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Attendees

Mike Dicus – Ex Libris (Chair)*
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Juli Marsh – The Library Corporation
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John Bodfish – OCLC*
Rob Gray – Polaris Library Systems
Kevin Stewart – Relais International
Peter Collins – University of Pennsylvania Libraries

*Participated by phone

Day 1 – Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Implementer Updates

Mike Dicus – Ex Libris
- Working with Relais on Alma.
- Looking at integration with Auto-Graphics in MassVC.

Lori Ayre – Galecia Group
- Reported that NCIP responders are being developed by an international team of developers for both Koha and Evergreen.
- Innovative, Sirsi and Polaris are making progress on their NCIP responders with Auto- Graphics (MassVC).
- MassVC client reports issues with Aleph (one message in particular) and Alma - very slow going. Lori will provide Mike with details about that problematic message (Aleph).

Juli Marsh – The Library Corporation
- Reports they are waiting on III and State of Michigan - ready to go live with MelCat.
- State of Michigan wants everyone available all at the same time, which is proving to be problematic in moving communications forward.

Kelli Schoneck Benitez – The Library Corporation
- Reports the SNAP Consortium (CA, CARL.X) has expressed interest in using FulfILLment, thus just waiting on more information/on hold.
- On hold with OCLC for testing Navigator with Florida CARL.X libraries - not yet at NCIP testing phase.
- Also exploring options with CARL.X libraries and their use of NCIP internally with web forms to request books online/facilitate collection development efforts

Tony O’Brien – OCLC
- Reports that OCLC has been working on NCIP v2 integration with several Alma libraries.
• Switching them from Millennium and screen scraping and other less desirable ways of doing things, thus reducing their support burden.

Rob Gray – Polaris Library Systems
• Working with Colorado Prospector (INN-Reach) and Michigan MeLCat (INN-Reach) will follow.
• Polaris has been working in Maryland MARINA (Relais) and have not heard of any issues.
• Polaris has been working with Massachusetts MassVC(Auto-Graphics) and that also seems to be pretty much done.
• Polaris is working with Texas libraries to get connected to the Texas (OCLC Navigator) project.
• Each library has its own implementation schedule depending on the ILL system.

Kevin Stewart – Relais International
• Reported they are testing with University of New South Wales and Ex Libris in Jerusalem (they were using two profiles so are sorting those things out) and this is where (Jerusalem) Alma developer is based.
• Ongoing Innovative issue - said they’d allow University of New Melbourne to use ILL messages but not D2D messages - but these are the same messages so trying to get Innovative to support both.

Peter Collins – University of Pennsylvania Libraries
• Reported that they completed moved to NCIP for several Voyager catalogs at EZBorrow.
• Kuali OLE ILS system is progressing and University of Chicago (BorrowDirect member) is scheduled to go live relatively soon so they will need to get an NCIP responder for that product. They’ve been sent messages that they need to support NCIP with BorrowDirect.

Open Discussion Topics

Version 2.x Defects/Change Requests

None were submitted.

Implementation Tips and Helpful Advice

Note – Both in between Implementer Updates and following, there were questions discussed related to this topic. Discussion spawned from specific Implementer Updates.

Question (Peter, context of Relais update) asked about using same NCIP interface with different ILL vendors. Shouldn’t that work?
• Evidently messages may be the same between different vendor products, but what happens with those messages isn’t necessarily the same.
• Tony reports that payload can be used differently and this is not subject of NCIP at this point. Each ILL has their own configuration file on the ILS. Need to know who "Agency" is sending Request Item request, for example. Although Kevin reports that SirsiDynix doesn’t pay attention to Agency info (an optional element).
Discussion of Consistency of Messages and NCIP Implementations

