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Welcome and Introductions

Wanner called the meeting to order and asked Dicus to provide a logistical overview of the facilities. Each person in attendance briefly introduced him- or herself.

Agenda Review

Wanner led a review of the agenda and asked if anyone had any changes to suggest. She reminded the group, too, that some people not present have planned to join the discussion on some topics by telephone, and we need to mindful of the schedule to ensure those topics start at the designated times.

Implementer Updates

Wanner asked if anyone had implementer updates to share.

Leckbee reported that Innovative Interfaces is testing in a consortium in Michigan with Polaris. They are working to convert functionality currently using an implementation based on Direct Consortial Borrowing (DCB) to NCIP by eliminating some request messages, primarily with respect to user authentication. Innovative is nearly finished implementing messages to exchange with Relais International for PALCI, but they continue to work on the internal implementations behind the message exchanges.

Miller reported that TLC Library.Solution is working in Maryland with SirsiDynix. Two libraries are in final testing, and no failures have yet been identified. TLC is preparing to move all libraries that are part of this project to final system testing. Their next project will be with Melcat. Library.Solution is working also with Auto-Graphics in Louisiana. TLC CARL is working in Northbay. All work is with NCIP Version 1.

Gray reported that Polaris is working in Maryland with SirsiDynix. They, too, will be working on Melcat.

O'Brien reported that OCLC WorldCat Navigator has an NCIP implementation, originally using Version 1. OCLC is committed to Version 2 and is beginning to develop a toolkit. Bodfish added that the code being written for Version 2 will be donated to the eXtensible Catalog (XCO) project and will be available under MIT license. Anyone interested in using the toolkit should contact XCO and get involved in the project. The toolkit supports the use of extensions, but none are presently implemented.
Other Standards News

Wanner asked if anyone had news from other related standards to share.

Wetzel reported that the Institutional Identifier (I2) working group has published a draft for feedback. They are working on how to better integrate with ISNI (International Standard Name Identifier). Their biggest issues are how to manage the data, how to maintain registries, and how to avoid conflict with existing identifiers (OCLC, ISIL, etc.).

Walsh reported that he recently assumed a co-chair role with the Discovery to Delivery Topic Committee. This position was held previously by O’Brien.

Dicus asked if anyone had any updates regarding SIP 3.0. Walsh indicated that little mention has been made in the community outside of a reference made as part of the Massachusetts state-wide sorter project. Dicus indicated a comment made in the UK suggested that NCIP was dying and SIP 3.0 would be the next standard. Bodfish has heard similar comments. However, no one is aware of any definition or specification for SIP 3.0, so it is easy for it to be the “next best thing.” The group indicated that it will be interesting to see how 3M manages to achieve some of the goals they’ve set for SIP 3.0. O’Brien suggested that, as a committee, we need to think about what our next steps will be if SIP 3.0 is introduced and begins to gain traction in the industry. We need to attempt to maintain contact with 3M to stay abreast of any developments.

Stewart commented that one of the biggest barriers to NCIP continues to be price. When vendors charge more for NCIP than SIP, customers are reluctant to pursue NCIP.

Wetzel indicated that we should continue to look for Version 2 success stories that can be highlighted and published to show the community that NCIP is working.

Review Version 2 Changes

Walsh reviewed changes being made in Part 1 and Part 2 of the NCIP Standard. The group discussed ways to simplify Section 5 in Part 1. Campbell expressed concerns over the tedious manual efforts associated with keeping the schema and the Standard in sync. She suggested that there should be some way, via an XSL stylesheet transformation for example, to automate the generation of Sections 5 (and 6) and reduce both the amount of work and the likelihood of additional errors. Bodfish said that there are some rules and semantics described in the Standard that cannot be adequately represented in the schema. He used the “if requested” model as an example.
Review Items previous marked for further study

Walsh reviewed three items that had been accepted for further study at the April 2010 meeting.

Number: 2010-01-0010
Type: Defect
Subject: User Id is allowed both inside and outside of User Optional Fields; however, Item Id is not allowed inside Item Optional Fields.
Description: Need to determine which is “correct” and ensure that both are handled consistently.
Discussion (Apr. 2010): User Id can be used both as an identifier and as data. When used outside of User Optional Fields, it is a key. When used inside, it is simply data.
Decision (Apr. 2010): Accept for further study. Attempt to find concrete use cases that require Item Id to be used outside of Item Optional Fields.
Decision (Sept. 2010): Reject. The group was unable to identify a compelling use case to justify this change.

