BIC

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

LCF REVIEW GROUP MEETING - Minutes
CILIP Building, 7 Ridgmount Street, London WC1E 7AE
Wednesday 10th June 2015, 2pm

Present	Apologies
Alaina-Marie Bassett, BIC	Keith Addis, Axiell
David Brett, 3M	Dale Beeton, Axiell
Francis Cave, BIC Consultant	Mike Chambers, 2CQR
Andy Chadbourne, Bibliotheca	Marvin Crisp, D-Tech International
Catherine Cooke, Westminster Library	Paul Crisp, D-Tech International
Matthew Dovey, Ceridwen	Des Kearns, Axiell
Mick Fortune, BIC Consultant (Chair)	Ian Manson, Infor
Karina Luke, BIC	Heather Sherman, Dawson Books
Colin Parker, Bibliotheca	Anthony Whitford, Capita
Phillip Sykes, Bibliotheca	
David Thomas, SirsiDynix	

1. **Introductions and Apologies**
   MF welcomed the Group to the meeting, noting that the LCF Review Group last met on Wednesday 10th December 2014.

2. **Review of minutes and follow-up on actions from the last meeting**
   The Group approved the minutes from the last meeting without corrections.

   - GitHub Issue Tracker
     MF noted that the direct link for the LCF Issue Tracker was circulated in the last set of minutes for this Review Group: https://github.com/anthonywhitford/bic-lcf/issues.
     He also noted that this link, and further information about LCF, can also be found on the BIC website at the following address: http://www.bic.org.uk/114/LCF/. AB noted that she has not received any further requests for amendments to this webpage since the last meeting of this Group.
     ACTION: ALL to notify AB if any amendments are needed to the above BIC webpage.

   - PS's one-page information sheet on LCF
     At the last meeting of this Group, PS was tasked with producing a one-page information sheet about LCF. PS informed the Group that this sheet will be discussed under item 4 of this agenda.

   - New representatives for the LCF Review Group
     AB informed the Group that the contact information for Lorensbergs, iCam and Info Technology Supply (ITS) Ltd was not forwarded onto MF and herself.
     ACTION: ALL to send contact information for Lorensbergs, iCam and Info Technology Supply (ITS) Ltd to MF and AB, asap.

BIC

The book industry's supply chain organisation

ACTION: MF to contact the Lorensbergs, iCam and Info Technology Supply (ITS) Ltd to encourage them to take part in this Review Group (and join BIC simultaneously).

- User Groups

  CC noted that she will not be able to provide contact information for the user groups mentioned at the last meeting of this Group. The suggestion had been to approach user groups in order to promote LCF to them. AB noted that she will need further information in order to approach them in the future.

  ACTION: ALL to provide AB with information for any appropriate user groups meetings that they are aware of, asap.

  ACTION: AB to look into the cost of stands / including information in delegate packs at these events and report back to the Group.

- Raising demand for LCF / LCF Promotion Activities

  KL noted that the issue of creating a demand for LCF was raised at a recent Libraries Committee meeting. The Committee members agreed that this Group have the most suitable experience and contacts to promote LCF and advised that this Group should therefore promote LCF themselves; only asking the Training, Events & Communications Committee for help when/if it becomes necessary, or if there is a task that this Group requires help/support executing.

- LCF Participant Declaration

  At the last meeting of this Group, it was decided that a declaration should be written to say that any organisation that does not want to share its work should not contribute to LCF. FC noted that he will write this declaration shortly.

  ACTION: FC to write the LCF declaration.

  ACTION: AB to circulate the finished declaration to the Review Group and Technical Panel for them to sign, and any new members of this Group in the future.

3. **Technical Panel Activities Report**

- Review of the minutes from the LCF Technical Panel meeting – 31st March 2015

  MF noted that the minutes from the last meeting of the LCF Technical Panel were circulated to this Group prior to this meeting. He commented that the discussions of the Technical Panel appear to be overlapping the responsibilities of the Review Group and suggested that there is a possibility that further meetings of the Technical Panel should not be scheduled until LCF is gaining more traffic and issues are being raised. He noted that currently there isn't a job for the Technical Panel to do. FC agreed. He noted that the Technical Panel will need to make it clear that the way to discuss changes for / raise issues about LCF will be via GitHub. He suggested that, if an issue is raised that cannot be resolved by the Technical Editors (FC, MD and AW) a call should then be scheduled to discuss the matter. The Group agreed that this would be the best line of action.