- Check-in and Check-out probably behave the same for everyone (per Kevin) but Lookups may have some variations but these are easily surmountable because they are very similar.
- Kevin encourages Peter’s BorrowDirect members use both ILLiad and D2D to go ahead and try sending the NCIP messages to ILLiad and see what happens. The pertinent ILSs would be Aleph and Horizon for Peter.
- INN-Reach NCIP behaves very different from other ILL products. For example, it doesn’t send the item barcode in initial Request Item message. ILS doesn’t get it until the hold is placed so this requires a lot of extra work on the ILS side.
- Also, batch uploads to DCB from Polaris are massive (in Prospector) so these have had to get broken down.
- Lori expressed the need for more consistency within NCIP and what happens with payload. If we can’t find consistency within NCIP implementations, how can we hope to create more consistency with ILL and LCF.
- NCIP developed to allow a lot of flexibility and that has made for the inconsistency (Tony) but what if we created an NCIP protocol that had ALL required elements? Maybe it is time to move away from focus on making everything so flexible because it is creating problems.
- May be able to define required CORE set that all NCIP implementations must support (Kevin). Kelli reported similar discussion came up in SIP working group and they went through all messages and came up with a set of fields that are required for each message - but kept it at a minimum with strong recommendation to provide more info and do it according to the protocol.
- Examples - On Check-Out messages, there’s a Due Date field, but most ILSs ignore. Alma will use it if provided. Kevin points out this is an example of a field that should NOT be required.
- Tony says that you have to go into the semantics of the fields if you are going to make them mandatory. Kevin believes we could define some core messages that are mandatory and provide info on how they have to be used while still leaving some options available.
- Question - Can we do this without breaking any existing profiles?
  - If we can, we can just create another application profile that is the NCIP Canonical Circulation Profile (Tony suggests).
  - Juli suggests this might be a way to make NCIP more marketable, easier to use.
  - Kevin believes that most ILS vendors do handle the messages the same - very similar. But subtle differences can make a big difference in workflows. Brings up the issue of what we put in the registry and what we put on NCIP.info website.
- Topic of a "simplified" or "canonical circulation" application profile tabled for later open discussion.

Distribution of Activities without Maintenance Agency

- Tasks of maintenance agency (previously EnvisionWare) were are: maintain documentation on NISO website and keep NISO website up-to-date, take minutes and upload to website, maintain NCIP.info (not a requirement of NISO)
- Discussion resulted in establishing these informal roles/responsibilities that everyone committed to until next in-person meeting:
  - Protocol Editor - manage schema and official documentation – Tony
  - NCIP.info Web Team - Juli, Lori, Peter
Secretary - takes minutes and submits to Chair or Vice Chair to put on NISO website – Kelli
Chair - runs meetings, maintains NISO website, shows up at meetings and events – Mike
Vice Chair - backs up Chair, different from “co-chair” – TBD - Juli will check with D2D committee to find out if this has be officially blessed by NISO and/or D2D.
  - See Day 2 Review
  - Juli also shared she was officially accepted as the liaison between the NCIP SC and the D2D committee

ISO ILL Update (ISO 18626)

- Kevin reported that new draft ILL protocol has gone to ballot.
  - Balloting closes December 5, 2013
  - If no major objections, then standard anticipated to be published early 2014
- They aligned the structures and messages with NCIP messages. For example "desired due date" instead of "requested due date" to make it easier for people working with both interfaces.
- Proposal is that working group (Claire MacKeigan, Ed Davidson, Leif Anderson) remain available for questions from vendors.
- This is a new ISO standard (versus a revision to the existing ISO ILL).
- This new protocol is much simpler than the previous one.
- Different from NCIP in that it is not based on "message pairs." Although there are messages and confirmations but the confirmations are asynchronous and you won't necessarily get the confirmation (per Kevin).
- OCLC will support the new standard and eventually the old one will go away.

Miscellaneous – SC Participation

- Innovative and SirsiDynix are no longer official members of committee so they are not preventing us from reaching our quorum
- There is interest in keeping better track of members and who is active and who is no longer active.
- Attendance is recorded in Kavi by Chair, it will become more obvious who is no longer actively participating and we can get NISO to follow up with them.
- There is an interest in being more pro-active about following up with people that have ceased to participate in the committee primarily because it causes problems with voting but also because we want to encourage people to remain active.

Website ncip.info Discussion

*Note – Purpose and Strategy and Review of Changes were discussed iteratively.*

Purpose and Strategy
• Everyone agreed with:
  o Learn about NCIP and why it matters
  o How to get involved with SC
  o Bibliography of NCIP info (e.g. journal articles, presentations, etc.)

