NCIP Conference Call  
October 22, 2009

Present on the call

Ted Koppel - Auto-Graphics  
Susan Campbell - CCLA  
Rob Walsh - EnvisionWare (Maintenance Agency)  
Mike Dicus - Ex Libris  
Lynne Branche Brown - Innovative Interfaces  
John Bodfish - OCLC  
Rob Gray - Polaris  
Gail Wanner (Chair) - SirsiDynix

Agenda

Updates from Implementers

Wanner reported that SirsiDynix is ready to begin testing with CARL. Walsh reported that EnvisionWare is seeing more interest in NCIP and is slowly moving NCIP up its development priority list.

News from the Standards Community

LITA

Gray asked about the NCIP session presented at LITA. Wanner said that it went well. There were approximately 20 people, and they asked some good questions. Koppel said he was a bit disappointed in the turn out. However, he said that the NCIP program was up against 3-4 others, so maybe 20 in attendance is good. “We had a better story to tell this year than in previous years. We got across what we wanted to get across, but I wish there had been more people.” Wanner said that the conference itself seemed lightly attended. Koppel agreed, saying that they generally draw 400-450, but this year may have been closer to 250. Wanner said that the presentation was well worth doing. “We may have reached some who haven’t heard it before, but more importantly the information will be available on the LITA website and we should be able to link to it soon.”

Single Sign-On

Walsh reported that NISO has formed a Single Sign-On (SSO) working group. Koppel said that the focus of that group seems to be in a particular direction (e.g., Shibboleth), and it is uncertain where the group’s efforts might go. Wanner recalled that, in the early days of NCIP, someone talked about Shibboleth and they were not impressed with what this group was doing with authentication. Bodfish added that they seemed to feel that NCIP authentication was not as robust. This was due to a desire not to recreate an
extensive authentication protocol. He concluded that we all should seek ways to contribute to the SSO discussion so that it does not fail in the ways Koppel is fearing.

**Tasks and Projects**

**Implementer Registry**

Campbell reported on her efforts with the Implementer Registry. She was able to download the profiles from the website. She put the ones from OCLC, III, and SirsiDynix into a database and identified the trigger events. She was able to search for triggering messages that are not part of the core. She said that there are issues with inconsistent use of language, spacing, capitalization, etc. Mixing C-ILL and DCB does not seem to be as big an issue. This highlights the need for an on-line form for creating a profile. The output would be both a document and entries in a database. Wanner volunteered to participate in an effort to clean up the formatting. Campbell asked, though, whether that effort would be better invested in the creation of a better framework for the profiles. Gray said that a system where a consumer could type in some information or select messages to generate a report would be both interesting and useful. Further, the system could be used as a way to record interest in NCIP. Koppel agreed that a system for helping people determine what capabilities exist in which implementations should be pursued. “First you have to know what people can do in order to know whether they are able to work together,” he said. “This is something we should do as quickly as possible.” Wanner noted that we should keep working on this and see if we can design something that could be useful.

**Getting Started with NCIP**

Bodfish reported that he had not been able to start the “Getting Started with NCIP” document we discussed at the last meeting.

**RFP Guidelines**

Koppel reported that he had expected some information from (Karen) Wetzel about what the procedures for revised RFP guidelines are to be. Bodfish said he did not think NISO was putting any efforts toward a new RFP document. Wanner, though, said that she recalled a goal of having a new document ready by ALA Midwinter. Koppel volunteered to check with Wetzel and coordinate efforts with NISO.

**Outreach**

**Bake-Off**

Wanner asked whether we want to begin planning a “bake-off” event. “This year’s low attendance may suggest that LITA is not the right venue,” she said. “Maybe the Rethinking Resource Sharing group would be a better forum.” Koppel asked whether that group represented “doers” or “talkers”. Wanner said that the “talkers” may be ones
we want in this effort. Bodfish suggested that we might consider doing something like this at the next NCIP-IG meeting. Koppel said that we would need to have enough of the people who are at the controls - the developers, product managers, etc. - as opposed to the policy-level members. Wanner agreed that this is an interesting idea, but suggested that we might not be ready by the spring meeting. Bodfish suggested doing a “dry-run” in the spring and more public event in the fall. Walsh agreed that a “proof-of-concept” is necessary before we decide where and how to proceed. Brown suggested that we add an agenda item to the spring meeting and revisit this then.

ALA Events

Wanner asked whether we should pursue an NCIP social at ALA Midwinter. She said that we tried this at the last ALA Annual, “but we drew only ourselves.” Koppel asked why people outside the NCIP-IG would come. Wanner said that it would be a chance to get to know those of us involved in NCIP. “It was intended as a social context for information, discussion, and Q&A.” Brown said that it was also an opportunity for those who had been less active in the NCIP-IG to demonstrate their interest in continued participation. Koppel suggested that it does not hurt to schedule an event. Brown added that we could set a date then charge each of us to bring a customer. Wanner asked whether the event should be at a neutral site like a restaurant rather than seeking a sponsor and using a vendor’s suite. Koppel noted that he would be reluctant to take a customer to a competitor’s suite for an event like this. Wanner offered to see if there are appropriate venues near the conference center in Boston. “If we can’t find anything, we can try for an event at annual,” she said.

NISO Webinar

Wanner reported that she and Walsh participated in the most recent NISO open teleconference and provided an update on our September meeting. “It was a nice opportunity to educate and inform,” she said.

Minnesota Library Association

Wanner reported that she attended the Minnesota Library Association meeting and was surprised by the level of interest in NCIP. “One customer said that NCIP is something everyone should have -- it just works,” she said. Bodfish asked if this was the customer who did a time savings study last year. Wanner said it was, and that we should try to get that study linked on the NCIP website. Bodfish and Wanner each offered to attempt to locate the study and/or get permission to provide a link.

Spring Meeting

Gray noted that Polaris is willing to host the NCIP-IG spring meeting. The group agreed that, since Syracuse was identified as a desirable location at the September meeting due to its proximity to the eXtensible Catalog group, we should accept Polaris’ invitation. Gray will post proposed dates to the NCIP list.
Next Call

Wanner indicated that the next call will be November 19, 2009, at 1:00 pm Eastern. [Editor’s note: In a follow email dated October 23, 2009, Wanner asked whether, due to a scheduling conflict, November 12 would be acceptable for the group. At this time, the date has not been firmly set.]

Adjournment

Wanner adjourned the call.