MF informed the Group that, since the last meeting of this Review Group, he has attended various library community meetings throughout the UK to discuss LCF. He noted that SCL Wales have suggested that they would be interested in hearing more about LCF during their future management meetings. He also noted that Dylan Hughes, Libraries Officer at Wrexham County Borough Council, has informed MF that LCF will be discussed by SCL Wales this week. MF noted that SCL Wales now want to discuss the next steps for LCF in a separate meeting, i.e. integrating systems, etc., and commented that the Heads of Services for all Welsh Libraries will be in attendance at this meeting. Further meetings in Weston-super-Mare, London and four more locations will follow shortly.

KL noted that the Society of Chief Librarians (SCL) are not currently members of BIC but that they may be able to, and indeed want to, help fund this promotional activity.   MF noted that he has a meeting arranged with Nick Stopforth in August at the Arts Council England (ACE) and will broach the subject of BIC membership (either for SCL and/or individual SCL members)again then.

MF informed the Group that other bodies want to find out more about BIC. In particular, MF noted that he has been approached by Kathy Settle, CEO of the Leadership for Libraries Taskforce, to speak about library technology, LCF and RFID. Brian Ashley, Director of Libraries at ACE, has also requested a meeting to discuss the same topics. MF noted that he will mention BIC at these meetings but they were set up primarily to discuss LCF.

MF commented that both SCL and CILIP are members of the Libraries Taskforce established by Ed Vaizey. KL noted that CILIP is one of BIC's four sponsors and, as such, it has been agreed by the BIC Executive Board (on which CILIP sits) that it is not yet appropriate for BIC to attend the taskforce meetings.. She noted that CILIP will notify BIC about any relevant information discussed at the Libraries Taskforce and reassured the group that , if BIC is invited by CILIP, or Kathy Settle to attend a meeting of this group in the future (if it becomes necessary e.g. as a result of the Task Force conversations moving towards standards and best practice), they will of course attend. FC commented that the remit of LCF falls beyond communication and the supply chain, i.e. beyond the remit of BIC. KL disagreed, noting that LCF is very much within BIC's areas of responsibility and so BIC should be leading this (LCF) work, plus BIC is the owner of LCF. KL agreed that there would be no harm in people discussing both BIC and LCF at these Task Force meetings should they wish to, and suggested that such discussions may lead to BIC being formally invited to the Taskforce.

MF noted that the LCF Twitter account – @BIC_LCF – has not been used greatly. He commented that there isn't much to tweet about at present but this will be used more liberally in the future. MF informed the Group that he now has the password in order to tweet on this account as and when he sees fit / when relevant information arises.

4. **Promotion**

MF informed the Group that he has been in discussion with PS of Bibliotheca regarding the promotion of LCF. PS noted that he has seen information about LCF being mixed / bundled

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

into tenders. KL noted that NAG have also been contacted to ask whether they might help BIC finance a revised edition of the BIC/NAG joint guidelines on RFID procurement to include LCF and other changes that have taken place since the first edition; though a response has not been received as yet.

KL noted that the promotion of LCF has also been addressed by the BIC Libraries Committee who suggested that a BIC Breakfast on LCF would be a good promotional tool which would facilitate the dissemination of information about LCF. She noted that this BIC Breakfast cannot, unfortunately, take place at the forthcoming NAG Conference in September 2015 but informed the Group that NAG are interested in collaborating on a forthcoming event which would include both a BIC Breakfast by BIC and a seminar on a yet to be decided topic by NAG. KL noted that the aim of this collaborative event is to entice a large portion of the library community to one venue at the same time; making it worth both the attendees' whiles (in terms of travelling costs) and broadening the audience for both BIC and NAG. **ACTION**: KL to follow up with NAG regarding the promotion of LCF.