Number: 2010-01-0017
Type: Enhancement
Submitted By: OCLC
Submitted Date: During Version 2 balloting
Subject: NCIP is too cautious with respect to element repeatability.
Description: Recent implementation experience has shown that NCIP remains too cautious in the design of its data structures, specifically in the area of element repeatability. The Standard allows for tightening of rules via application profiles (e.g., marking an optional element mandatory), but it does not permit loosening of rules as would be the case if a non-repeatable element were allowed to repeat. If more elements are allowed to repeat it will also be necessary to specify the semantics. In some cases, it may be obvious how multiple or repeated elements are to be handled. But where the element is part of a key (e.g., Request Item’s Bibliographic and Item Ids), perhaps the semantics are that the initiator thinks any of them is valid, and the responder gets to choose. In these cases the responder ought to return the key chosen in the response.
Discussion (Apr. 2010): O’Brien indicated that this seems to require open discussion within the group. It may be quite useful, but it may lead to chaotic and ambiguous implementations. Wanner explained that she could see making something like ISBN repeatable since many bibliographic records contain multiple ISBN numbers. Two disparate systems may not have identical bibliographic records. Repeating ISBNs, then, would seem to make sense. Jackson asked if we would also allow elements like title and author to repeat so that we could send different titles and different authors. Gray indicated that would not be relevant since we cannot search on title and author. Walsh noted, though, that the same example might be valid with ISBNs where two ISBNs do not represent the same work. That could lead to a confusing implementation. O’Brien explained that the request is to make every element repeatable and to restrict
them where necessary through profiles. Jackson asked what problem the proposal is trying to solve. O’Brien said that the problem is philosophical rather than practical. He presented an example using Accept Item. It contains User Id. Repeating that might prove to be problematic. Jackson, however, said it could represent a book club. Stewart asked what it would mean to repeat a Pickup Location. The group acknowledged that would be a problem. Gray indicated that the excessive repeatability might significantly increase the overall bulk of the messages. A Check In message with many items could get pretty big. Walsh observed that if one plan to execute the same number of check ins with separate messages, the aggregate would probably be less. Gray said that the response would likely be slower, however.

**Decision (Apr. 2010):** Accept for further study. Attempt to find use cases for how it might be used effectively and provide examples to the submitter showing potential problems.

**Decision (Sept. 2010):** Reject. The group was unable to identify a compelling use case to justify this change.

**Number:** 2010-01-0021  
**Type:** Enhancement  
**Submitted By:** Brent Jensen ([brent.jensen@sirsidynix.com](mailto:brent.jensen@sirsidynix.com))  
**Organization:** SirsiDynix  
**Submitted Date:** During Version 2 balloting  
**Subject:** Add “transaction agency” or “transaction location” to Accept Item message.  
**Description:** Add “transaction agency” or “transaction location” to Accept Item message.  

**Discussion (Apr. 2010):** Wanner explained that Accept Item needs a third agency to represent the pick up location. There may even be a need for a fourth agency representing where the lending agency needs to send the item in order to get it into the borrowing system. Jackson asked if that is simply a function of the borrowing system. Wanner asked how the borrowing system knows where the user wants to pick up the item. Stewart noted that Version 2 has Pickup Location within the Accept Item Response.

**Decision (Apr. 2010):** Accept for further study. Ask Jensen whether Pickup Location within Accept Item Response meets his needs or if there are additional use cases.

**Decision (Sept. 2010):** Reject. The group was unable to identify a compelling use case to justify this change. Further, it was noted that Accept Item Response permits the use of Pickup Location in Version 2.
Review Schema Changes Resulting From Items Reviewed at April 2010 Meeting

O’Brien showed two specific schema changes that resulted from change requests accepted at the April 2010 meeting.

**Number:** 2010-01-0015  
**Type:** Enhancement  
**Submitted By:** OCLC  
**Submitted Date:** During Version 2 balloting  
**Subject:** Bibliographic Record Id is not repeatable in Bibliographic Description of Accept Item.  
**Description:** Bibliographic Record Id is not repeatable in Bibliographic Description of Accept Item. It should be possible, for example, for an initiator to send Accept Item using both an OCLC number and an LCCN number.  
**Discussion (Apr. 2010):** Jackson clarified that the requested change should be generic with respect to the types of ids allowed and not limited to OCLC and LCCN. Gray asked what the responder is accepting. Is it one item with two ids, or is it two separate items. O’Brien explained that, when one is creating a temporary record, one may need multiple ids to represent a single item. “It seems like a fairly non-offensive change that would be generally useful,” he said. Wanner added that it is primarily a resource sharing issue. The lending organization may use one id, but the borrowing organization may use a different one. The common record, then, needs both. Gray asked if this would make Bibliographic Record Id repeatable everywhere it is used. O’Brien indicated that the field is used only to carry information, never to identify an item, so allowing it repeat should not cause any problems.  
**Decision (Apr. 2010):** Accept without modification. Change the schema to make Bibliographic Record Id repeatable within Bibliographic Description. Then update the Standard document to match the changed schema.
Number: 2010-01-0016
Type: Enhancement
Submitted By: OCLC
Submitted Date: During Version 2 balloting
Subject: Request Item does not allow a combination of Bibliographic Record Id and Item Id.
Description: Request Item does not allow a combination of Bibliographic Record Id and Item Id, and it does not allow either to be repeated. An initiator should be able to send both, and it should be possible to send more than one of each.