Review of Changes
• NCIP Initiator/Responder Matrix
  o Much discussion about the layout and display
  o Three options fleshed out of discussion based on concerns/opinion expressed
    ▪ Option 1: Granular Product Detail – both Initiators (x axis) and Responders (y axis) have a value for each product; a dot or asterisk to be placed in corresponding cells to represent “in production” implementations
    ▪ Option 2: Company Level Detail – both Initiators (x axis) and Responders (y axis) have a single value; a dot or asterisk to be placed in corresponding cells to represent “in production” implementations
    ▪ Option 3: Combination Detail - both Initiators (x axis) and Responders (y axis) have a single value; a dot or asterisk to be placed in corresponding cells to represent “in production” implementations. Vendors may also list specific products within the cell instead of an asterisk
  o Points of discussion surrounded:
    ▪ Definitions of “in production” – i.e. there is a current, working implementation
    ▪ Ensuring representation of vendors is not skewed (equality of representation) and/or display of information shows a bias toward one or more vendors
    ▪ Information displayed does not lead a library to start a negative conversation with the vendor and/or product contacts
    ▪ Group divided in terms of whether to display detail down to the product and NCIP version vs. general information about who is communicating with who (libraries can then review individually submitted profiles, and/or know to start with the vendor who can direct to the appropriate product)
    ▪ Disclaimers and/or how to include other vendors and/or open source solutions (e.g. Evergreen, Koha) who do not have active representation in NCIP SC
  o Group undecided – feels options should be discussed with more participants on call.
    o Juli created a Google doc to mock up matrix and shared with group.
• Left hand menu cleanup – updated to have fewer sections. New Left Navigation will be:
  Home
  About NCIP
  About NCIP SC
  SC Meeting Minutes
  Technical Documentation
  Links and Resources
• Agreed to remove Application Profiles – look to replace with upcoming discussion on “simplified” or “canonical circulation” application profile
• Reorganization so that things about the standard are together and the things about the SC are together (e.g. some of the stuff in documentation might be better in About NCIP)
- Goal to keep it simple and short – e.g. information on page should not be lengthy and should be direct/to the point
- Changed “Purpose and Structure” left hand menu option to "About NCIP SC"
- Under "Links and Resources" - add link to NISO site and provide info about getting Implementer Info (e.g. submit info about an update production instance)
- General discussion about linking to Meeting Minutes and/or other documents that require a NISO login.

**Day 2 – Wednesday, October 9, 2013**

**Review of Day 1**
- Kelli (acting on Mike’s behalf to guide Agenda) – reviewed items from previous day
- Vice Chair clarification – Juli to continue communication with Nettie. Initial feedback is that a “co-chair” would need to be approved by D2D. However, the NCIP SC is seeing a “vice chair” as different from a “co-chair” – vice chair is not equal, but rather a back-up in case the chair cannot attend
- Website Options reviewed and group shared agreement this should be tabled until the next call and/or more participants to provide feedback.
- Group discussed topics vs. availability for John to provide LCF and SIP Working Group update