The Group discussed the necessary changes and revisions to the procurement guidelines, noting that these will take a few days' work to update. MF noted that some information included in the guidelines isn't relevant now and should be removed, and further information needs to be revised. He noted that he had spoken to his co-author Mark Hughes, Head of Collections at Swansea University Library, about revising the document and that he was happy to be involved, if necessary. He also noted that the physical effort will be minimal (about two days) and suggested that the dissemination of this information will be equally minimal since the new version will simply replace the previous version. PS noted that this work should be done as soon as possible in order to gain feedback. He noted that, generally speaking, the responses will be obtained around 3 months after the new version has been released. AC commented that the new version can also be used as a promotional tool to increase the library community's awareness about LCF.

CP noted that the definition of 'compliance' needs to be discussed as a fundamental issue. FC suggested that it might be more obtainable to measure the rate of LCF adoption within organisations, rather than their compliancy level. AC noted that, since adoption isn't a measurable entity, organisations could claim to be compliant when they are, in fact, not. PS agreed, noting that the issues this could cause will then have an effect on the end-user. MF noted that this topic will be discussed further in item 5 of this agenda.

AC informed the Group that he has spoken with KL regarding LCF promotion. He noted that, in the past, Bibliotheca have produced a website and various other marketing materials to promote their projects. Having discussed this with KL, AC confirmed that Bibliotheca are prepared, and indeed more than happy, to produce something of a similar nature for LCF promotional purposes. He noted that a joint press statement could be written and sent between system suppliers, and also suggested that organisations should be approached to endorse the implementation of LCF. The Group agreed that a list of activities should be drawn up and that it should be discussed before further promotional work is done.

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

ACTION: AC to create a full list of promotional activities for this Group and send to AB.
ACTION: AB to circulate this list of promotional activities to the Group for comment.

KL commented that the above mentioned marketing materials, including leaflets, will provide the Group with a standard body of text to use – ensuring that every member of this Group is saying the same things to interested parties; encouraging libraries to do the same. FC questioned whether the Group believes there might be a second, more technical line of promotional activities for LCF. He suggested that a "PlugFest" event could be set up specifically for technical experts, to illustrate how LCF could be implemented into systems, what makes an organisation compliant, and to discuss the functionality available; in a nutshell, this event would be a day of technical advice. FC suggested that the day could begin with a seminar and could end with case studies from organisations that have recently implemented LCF. He suggested that the event could take place in a few months' time – the lead up to which will encourage organisations to discuss the implementation of LCF amongst themselves, thus raising awareness and interest. MF commented that more work may need to be done by this Group to raise awareness about LCF prior to this technical day taking place but the Group agreed that this Technical Day should be arranged. AC noted that the aforementioned changes to LCF will need to be completed before the event goes ahead. KL agreed, noting that the workshop will encourage organisations to address any issues and attend for the purpose of gaining advice. MF noted the involvement of academic libraries should be encouraged, as should ExLibris' attendance.

On the topic of LCF changes, MF commented that this Group still needs to find a way to make it easier for organisations to request changes to the standard. MD noted that GitHub provides this service but commented that the requests are dependent upon the participating person/organisation being familiar with it. The Group suggested that a document should be created to outline how each sort of request should be submitted.
ACTION: MD to create a draft Submission of Requests Document and send to FC and MF for their comment, before the next meeting of this Group.

MF questioned whether this Group should seek out organisations that are willing to endorse / confirm their support for LCF. He suggested that this task may inadvertently encourage organisations to participate in this Group in the future. KL asked how many organisations would be contacted to this end (both BIC members and non-member) and noted that, providing the majority are BIC members, it might be beneficial to encourage BIC non-member organisations to both endorse and become involved in this Review Group. She noted that these organisations will be included in the press release and promotional materials produced. FC commented that these organisations will need to see a certain level of momentum in order to want to be involved and subsequently to remain engaged. KL agreed, suggesting that this Group should therefore begin by contacting organisations that are known to support LCF already and then seek out new endorsers, so that the new targeted organisations can see those they would be associated with. The Group agreed this would be the best approach to gaining endorsements.

BIC

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

ACTION: MF to write up a document of endorsement, including a list of the organisations that already endorse LCF and circulate to the Group prior to the next meeting.