Discussion (Apr. 2010): O’Brien explained that today one must choose to send either an Item Id or a Bibliographic Id but not both. This proposal would allow an initiator to send either or both. Gray asked if that meant the request would be for a specific item or any item that matches the Bibliographic Id. O’Brien said that he did not think that was meant to be the case. It was meant to provide extra information. Wanner asked if it was extra or alternative information. Gray said that his understanding is that an Item Id always represents a single item. A Bibliographic Id would mean any item that matches the given criteria. Stewart noted that the proposal also includes a request that each be made repeatable. O’Brien suggested that we need more information on why this change was requested so that we don’t risk an implementation that is ambiguous.

Decision (Apr. 2010): Accept for further study. Attempt to find a use case that demonstrates how multiple and repeatable Item Ids and Bibliographic Ids might be used. However, through additional discussion, this decision was changed to “accept without modification.”

Bodfish explained that, at least initially and with respect to both changes, the context should be understood to mean a transaction on a single item identified by any of the ids supplied in the elements that have now been made repeatable. This distinction should be captured in the Standard, possibly in the Data Dictionary (Section 6) and/or in Section 5. As it stands, the response message is able to supply only a single Request Id (or Item Id in the case of Accept Item).

It was noted that the new version (deemed 2.01) is backwards compatible with the original Version 2 (2.0) with respect to an initiator at Version 2. However, an initiator at Version 2.01 cannot communicate with a responder at Version 2.0. This should be clarified in the version notes in the Standard.
Future Version 2.x Changes

Performing Item Lookups Using Bibliographic Id

Bodfish described a scenario where another future change may be necessary. The eXtensible Catalog (XC) is developing a discovery interface, a replacement for ILS-specific OPACs to augment and extend functionality. The basic process is to extract bibliographic information from the ILS, index it, and, using Drupal, build a patron interface. The next step is to add empowerment features for the patrons - the ability to place holds, check out, etc. NCIP becomes more relevant in this final stage. What they've extracted from the ILS are bibliographic records, and what they are displaying to the patrons is bibliographic information. Their are additional data that could be displayed in the form of metadata about each item. However, NCIP does not permit lookups by bibliographic id. If that were added, we would have to address the issue of a response including multiple items rather than only a single entity since a bibliographic id may not represent a unique holding. XC added a custom message to address this in their Version 1 implementation. In Version 2, they can use an extension. They have drafted a proposal to put a bibliographic id in a lookup item request and allow the response to include a set of items.

Walsh said on the surface it would not seem to introduce too many issues, at least in a lookup. Bodfish noted, though, that some requests might generate many items and the size of the response might be unwieldy. O'Brien showed how the hypothetical change would not be technically complex in the schema. Gray suggested that it might be best if it were implemented with a new message because it could be implemented in the most appropriate way without any preconceived restrictions. Wanner asked if there is a need to expand the Standard this significantly, or if this is an isolated change where we could live with fitting it into the existing structure. Bodfish indicated that the big issue is the repetition of the bibliographic information that would be expected to be the same for each item in the set.

Another approach might be to make the subelements within NCIPMessage repeatable. That still may not address the problem of repeating the bibliographic data in each message. It may work in some contexts to assume that all members of the set share the same data, but in other contexts, it would be impossible to determine which are meant to be shared and which simply do not have bibliographic data.

O'Brien suggested that new messages give us more opportunity to properly express the intent and the semantics for the exchange.

Walsh asked if the discussion would be different if we considered what happens if we expand the scope to include transaction oriented messages rather than just lookup messages. He said he might be willing to support simply changing the current structure if we limit the scope to only meeting immediate needs. However, if we consider the impact of potential future needs, we might be better served by adding new messages.
O’Brien expressed concern over adding new messages since we have spent much time and energy trying to simplify. Wanner, however, indicated that clarity in the resulting messages should be considered.

Campbell asked why the Ext element is not appropriate to this change. O’Brien indicated that it would be, but that we should consider how useful Ext implementations can be later incorporated into the Standard.

Gray said he thinks looking up an item by bibliographic id is conceptually different than lookup up an item by item id. A lookup by bibliographic id should carry a bibliographic payload, not an item payload. Bodfish agreed, noting that a Lookup Item Response that could be used for either type of request might become very confusing.

Bodfish added that, while this request comes from XC, it is fairly common among those working with ILS discovery products. He agreed to take the XC proposal and attempt to produce a schema structure to support it. His approach is likely to center around adding a new message. He invited others who may prefer making Lookup Item Response repeatable or overloading Lookup Item Response to handle both single and multiple items to draft their own proposals.

