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Attendees

Mike Dicus – Ex Libris (Chair)
Lori Ayre – Galecia Group (Host)
John de la Fontaine – Guest, SCELC**
Kelli Schoneck Benitez – The Library Corporation
Juli Marsh – The Library Corporation*
Tony O’Brien – OCLC*
Rob Gray – Polaris Library Systems*
Kevin Stewart – Relais International
Peter Collins – University of Pennsylvania Libraries

*Participated by phone
**SCELC stands for “Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium”

Day 1 – Wednesday, April 23, 2014

Introductions and Implementer Updates

- With John D. as a new participant, all parties present – in person and on phone – introduced themselves.
  - John shared information about SCELC and the make-up of their consortium, which is primarily Academics with a few publics
  - User of Innovative Interfaces’ INN-Reach Resource Sharing product
- Initial introductory discussions segued into a discussion on attendance and participation – implementer updates tabled until regular May Conference Call

Open Discussion Topics

Version 2.x Defects/Change Requests

- None were submitted.
- There was a question on the ncipinfo listserv about patron authentication via EZProxy with blocked and/or expired patrons and NCIP
  - Group discussed initial responses such as asking for sample outputs
  - Group felt the NCIP standard could handle the issue of blocked or expired patrons still being provided access to databases with valid to/from dates and/or block trap values
  - Meeting follow-up: ncipinfo listserv members to review question and post a reply to see if the question is still relevant and share desire to have examples for review.
    Also request to add ncipinfo review as a standing monthly call agenda item so we don’t miss any posts to the listserv.
Participation and Attendance

- Mike and Nettie reviewed NCIP SC Roster and contacted several members
  - Many wanted to continue participation and there was an option to be downgraded to Observer status if full attention could not be committed to remain a voting member of the group
    - Auto Graphics, Inc. – sends regrets for In Person Meeting, wants to continue as participant
    - EnvisionWare – participation still under discussion, current representative is Rob Walsh
    - University of Rochester Libraries – downgraded to Observer status, Randy Cook is representative
    - Florida Virtual Campus – downgraded to Observer status, John Sandstrum is representative
    - 3M – participation still desired, Sue Nelson shared she would try to encourage more attendance, etc. from other 3M representatives on roster
  - John Barr has retired from Polaris and no longer a member of the group

- Concerns still raised about follow-up policy for those who shared they want to participate, but continue to be absent
  - One suggestion – attend at least three meetings in the next six months, or be downgraded to an Observer
  - No binding decision made, but concern acknowledged

- NCIP SC still lacked a quorum at this In Person meeting even with a revised and trimmed roster (6 out of 14)

- Discussion about impacts of Innovative Interfaces’ acquisition of Polaris
  - Innovative is not a member of the NCIP SC, but are members of NISO
  - Rob Gray is the primary Polaris representative and will continue with the group until otherwise informed
  - Voting responsibilities could be in flux and group will wait to hear more
  - Action Item: Mike and Nettie to reach out to Innovative about participation
    - John D. shared Tim Auger as a potential Innovative contact and anticipates seeing him at the upcoming Innovative User’s Group Meeting
    - Other members of the SC – Polaris and TLC – shared Tim as a primary contact from past NCIP implementation projects with INN-Reach
    - At a minimum the group would like Innovative participation in Observer status until Polaris/Innovative voting status can be reviewed
    - Elizabeth Henry was another contact put forth by Innovative after Eric Leckbee’s departure

- Group would also like to reach out to SirsiDynix (who is no longer a NISO member) and Atlas Systems for ILLiad
  - ILLiad has activity for NCIP integration with the IDS Project in New York State – where John D. and Peter echoed Mark Sullivan (not an Atlas employee, but heavy work with IDS) as a potential contact

- John D. from SCELC will be upgraded to Observer status
In Person Meeting – Continuation and Scheduling

