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

BIC RFID PRIVACY TASK & FINISH WORKING GROUP MEETING – Minutes

Location: CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE / Conference call
Date and time: Thursday 13th April 2017, 2pm
Minutes taken by: Alaina-Marie Bassett

Present	Apologies
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC	Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Libraries	Karen Carden, Uni. of the Arts, London
Simon Edwards, Consultant (Chair)	Philip Farrell, 2CQR
Karina Luke, BIC	Jim Hopwood, Bibliotheca
Ian Manson, Infor (dialled in)	
Darren Ratcliffe, Bibliotheca	

1. **Welcome to the call and apologies**
   The Group was welcomed to the meeting and the apologies were delivered. It was noted that Mike Chambers has now resigned from this Task & Finish Working Group (T&FWG); Philip Farrell will attend future meetings to ensure that 2CQR continues to be represented.

2. **Competition Law – conduct reminder**
   The Group was reminded about BIC's Competition Law Policy – please click on the following link for more information regarding this policy: 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. The following actions were discussed:

   - RFID Privacy Policy / Code of Practice (CoP) document
     SE confirmed that RFID Privacy CoP documents were drafted following the last meeting of this Group; three versions have been produced for libraries, stock suppliers and LMS / RFID vendors respectively. SE noted that sample text is included in the CoP document which organisations can use to notify their patrons / customers about RFID privacy and the measures put in place to address this. He also informed the Group that stock suppliers which currently supply RFID tagged products to libraries which do not currently use RFID are deemed to be responsible for privacy issues for those libraries according to the proposed EU legislation.
     ➢ **ACTION**: SE to circulate information to this Group regarding stock suppliers' responsibilities when supplying RFID tagged products to non-RFID libraries.

     CC suggested that, in order to inform their customers about the potential privacy issues, stock suppliers could include an additional label featuring the RFID logo on the products they supply; although this process would incur additional costs for suppliers. She noted that the logo should not be included on the RFID tag itself as this could result in some patrons removing the tags in order to get past security. KL noted that this idea has been pursued previously but was subsequently disregarded; she suggested that it should not be reconsidered now for this reason.

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

- RFID Privacy Poster template which libraries can use / display
The Group agreed that this poster template should be produced using Microsoft Word so that libraries can include their logo and edit the document, if required.
  ➢ **ACTION**: SE to liaise with AMB about the information that should appear on this template.
  ➢ **ACTION CARRIED OVER**: AMB to design the RFID poster template, including the RFID logo on it, asap and circulate it to this Group for comment.

4. **Latest from other representative bodies and Convergent Software**
Referring to KC's correspondence which was circulated to this Group prior to this meeting, SE noted that Convergent Software and the British Standards Institute (BSi) have collaborated on and subsequently announced a new risk assessment service for libraries (a paid-for service) which will determine whether each organisation's level of risk is high enough to justify a full impact assessment. As a result, KC has suggested that BIC should liaise with BSI to ensure that they are aware of the full implications of this legislation and its financial impact on libraries. SE noted that all libraries are almost certainly going to be classified as high risk organisations anyway, so the initial risk assessment service that the BSI is advertising is potentially redundant in this respect.

- Low / High Risk Organisations
KL noted that organisations are not currently obliged to become a low risk organisation under the new EU legislation and queried therefore the incentive for them to do so. CC and IM noted that it is possible to look up a book online and determine where it is (geographically) however doing so would require hacking into the Library Management System (LMS); which is of course illegal anyway. IM noted that providing patrons' addresses are not stored on the LMS or linked to RFID tags, libraries are doing enough. He commented that the practices suggested in BIC's CoP document show due diligence.

The Group discussed the cost of the BSI's risk assessment service, noting that organisations will need to carry out a risk assessment (according to BSi) every time a new system is purchased. CC noted that system providers could potentially carry out this process on libraries' behalves although a large volume of systems are produced by US organisations. SE suggested instead that BIC could provide 2 case studies to show the outcomes of this risk assessment for both a large and small organisation respectively. He suggested that these case studies could help to tie-up the work carried out by this Group to date.
  ➢ **ACTION**: KL to explore the possibility of BIC applying to BSi for assessment representing 1 x large and 1 x small library.

5. **Latest from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO)**
KC did not have anything new to report from the ICO regarding RFID privacy. SE suggested that BIC should seek an endorsement of the CoP documents from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) and/or ask them to sign off on due diligence. The Group agreed. IM noted that even the production of the CoP documents shows how seriously the proposed legislation has been taken within the library community. SE reminded the Group that the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) will become mandatory in May 2018. The Group agreed that the CoP documents should be

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

finalised as soon as possible in order to liaise with the BSi prior to the legislation taking effect. It was suggested that KC and CC could attend this meeting alongside BIC.

➢ **ACTION**: AMB to liaise with KC about her contact at ICO (with a view to BIC arranging a meeting between select members of this Group and the ICO prior to the next meeting of the BIC Libraries Committee (which will take place on Thursday 18th May 2017).

6. **Next Steps**
The Group agreed that the three CoP documents should be circulated for further comment to both this Group and the BIC Libraries Committee. Upon receiving this feedback, SE agreed to amend the CoP documents according to the feedback received and send them to AMB for circulation prior to the next meeting of the BIC Libraries Committee. The Group agreed that the CoP documents should be signed off during the next meeting of the BIC Libraries Committee and that any non-attendees of this meeting should sign off the documents via email prior to the meeting.

➢ **ACTION**: SE to send the latest CoP documents to AMB for circulation by Friday 21st April 2017.
➢ **ACTION**: AMB to circulate the CoPs to this Group and the BIC Libraries Committee for feedback.
➢ **ACTION**: ALL to provide feedback on the CoP documents by **Friday 5th May 2017** to SE, KL and AMB. (This will allow time for SE to amend the documents (according to the feedback received) in time for a revised version to be circulated to and signed off by the BIC Libraries Committee).
➢ **ACTION**: AMB to ensure that any BIC Libraries Committee member that cannot attend the next meeting signs off on the CoP document via email prior to 18th May 2017.

AMB reported that a BIC Breakfast on RFID is scheduled to take place in July 2017 so the completion and publication of these documents is intrinsic to this event taking place. She also noted that Axiell Ltd has kindly agreed to sponsor this BIC Breakfast.

➢ **ACTION**: AMB to continue to arrange July 2017's BIC Breakfast on RFID Privacy.

The Group discussed the timeline for liaising with the BSi and ICO. They agreed that the CoP documents should be finalised before approaching either organisation. SE suggested that, in order to keep future correspondence as simple as possible, BIC should show only the standard / libraries' CoP document to the BSi and ICO, informing them that the document will be published imminently. He suggested that BIC should ask whether the risk assessment could be carried out centrally.

➢ **ACTION**: AMB to liaise with KC after BIC's meeting with ICO has taken place to discuss whether a meeting between select members of this Group and BSI is required.

7. **Watching Brief on NFC (in scope of this project)**
SE suggested that this Group should find out whether NFC is being misused in any way that affects RFID privacy. DR reported that a few new issues have been identified but none in relation to RFID.

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

9. **Date of next meeting**
The Group agreed that the next meeting should take place after the RFID BIC Breakfast in July 2017.