**Identifying Deprecated Services**

Wanner said that she would like to undertake a project to review existing services in an attempt to determine if any are unused and could be deprecated. O’Brien suggested that we could do this here by going very quickly through the list to see if any are consensus targets for elimination. Campbell suggested that she could add a survey page to the Implementer Registry to allow implementers to provide feedback about each message: Important, Not Important, etc.

The group quickly reviewed each service and identified the following candidates for deprecation:

- Agency Created
- Agency Updated
- Circulation Status Change Reported
- Circulation Status Updated
- Create Agency
- Item Created
- Item Recall Canceled
- Item Recalled
- Item Request Updated
- Report Circulation Status Change
- Send User Notice
- Update Agency
- Update Circulation Status
The group acknowledged that the results of this impromptu survey are non-binding and simply represent a “gut-feel” about which services may no longer be useful. Wanner agreed to draft a proposal to deprecate these (or a subset of these) services.

Provide Displayable Text for Enumerate Types

Bodfish described another item of interest for the XC. They would like to be able to display the ILS-specific wording for enumerated types such as circulation status.

Break Out Groups to Review Changes Made to Section 5

The group split into small groups to review the changes made to Section 5 of Part 1 to ensure they agree with the schema. It then reviewed as a large group the various findings. The group noted a discrepancy in Update Request Item Response where Required Item User Restriction Type is missing (as compared to Request Item and Renew Item). It was decided this was an oversight and should be corrected. O’Brien made the change to the schema.

The group also reviewed Request Scope Type as being optional in Cancel Request Item. The thought was that it was required in Update Request Item; however, it appears that it is not required there. Therefore, no change is necessary.

Some discussion was held around using alphabetical or schema order for the subelements listed in each message described in Section 5. The group agreed to add a sentence to 5.2 to explain that the table is in alphabetical order and serves as an index to the rest of Section 5, but that the data elements listed in each message are in schema order.

The other minor typographical errors were reported to Walsh, and he agreed to make the appropriate corrections to the document.
Continuous Maintenance Procedures Changes

Wanner asked if anyone felt a need to propose any changes to our Continuous Maintenance procedures. Walsh reported that the delays that caused us to miss the initial revision deadline after the April 2010 meeting were largely logistical and due to insufficient infrastructure. He indicated that he is now comfortable with the timelines associated with each revision and feels confident that we will be able to publish future revisions in accordance with the procedures.

Wanner asked if anyone has concerns about the twice-per-year revision schedule. Various views were presented. On the one hand, it may be burdensome on responders and customers. On the other, it provides the ability to respond to needs identified in the community. No one expressed a strong opinion, and the group decided to retain the ability to release twice-per-year.

Wanner indicated a need to have a designated back up for schema changes. Stewart volunteered to serve as O'Brien’s back up.

Thursday, September 9, 2010

Overview of NCIP Forum (WebEx - Presented by John Barr, Polaris Library Systems)

Barr provided a demonstration of the NCIP forum (available at http://ncipnow.com). He explained that the site is very configurable, and we expect to see things change as we get feedback from the group about what is and would be useful. People may join the forum, but it is possible to view the content without being a member. Barr showed how one might start a discussion topic and post messages to the forum, and he demonstrated other features and functions available within the forum. Currently, registration is moderated and requires approval of the forum administrators (Barr and Dhaval Kotecha). However, Barr feels this may be temporary. The group discussed this topic and views on both sides were presented. Mak said that it should be open to encourage participation. O'Brien cautioned that this might be overly trusting. If the forum gets the attention of some sort of automated bot, it may wreak enough havoc to force a fairly large clean up effort. However, he indicated that even unmoderated registration should help, and we might further limit unmoderated participation to a single forum. Bodfish said that we likely will not have sufficient information at registration to know whether a user should be banned. More likely, we would discover only later that a user's behavior warrants moderation or deactivation. Therefore, it would be better to allow people to register and post immediately (without specific activation) rather than force them to register and wait for activation, possibly losing the incentive to post. Barr agreed to change the registration policy so that new users do not have to be activated by an administrator.
O’Brien indicated that it might be beneficial to have some sub-forums accessible to anyone and others available only to certain users (members of the NCIP Standing Committee, for example). Barr agreed to create an Implementers Lounge forum that only members of the NCIP Standing Committee can join. O’Brien expressed a preference that the private forum should not even be visible to those who cannot post to it.

Wanner said that a link to the forum should be added to the NCIP website. Walsh agreed to add the link. Wetzel asked if the forum has links to the NCIP and the NISO websites. Barr indicated that those links are available in the “About this forum” forum. O’Brien added that useful posts (like the one with the links) can be “pinned” and locked so that they cannot be changed and they remain at the top of the forum in which they exist.