- Low attendance at in person meeting makes for a repeat discussion topic of whether to continue with in person meetings
- Group agrees we like the in person because of the potential for organic conversations and overall productivity
  - Acknowledged lack of quorum does hurt ability to make decisions, but this is not unique to in person meetings and occurs for regular monthly calls
  - Travel expenses are an issue for some NCIP SC members where a commitment to only one meeting per year can be accommodated
- Suggestions for what to do about in person meetings:
  - Identify a more central host location as group has more members from the East Coast
  - Reduce In Person meeting to once a year – pick the fall or the spring
  - Ask SC members to better flesh out agenda earlier and have compelling topics to encourage more attendance
  - Use Google Hangout or other video conference service in place of in person
    - Using both video and voice may encourage a higher level of accountability
    - Group would like to try this – targeting July conference call as a dry run to see if this is a viable alternative to review further
- NISO/ANSI Continuous Maintenance Agreement does require group to meet twice a year to review change and defect requests
  - Requests must be submitted by March 1/August 1 to be considered by the NCIP SC by May 31/October 31 respectively
  - No requirement that the meetings be in person, but we do need to meet regardless of whether there are change/defect requests
  - We have had fewer if no change/defect requests for the last couple in person meetings - no known reason as to why
    - Last known enhancement request was for Item Holdings Set submitted by the xC (eXtensible Catalog) group

Real-world ILL Issues – Item Barcodes

- Rob Gray from Polaris presented this discussion topic
- An implementation of INN-Reach resource sharing in Colorado has an issue with duplicate item barcodes between multiple libraries.
  - This is causing issues with checkin and inappropriate local hold fulfillment
  - INN-Reach is sending shipment notification messages that include the Item Barcode, but these do not allow for a Polaris response once the item has been shipped
  - Then when the requesting (borrowing) library receives the AcceptItem request, Polaris sends back a failure/error message due to INN-Reach barcode formats (e.g. Item ID@[INN-Reach Library Code]); however, the Item is still shipped and circulated
  - When the item is returned, due to the presence of duplicate barcodes and no other ILL identifiers, there is a possible scenario where this Item ID is associated with a local Title and will fill a non-ILL local hold
  - The Polaris library participating in the resource sharing group wants to manage the circulation in the Polaris ILS and not through the INN-Reach interface
- John D. shared his user experience with INN-Reach item barcode suffixes
These are typically added as suffixes in an @[INN-Reach Library Code], e.g. 9 digits@BERK – this way the borrowing agency knows the lending agency was Berkeley.

- The suffix is added when the lending agency ships the items
- When an Item Barcode of this format is scanned into the Innovative Interfaces’ ILS, the user is prompted for action

- Polaris, with corroboration by TLC, have shared these Item Barcodes with suffixes have caused issues in the past and may not be entirely consistent
- Is there a solution within the NCIP standard that is ILS vendor agnostic to better manage ILL Item barcodes and reduce instances of local and consortia duplication?
  - Group discussion felt this is not something that can be addressed by the NCIP standard as the determination of the Item Barcode is happening outside of the protocol
  - There will always be an issue and risk of confusion when we are dealing with a static and affixed item barcode on material and treating it as a “unique” identifier
  - One software solution proposed for ILS vendors to support unique ILL item barcode formats and when items are scanned in to have a “begins with” search and a staff prompt when the first elements of an item barcode match more than one barcode in the system – this could alert AMH systems and library staff will need to act on it.
  - Suggestions for the presence of an ILL barcode registry that resource sharing groups could agree to use
  - Suggestion to use the ILL Request ID – potential risk is that those are starting to be cycled through by OCLC
  - Adoption and use of RFID data elements may be an resolution – it is more flexible/updatable and there is the potential for more identifiers in a single physical tag
- Discussion was tabled due to the group consensus this is not an NCIP issue, but recognizes there is not another “resource sharing” group we are aware of where this type of conversation could occur and issue resolved

**Review/Revise SC Member Responsibilities**

- Members agreed to remain in roles assigned during Fall 2013 In Person Meeting
  - Web Team – Juli, Lori and Peter
  - Secretary – Kelli
  - Schema – Tony (Kevin as backup)
- Vice Chair ballot – Mike will follow-up with Nettie

**Simplified Application Profile**

- Group reviewed notes from Fall 2013 In Person Meeting
- Consensus on purpose of simplified application profile
  - Geared at removing guesswork in implementing NCIP with goal to simplify implementations
  - “NCIP-Lite”
  - Key elements of stripping down to minimal viable data elements and sharing expected behavior, where the latter is crucial to making implementations between systems go more smoothly
- Initial conceptual model included two concentric circles
Inner Circle – primarily focused on circulation – one could technically implement this as stand-alone if not needing to handle external resource sharing requests

Outer Circle – primarily focused on requesting activities and encompasses circulation – would recommend this level of implementation based on resource sharing models

- **Action Items:**
  - Kevin to look at messages for minimal data elements needed – since Relais works with many ILS vendors there is a good opportunity to come up with a list based on actual implementations
  - Tony will look at existing schema and start to strip it down – keep iterating until the schema can be as small as it can but still viable
  - Option vs. mandatory elements would be open to discussion

