc. SE and CC agreed

that the format should be A4, but centred, with a generous border to allow for any necessary corporate logos.

- **ACTION:** AMB to design a poster for libraries to display - A4 with the content centred (allowing a generous border), once SE and CC have drafted what is required to appear on the poster.

## 5. BIC 5 Point Plan and RFID Privacy Code of Practice (CoP)

KL noted that most of the points on BIC's original 5 Point Plan have been incorporated into the CoP and SE added that some of the parked ideas (which had previously made up a 13 Point Plan) have also been incorporated (i.e. point 6). The Group went through the remaining points which had been parked. The only points which have not already been incorporated in some way or another into the CoP were discussed:

*12. Standard NAG Servicing could be adapted to include a spine label containing the RFID logo and libraries could adopt this overtime. If this became the new NAG servicing standard, library stock suppliers might be able to accommodate the change without extra costs for libraries*

SE noted that this is not something the Group wants to do but that if it becomes mandatory in the future then this change would enable BIC to inform the authorities that, given the churn on library books, over a 5 year period, roughly 50% (for example) of books would be labelled with an RFID warning logo. If the authorities required more rapid/complete labelling then there would be a cost which could be funded from central government.

*13. BIC could hold a workshop for RFID vendors to examine the technology solutions and counter-measures suggested in EN 16571 and assuming there is a practicable way forward, a plan could be put together with RFID vendors to deliver an improved privacy and interoperability tag for very long term implementation*

SE noted that LMS/RFID Vendors had indicated that there was not much that could be done at least at present to use technology to reduce privacy risk. Any future developments would still need to be paid for and implemented probably involving re-tagging all library stock. So this event is unlikely to go ahead.

CC noted that including an RFID warning on self-issue receipts, as point 5 in the original 5 Point Plan suggests would be expensive and time consuming and there might not be space on the receipts. SE speculated where else a customer could be notified without slowing down any processes. JH noted that there are no messages displaying the risks on NFC enabled credit/debit cards or smartphones even though there is a much higher risk involved in payment. DR stated that the more warnings the public sees the more panic it will instil. SE agreed and reiterated the point CC made in the last meeting of this group, that by informing borrowers of the RFID tag in books, they would also be notifying them of the library's security.

## 6. RFID Privacy Project Update Form

There was nothing to report under this item.

**7. Latest from other representative bodies**

SE speculated whether the Libraries Taskforce were concentrating on anything related to privacy and noted that something may come up in the future if not now.

**8. ICO Latest**

SE noted that KC had sent her apologies to the Group for this meeting, and that there had been nothing to report on ICO since he last spoke with her. SE stated that ICO may have more to say if asked about data protection rather than RFID Privacy.

**9. Watching Brief on NFC (in scope of this project)**

SE noted that NFC is evident everywhere e.g. with Contactless and Apple Pay. He added that the issues and risks associated with these payments have been reported on the news and that any developments should be watched as they may have an impact on privacy. SE noted that organisations that accept credit card payments are now being charged/fined if they are not compliant with "The Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard" (PCI DSS). This is apparently a measure to deter fraud, as it is possible for payment to be intercepted. SE noted that as NFC is a considerably higher risk, the same process may be applied in future.

**10. A.O.B.**

The Group discussed promotion of RFID Privacy, including a BIC Breakfast. CC noted that she could take information to the SirsiDynix user meeting in December 2016. DR also suggested the Bibliotheca user forum in October 2016. CC agreed stating that even if all of the necessary documents are not complete by October, some information should be shared. KL noted that there is a BIC Bite available. JH added that Bibliotheca will promote RFID Privacy on their website. CC noted that CILIP may be able to promote it as well.

- **ACTION:** CC to promote the BIC RFID Code of Practice and Policy at the SirsiDynix user meeting in December 2016.
- **ACTION:** DR to promote the BIC RFID Code of Practice and Policy at the Bibliotheca user forum in October 2016, even if the final version documents are not available by this point.

JH suggested that there should be a pilot group to begin with, going through the process with certain organisations first to see what issues emerge. The Group agreed.

- ❖ **DECISION:** The Group agreed that the CoPs and Privacy Policy will be circulated to this Group around mid-September 2016 and that they can be finalised via email. Once these have been reviewed by this Group, the documents can then be shared with the Libraries Committee for review and sign off.
- **ACTION:** SE to circulate the amended Code of Practice(s) (for public libraries, academic libraries, library stock suppliers and specials) and associated Privacy Policies to this Group by mid-September 2016 with a view to circulating these for sign off by the Libraries Committee at their next meeting.

**11. Date of next meeting**

TBC - as required.