**NCIP Implementer Registry**

Campbell demonstrated the NCIP Implementer Registry she has been building in Drupal ([http://ncip.dev3.webenabled.net](http://ncip.dev3.webenabled.net)). (See Appendix A for a copy of the handout she provided.) She showed how a user can search the site to determine what vendors support which NCIP messages and data elements. Most of the data in the site is fictitious at the moment (using names from mythology to make them easy to identify and remove later). She explained, too, how a user can download the data from the site’s database as an Excel spreadsheet. NCIP Implementers are able to create an account that will permit them to provide information about the use of NCIP in their products. An account manager (TBD but likely to be Wanner as the Chair or Walsh as the Maintenance Agency) will be responsible for approving and activating the account once the various information in the request is verified.

The group was overwhelmed with the work Campbell has done. Campbell acknowledged the assistance she received from Jackson and Wanner.

Wetzel asked for a timeline for moving the site from BETA to live. Walsh indicated that there are some technical issues that need to be resolved in order to migrate from the current hosting provider to the Maintenance Agency’s Drupal site. However, the responsibility for administering the site could be transferred earlier if the site can remain hosted with the current provider for now. The group agreed to aim for the end of October for bringing the site “on-line.” Group members agreed to send their company and product information to Campbell directly, and she will enter the information into the site.
Next In Person Meeting

The group reviewed various dates in April 2010. Easter and Passover are the week of April 19-25. Computers in Libraries is March 21-23. The week of April 18 (with a meeting to be held April 20-21) seemed to be open for everyone. The group agreed tentatively to schedule a meeting for April 20-21 with a full day scheduled for Wednesday and a short day on Thursday (ending around 3 pm). NISO offered to host in Baltimore, and Relais International offered to host in Ottawa. Wanner agreed to add an agenda item for the next call to discuss again and make a decision.

2011 Call Schedule

Wanner asked if the group wants to retain the current call schedule. Presently, a monthly call is held the third Thursday of each month at 1 pm Eastern. No one expressed any objections. The group agreed that there is no need to hold the scheduled call on September 16. Wanner agreed to send a note to the list announcing that the call is cancelled. The next call will be October 21, 2010.

NCIP as a RESTful Web Service

Wanner asked the group to review Stewart’s draft of a statement on whether NCIP is RESTful. (See Appendix B for a copy of the email sent by Stewart on May 10, 2010.) Bodfish expressed a concern over bullet point #4 (“Resources are accessed with a generic interface (e.g. HTTP, POST, GET”) and explained that NCIP uses POST. However, “good form” for HTTP and REST suggests that a message should be sent via an HTTP GET unless it performs some sort of update. For example, the Lookup Services should use GET since they do not cause any updates in the responding systems.

Bodfish asked why this group feels the need to claim that NCIP is RESTful. Stewart indicated that the motivation is to make NCIP more accessible to some implementers, specifically the ILS-DI group. Bodfish added that some in the ILS-DI might challenge the claim that NCIP is RESTful, even with the provided justification, on the basis of a strict definition of REST.

Wanner asked if we continue to see value in having a statement like this. If so, she asked whether it should it be revised to minimize objections to it. Wanner suggested that we might post this topic to the forum to generate some discussion. Gray asked if the XC was relying on NCIP as a RESTful web service to obtain a grant. Bodfish explained that others in the ILS-DI, not just the XC, were interested in a RESTful web service (which would not be NCIP). However, in subsequent discussions, the group agreed to use some of the NCIP work from the XC for its purposes, and the “requirement” that the web service be RESTful became less significant. Therefore, it would seem that there is no longer a need to convince the ILS-DI that NCIP is RESTful.
Walsh asked what those in the ILS-DI who preferred REST were after in terms of benefits. Bodfish explained that the motivation was two-fold. First, many in the group are familiar with RESTful web services. Second, some wanted a simpler query syntax that did not involve parsing large XML data streams. Walsh added that the interest, then, was more in simplification than in REST itself. An NCIP that allowed for the XML payload to exist in a URI would be RESTful since it could be passed via HTTP GET, but it would not necessarily accomplish the objectives. Also, NCIP could be easily implemented as a RESTful web service where the service name and various data elements were expressed as URI attribute/value pairs. This would accomplish the group’s goals, but it would bifurcate the universe of implementations into those that use the traditional XML and those that use a simpler URI format.

Bodfish and O’Brien suggested that a statement similar to: “Like RESTful web services, NCIP shares the following characteristics” and list those from Stewart’s email except #4. O’Brien further suggested that it could be voiced more aggressively by indicating that, while NCIP uses POST rather than GET, the Standard makes no presumption about whether the responding application generates side-effects (like logging or statistics gathering). Bodfish disagreed stating that REST implies that various objects need to be accessible via GET, and that the issue is not limited to whether side-effects are generated.