**NCIP Info Website**

- **Action Item:** Kelli to contact Nettie about settings to make Meeting Minutes public so they may be viewed from links on ncip.info site. Will CC Web Team members when this is complete so links can be added to the ncip.info site
  - Decision these minutes should be uploaded in PDF format was the preference
- Web Team tried to meet a few times offline in between In Person Meetings to discuss strategy and actions, but have not yet had the opportunity – will try again.
- **Action Item:** Mike will look to make Implementer Profiles public links from NISO
- **Action Item:** Web Team committed to getting the website into a more workable state (e.g. remove dead links, additional cleanup, etc.) prior to June call so the larger group can discuss strategy
- Discussion about populating purpose – “What is NCIP about?”
  - Lori thought she might send out to listserv to elicit responses to get a more collective and broader perspective on NCIP so we can use this for future strategic discussions and display it on the site

**Barriers to Interoperability**

- Organic discussion out of NCIP Info Website and purpose of NCIP
- Group consensus that the use of proprietary APIs hurts libraries and resource sharing initiatives
- A point was made for the group to use the API term with nuance – technically NCIP is an API – when we are referring to APIs, the group was thinking of web services
- The main battle ground is standard (e.g. NCIP, eBooks, etc) vs. proprietary APIs in external communications
- The ideal is to have all communications standardized, but the reality is we have a long way to go working towards “true” and “ideal” interoperability
- Proprietary paths can be more attractive to vendors due to up-front costs and time constraints
  - Group felt the strategy to present a simplified application profile may help with these types of barriers (expediency, cost, time to develop, etc.) and encourage a standard API adoption vs. opting for a proprietary route
- Group acknowledged NCIP is a large standard and vendors may see all of those messages as unnecessary
- Question asked: Does the simplified application profile only benefit implementers?
  - Yes – but making this profile will help for adoption outside of the ILS or more technical groups.
Having a more simple schema to present can assist with the brokerage of conversations between ILS vendor, library staff and/or IT staff, and resource sharing products

- Cost – some vendors are charging too much for NCIP connections and libraries cannot afford these
  - Unfortunately, this is not something the NCIP SC can directly do anything about
  - Hope the simplified application profile would provide libraries leverage to advocate to their vendors to implement a low cost option

**RFID and NCIP**

- RFID has a standard for the physical tag and a standard for the data elements to be contained by the tag
- RFID tag has a broad life cycle – there is flexibility of what a tag owner of an item wants to write to the tag
- Currently facing issues with adoption and belief NCIP may be lacking in support
- NCIP SC would like to better understand the data elements of RFID and how they fit into NCIP – this way we can be better equipped to suggest enhancement requests to expand the protocol.
- Batch processing was also discussed
  - Group discussed serial vs. parallel processing – again bandwidth does make the need to accommodate parallel processing within the protocol not necessarily an issue; also the ILS is going to process each item received in a somewhat serial fashion, but quickly
  - Reiterated need to have RFID data elements presented so NCIP SC can discuss enhancements to protocol, e.g. potential to add Batch ID to tie groups of items together

**LCF Update**

- Lori emailed to NCIP SC listserv (not ncipinfo) the officially published documents for the LCF standard
- v1.0 published January 2014
- While copyrighted material made available for general use, would like to point out users of LCF have to agree to terms – where BIC is exercising more control/involvement of use when it comes to changes
- Innovative Interfaces and Bibliotheca are the first North American companies entered in a strategic partnership to improve the RFID market and there may be plans to implement using a standard such as LCF

**NISO SIP WG Update**

- John Bodfish – co-chair of SIP WG – provided the following update:
  - The NISO SIP Working Group has completed its revisions to SIP 3.
  - The next step is editing of the standard document.
  - Initial steps have been taken to begin edits, but estimates and/or committed timelines for completion are yet available

**Next Meeting**

- Potential host for Fall 2014 In Person Meeting – Peter in PA – will check internally
• Next SC meeting in May – regular conference call
• There will be a few SC members at ALA in Vegas so will want to discuss potential for another informal gathering

Day 2 – Thursday, April 24, 2014

NCIP SC stayed later on Wednesday to finish topics of discussion, which were planned to be covered the morning of Day 2.

Group agreed all topics had been discussed to their max capacity and due to later Day 1 meeting, adjourned allowing some to travel earlier and reduce expenses.