ACTION: AC and MF to collaborate on creating a list of organisations that should be targeted for endorsement. This action should be completed before the next meeting of this Group.

The Group agreed that, after the above endorsements have been gained, a Press Release should be written. KL informed the Group that this Press Release can be sent directly to BIC's Associate Member's mailing list. CC suggested that launch of this Press Release will encourage suppliers to include LCF in their systems in order not to be left behind.

The Group agreed that a date should be set for the LCF BIC Breakfast which was discussed at the previous meeting of this Group. AC suggested that October might be the best time to encourage the involvement of academic libraries. KL reminded the Group that a sponsor would need to be found to cover the cost of any consultants attending/speaking, and venue/refreshments. The Group agreed that this BIC Breakfast should go ahead on Thursday 22nd October 2015 in London.

ACTION: AB to organise this BIC Breakfast on the above, specified date.

The Group suggested that the aforementioned 'Plugfest' should follow the LCF BIC Breakfast in November 2015. They suggested that the event should be a full-day session and that it could be held at the CILIP Building, or perhaps in Birmingham. They suggested that this event should take place on 19th November 2015 but agreed to discuss this event further during the next meeting of the LCF Technical Panel, which is taking place on Tuesday 23rd June 2015.

ACTION: AB to add the Plugfest as an item on the agenda for the forthcoming LCF Technical Panel meeting.

With the above events in mind, the Group agreed that the definition of compliancy needs to be finalised by Friday 16th October, at the very latest.

ACTION: Compliancy to be kept on the agenda for the next meeting

5. **Accreditation Schemes**

The Group discussed the definition of LCF compliancy and what it might involve / include. It was suggested that a list of functions should be drawn up – a criteria that all organisations would need to adhere to in order to be fully compliant with LCF. FC commented that technical compliance means that any message which is sent out will use a specific language / vocabulary that corresponds fully to LCF. MD suggested that 'compliance' may not be the correct term in light of this but suggested that the Plugfest will help to ascertain the level of compliancy for each system type and what these involve. MF questioned whether, in order to add functionality to LCF, this Group should set up a new profile page for requests. CP suggested that a sandbox would be more beneficial and noted that this Group will need to formulate a standard which organisations can mark themselves against.

AC questioned whether this matter is being overcomplicated unnecessarily. He suggested that, if organisations choose to endorse LCF they will surely be compliant and will send

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

technical representatives to the Plugfest. MD noted that there are different variants of compliancy for different systems, i.e. self-issue, stock control, payments, etc. He noted that, in these instances, a "yes/no" dichotomy does not provide enough information to prove whether a system is compliant. For instance, he noted that in a SIP system the minimum requirement would be checking books out of the library using self-issuing but this would not be the case for all systems. CP agreed, noting that the requirements are usually split into different profiles. MF noted that this Group could therefore either create suitable sub-folders itself or else leave this to the organisations at the Plugfest to devise. KL suggested that this Group may benefit from concentrating on promotion at this stage and discussing compliancy at a later date.

FC noted that interoperability is the fundamental aspect to ensuring that a system is LCF compliant. He noted that the difficulty will lie in ensuring that LCF is easy to understand and the definitions are well documented. DB agreed, noting that the LCF Technical Panel will need to ensure that each organisation's definition and use of the agreed terms are the same. He noted that any discrepancies should be recorded and sent to the Group via GitHub. PS commented that being too granular will not facilitate this process instead this Group will need to ensure that each organisation knows that the systems need to be interoperable; and will need to conform to the LCF standard to achieve this. FC commented that everything decided upon by this Group will need to be documented.

MD suggested that this Group should assume that any organisation that signs up to attend the Plugfest will intend to interoperate and commit to the use of LCF. MF agreed, suggesting that a charter could be drawn up for this purpose – a Charter for Interoperability. PS noted that attendees will be committing to and discussing LCF simultaneously. KL noted that this Group will need to sign off on this charter before it can be disseminated.
ACTION: PS and MD to put a draft version of the Charter together and circulate to the Group prior to the next meeting.

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

7. **Date of next meeting**
   Thursday 10th September 2015.