Bodfish volunteered to revise the statement to make it more appropriate, and Stewart and O’Brien agreed to review Bodfish’s draft. He plans to have something for the group to review by the October 21 conference call. He further agreed to involve people from the ILS-DI and/or the XC in order to ensure we meet their needs. Gray asked if there is still a need to make this statement. Various members of the group indicated that they see value in making the statement even if the ILS-DI and the XC are no longer concerned.

**Break-Out Group Work on Documentation**

The groups broke into two small working groups and reviewed draft documents on NCIP Core Messages and the RFP Writer’s Guide. Both groups had many comments, so Wanner decided that each should send the comments to her to incorporate into the documents.

**Review Action Items**

The group reviewed the action items from the meeting. (See Appendix C.)
Adjourn

Wanner thanked Dicus and Ex Libris for hosting, thanked the group for attending, and adjourned the meeting.
Appendix A - NCIP Implementer Registry Handout

This document gives an overview of the NCIP Implementer Registry site currently at http://ncip.dev3.webenabled.net.

The first section covers what unauthenticated users can see and do on the site. This would include libraries who want to know more about NCIP and its implementations. On pages 3-5 is a description of the experience an unauthenticated user would have when requesting an account and the actions to be taken by either the maintenance agency or the chair of the implementers group.

The second section shows what authenticated users can see and do on the site. It includes information about the vendor profile and the forms to enter information about an NCIP implementation.

Unauthenticated users

Unauthenticated users can see all completed forms, vendor profiles and download the spreadsheets. They can also see the full text of the items on the front page (see full texts below). Unauthenticated users also have the opportunity to “Create a new account.”

About the NCIP Implementer Registry (visible on the home page to guests and authenticated users)

This site collects information about vendors’ implementations of the NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol (NCIP). Vendors enter information here about their implementations of Version 1 of the standard, now deprecated but still widely used, and Version 2 of the standard, the current version of the standard adopted in 2008. There is no independent verification of the information entered here. Vendors may participate in the standard as an initiator of messages, a responder to messages or both. The protocol currently supports two services, Resource Sharing and Self-Service.

Responses to all data elements for Core Messages

Information entered about an implementation is accessible by selecting the appropriate version from the menu links on the "Completed Forms by Version and Role" tab. Select the "Support for
"..." link to see the vendor's data element responses to the Nine Core Messages for that implementation. On the pages accessible from this tab, there is also a link to the Vendor Profile which gives more information about the vendor and the implementation of NCIP.

Support for Required Messages
Information about the support for Required Messages (all required messages must be implemented for compliance with the core messages) is available on the "Support for Required Messages" tab. There the results can be limited by service, Resource Sharing or Self-Service, and/or by Vendor(s). Information about all vendors' support for required messages is available by selecting the "Spreadsheets for Required Messages" tab and downloading the Microsoft Office Excel 97-2003 spreadsheet.

Core Messages

The 9 Core Messages for Resource Sharing are:

1. Lookup User
2. Lookup Item
3. Check Out Item
4. Check In Item
5. Renew Item
6. Request Item
7. Cancel Request Item
8. Accept Item
9. Recall Item

The 9 Core Messages for Self Service are:

- Lookup User
- Lookup Item
- Check Out Item
- Check In Item
- Renew Item
- Undo Check Out Item
- Create User Fiscal Transaction
- Update User
- Create User

Required messages are first and are labeled in all capital letters. Not supporting a required message means the service is not supported and, therefore, the core message set is not supported.

An (R) indicates repeatable messages. The absence of this notation indicates that the message is not repeatable.
Conditionally required messages are enclosed in braces {}.

**Core Message Sets**

Compliance with the NCIP Protocol (Z39.83) has evolved to mean that a vendor could send or respond to one message.

However, in 2010 the NCIP Implementers Group defined two sets of core messages for accomplishing essential tasks. One set of core messages, The Resource Sharing Core, consists of the messages to accomplish basic resource sharing tasks. The other set of core messages, The Self-Service Core, consists of the messages to accomplish basic self service tasks. All required messages must be enabled for a vendor to claim support for a core message set. Depending on the role the vendor is playing in the transaction, the vendor must either support the messages as an initiator or responder.

NCIP 1.0 and NCIP 1.1 (Z39.83) are deprecated standards. NCIP 2.0 (Z39.83-1-2008) is not backwardly compatible. The current standard is NCIP 2.0 (Z39.83-1-2008). Many vendors currently support NCIP Version 1.x and support for Version 2 is growing, with several systems expected to be available in 2010.

When writing an Request for Proposal (RFP) ask the vendor for information about which role, core message set and version are supported (rather than asking if a vendor is compliant with NCIP or Z39.83).

**Create a new account**

If a user clicks on the Create a new account, they will see this text:

This site contains information about implementations of the NCIP protocol. The information is provided by the implementers of this protocol.