**Open Discussion Cont’d**

**Simplified Application Profile**

- Two concentric circles: simple circ (inner) and simple request (outer)
- Simple Circ: lookup user, checkout, and checkin, should consider renewal as well - this covers the most simplistic workflow
  - Now need to look at a simple set of data elements
  - Tony may be able to strip down the schema to get the smallest possible data set to support those four messages
  - Important to consider the messages are still compliant with the larger v2.02 NCIP schema, concept of a "schema subset"
  - Strip out optional elements and keep core elements, e.g. Patron ID and Item ID are typically the minimum
  - Discussed issue with creating a separate schema, could get out of sync
    - Alternative - imply a schema without creating one with sample XML string
    - There are ILS requires an application profile and agency ID (e.g. Ex Libris Aleph)
    - Advocate for simple because this helps with the marketing of NCIP and address one of the major complaints/perceived hurdles that NCIP is too complex
  - Have to make an assumption that the ILS responder will be able to apply circulation policies without the agency/location. If there are more complex policies (based on owning library vs transacting branch), then optional fields such as Agency ID should be sent.
    - Terminal location could be determined by IP - lowest assumption
In some implementations, the Agency ID is fabricated/does not carry meaning
- Can complete a reverse DNS lookup to identify host
  - Version 2 already has capability to strip down and simplify vs version 1
- **Simple Request** (larger circle)
  - Upstream processes that get the material from A to B predicated by the patron request, then move to inner circle simple circ
  - Potential messages: request item, cancel request item, and accept item
  - How to get book shipped: borrowing agency sends request item to lending agency, borrowing agency then uses accept item to create temp record
  - Need to compare to core messages and what are we missing (follow-up 9 core - recall item and lookup item were left out of this simple set)
  - Delete item is nice, but not necessarily needed in this simple profile
- Need to address the action to get the item back to the lending agency - statements about assumed item, temporary item has some sort of identifier info so that when item is checked in, there is an indicator in the ILS to flag to send to ILL staff. ILL staff then send checkin message to lending agency via ILL system let them know it’s on its way back.
- This work flow assumes that ILS is only a responder, and not an initiator.
- **Question:** Why are ILS’s only responders?
  - Suggested reasoning - ILS systems are high performance responders, so we have to take care that if ILS becomes an initiator or, we have to know we’ll get a response
  - OCLC WMS ILS is only a responder, where Worldshare and Navigator are ILL initiators and responders
- **Action Item (new)** - Tony and Kevin – Strawman to mockup these XML sets and also present recommendations to explicitly state expected data elements and expected behavior

**LCF Update**
- Presented by John Bodfish
- Lori and John met with folks from Bibliotheca (Scott and Jim)
- John now has a copy of the LCF documents, dated July
- **Action Item (ongoing)** for John to look through to see how they line up with SIP, NCIP and forthcoming ILL standard; looking to see what can be achieved with LCF vs other standards
  - There is a lot more work to be done at the field level to see what is covered
- No one of these is a super set of the others; each has capabilities that the others don’t
- Could be problematic for ILS vendors - may have to implement all three
- Degree of difference between the three, there needs to be greater coordination where gap functionality should be added (which standard? And how to address this process?)
- LCF Draft standard delayed until November for release
- NCIP SC hopes LCF group won’t work in isolation; coordinate between changes in standard.
  - Future issue - how can we coordinate earlier?
- Potential to have a neutral conference call - SIP, NCIP, ILL, RFID, and LCF with the agenda to have regular calls every x frequency
  - There is some history with LCF and reaching out to NISO, the group would like more information
- **Action Item (new)** – John – continue comparison, reach out to LCF to get an updated copy of the latest document – next level is to review field level
- **Action Item (new)** – Lori – gathering contacts for the neutral conference call
• **Action Item (new)** – Juli – email Nettie to learn more about history of LCFs first approaches to NISO

**SIP Working Group Update**
- Presented by John Bodfish
- Almost wrapped up the discussion items, then proceed to editing the draft standard for publication
- Going to be submitted to NISO members of the topic committee, will likely be approved
- Position of the Working Group on NCIP vs SIP - reasonable to offer both based on the specific areas of operations. SIP can be distinguished from NCIP as a subset of internal circulation actions
- Question - do we know if any initiators/vendors will implement?
  - No official statements, but 3M, EW and Bibliotheca have been participating in the Working Group

**Next Meeting and Wrap-up**
- Two potential hosts for 2014 In Person Meetings
  - Lori in CA – potential for Spring; reviewing internally
  - Peter in PA – potential for Fall; checking internally
- Next SC meeting in November – regular conference call
- Proposed Agenda Items not discussed/consolidated
  - Fewer Messages – addressed in *Simplified Application Profile*
  - Extensions – no known requests for extensions, thus a point of non-discussion
  - Marketing NCIP – addressed in *Website ncip.info Discussion* and *Simplified Application Profile*
  - Revisit October 2012 Accept Item Discussion – group ran out of time; this topic may need more preparation and/or action items to have effective discussion