If you have an implementation of NCIP and would like to share information about that product or service on this site, please submit an account request.

After you submit this form, your information will be verified and, if appropriate, an account will be created for your use. Thank you for your understanding and patience.
They will also be asked for the name of their company and the products they have that use NCIP. No account will be created without action by either the maintenance agency or the NCIP-IG Chair.

1. Upon applying for an account, the user receives this message on the screen:

   Thank you for applying for an account. Your account is currently pending approval by the site administrator.

   In the meantime, a welcome message with further instructions has been sent to your e-mail address.

2. And receives an email with the following text:

   Xxxx Xxxxx,

   Thank you for registering at BETA - NCIP Implementer Registry. Your application for an account is currently pending approval.

   Once your account has been approved and the Vendor Name and products added to the database, you will receive another e-mail containing information about how to log in, set your password, and other details. Remember to create your Vendor Profile when completing the registration process.

   -- BETA - NCIP Implementer Registry Maintenance Agency

3. The administrator, or maintenance agency or NCIP-IG chair receive notification that a request to create a new account has been made:

   Account details for Beth Dawkins at BETA - NCIP Implementer Registry (pending admin approval)
   scampbell@cclaflorida.org
   To: Susan Campbell

   Beth Dawkins has applied for an account.
   http://ncip.dev1.webenabled.net/user/42/edit
4. Following the link in the email, they can see the Create New Account fields and, if appropriate, add the vendor name and product names to the appropriate taxonomies. They will also assign the new user a role, probably NCIP Implementer, and change the account from “Blocked” to “Active”.

This is what the Maintenance Agency or IG chair will see after clicking on the link in #3 and logging in. They can will the account from blocked to active, click on the Create New Account Fields to see the vendor name and product names to add to the taxonomies.

When the user is changed to active, the user receives an email that says:

Beth Dawkins,

Your account at BETA - NCIP Implementer Registry has been activated.

You may now log in by clicking on this link or copying and pasting it in your browser:

http://ncip.dev3.webenabled.net/user/reset/42/1283521526/67f4a74629836aaaaa18472bc2489e6

This is a one-time login, so it can be used only once.

After logging in, you will be redirected to http://ncip.dev3.webenabled.net/user/42/edit so you can change your password.

Once you have set your own password, you will be able to log in to http://ncip.dev3.webenabled.net/user in the future using:

username: Beth Dawkins

Remember to create your Vendor Profile when completing the registration process.
Authenticated Users

Authenticated users can do everything unauthenticated users can do (except request Create an account) and more. The login name displays for authenticated users and they have the option to access their account (location for the Vendor Profile, password updates, etc.) create content and complete the Implementer Registry Forms. They can also see the full text of the items on the front page, including another text, Information about this SITE for NCIP Implementers (see full text below).

Information about this Site for NCIP Implementers (visible on home page for authenticate users)

NCIP is a complex standard. It has had complex implementation. This means that the forms on this site are also complex. The information entered in the forms will be used and reused to present information about the implementation of the standard.

To enter information about an NCIP Implementation on this site and have it display effectively, please follow these steps:

1. If instructions are given at the top of a form, please read them carefully. Here, please read all of these instructions. (Click Read More, please)
2. When completing a form, please note the name of the fields. Names were chosen to help indicate what information is expected. Obviously, it makes a great deal of difference if the form is expecting information about a Responder product or an Initiator product in a particular field.
3. There may be help text under the form field. Please read the help text when it is available.
4. A Vendor Profile should be completed. Failure to complete the Vendor Profile will mean missing information in some of the results, i.e. no product, contact, implementation information on some displays. Completing the Vendor Profile will populate these fields on all displays, but not in the form results. The form results, look like a display, and are reused, but they do not contain information from the Vendor Profile.
5. The Vendor Name, Implementation Name and Implementation Description are used in generating the title of the form. You may leave the Implementation Name and Implementation Description blank if you do not have relevant information for those fields. Do not skip the Vendor Name field on the form.
6. Any content a user enters can be edited by that user. Review the results after you have submitted a form. If an error is found, simply click edit, edit the form and resubmit.

In addition to the Vendor Profile, there are four forms about support for NCIP messages that provide the content for this site.

1. Version 1 (deprecated) Initiator Form
2. Version 1 (deprecated) Responder Form
3. Version 2 Initiator Form
4. Version 2 Responder Form

Select the appropriate form for the service to be described from above or from the left menu block Implementer Registry Forms or from the Create Content link in the first menu block. You will be presented with instructions and the nine core messages or services. The first five messages are common to both Resource Sharing and Self-Service. After these five messages, select either Resource Sharing messages or the Self-Service messages. The appropriate four messages for the selected service will follow. ALL messages require a response. If you skip a message, the form cannot be submitted. (It will respond with a list of the skipped messages.)

On the form page, where it says, “Choose Resource Sharing or Self-Service to Continue” click on the service name to open the appropriate box with the data elements for that service.

Remember, any content a user enters, can be edited by that user. Review the results after you have submitted a form. If an error is found or you wish to change something, click edit, edit the form and resubmit.
Vendor Profile and Account Information

The Vendor Profile and Account Information are available by clicking on “My account”. There are two parts. On the Account page you may add your email address, change your password or location settings.

On the Vendor Profile page you will complete information about your company and about your implementation of NCIP. If a field is required, it will be marked with an asterisk, e.g. Primary Contact information is required, and Secondary Contact is not. Pay attention to the help text located below the selection or text boxes.

The information in the vendor profile is used in the pages accessed from the menus.
This is the section of the Vendor Profile that deals with products and implementations with other companies.

The labels and instructions below the fields indicate which version of NCIP is being asked about and whether the answer should be about your company's product or about the partner implementation.

All of the questions about version 2 are optional.

These answers are used in these responses are used in the pages accessed from the menus.
The Registry Forms

The Registry forms can be accessed from either the Create Content link in the user navigation box, or by selecting a form from the menu implementer Registry Forms.

A completed form will appear on the menu links for “Completed Forms for Version and Role.”

Information for Vendor Name (a required field) and Implementation Name and Implementation Description (optional fields) will be added to the title along with Version and Role.

Help text appears below the item.

The five messages on the Registry form apply to Resource Sharing and Self Service and are in a group. By clicking on an item in the group, e.g. Lookup User, the data elements are visible. Each message is marked with a small red asterisk. A response is required for each message. Messages noted as REQUIRED in the standard. Messages marked required are displayed in the menu "Support for Required Messages" and on the spreadsheets.

Choosing Resource Sharing or Self Service will give access to the appropriate four messages for that group item.
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It was great to see everyone in Syracuse last week. During the meeting I was tasked with researching the requirements for RESTful web services and if NCIP meets the requirements.

First of all the basic structure of NCIP consists of sending an XML message via http or https and receiving an XML response which makes NCIP a web service. In order to call NCIP a RESTful web service we need to look at the basic requirements.

1. REST is an architectural style, not a standard.
2. A RESTful web service must be completely stateless.
3. Should be based on a Client-Server architecture with a pull-based interaction style.
4. Resources are accessed with a generic interface (e.g. HTTP, POST, GET)
5. The service producers and consumers must agree on a schema that describes the data being exchanged.
6. There should be documentation describing how to process the data meaningfully.

The original definition of RESTful web services was based on the idea of a simple URL where something like www.niso.org/RESTful/patrons could be used to ask for an XML response listing all patrons. This being said the concept of web services has evolved over the past decade and I believe NCIP meets the basic requirements for RESTful web service status. I would like to suggest an agenda item for the next meeting to discuss the possibility of adding text to the NCIP standard indicating that NCIP messages are exchanged using RESTful web services.

I would appreciate comments from those more familiar with RESTful web services.

Kevin

Kevin G Stewart
Chief Technology Officer

kevin.stewart@relais-intl.com
Phone: 613-226-5571 x241 Toll Free (NA): 888-294-5244 x241
Skype: relais.kevin
http://www.relais-intl.com
### Appendix C - Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposal to add a message similar to Lookup Item that accepts and returns information relating to more than one item, probably keyed on Bibliographic Id</td>
<td>Bodfish</td>
<td>Before spring deadline for change requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove activation requirement on new user registrations to the NCIP forum</td>
<td>Barr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an Implementers Only sub-forum to the NCIP forum and make it visible only to those who are allowed to access it</td>
<td>Barr, O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a link from the NCIP website to the NCIP forum</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a link from the NISO website to the NCIP forum</td>
<td>Wetzel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition the NCIP Implementers Registry from BETA to live</td>
<td>Campbell, Walsh</td>
<td>End of October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send company and product information about implementations to Campbell</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>End of September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add discussion item to agenda for October conference call to decide on site for spring meeting</td>
<td>Wanner</td>
<td>October 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post to the NCIP general interest list that September 16 conference call is canceled</td>
<td>Wanner</td>
<td>Done (after the meeting but before Minutes were published)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the statement showing how NCIP is similar to REST</td>
<td>Bodfish, Stewart, O'Brien</td>
<td>October 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft proposal to mark certain NCIP services as deprecated based on the results of our internal straw poll</td>
<td>Wanner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published the 2.01 schema to the NCIP Standing Committee</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send working group comments on NCIP Core Messages draft documents to</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send working group comments on RFP Guide draft document to Wanner</td>
<td>Leckbee</td>
<td>Done (after the meeting but before Minutes were published)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate working group feedback into NCIP Core Messages and RFP</td>
<td>Wanner</td>
<td>October 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide drafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>