Library Management & Bibliographic Data Services Advisory Group

28th March 2017

12:00 – 16:00, Jisc, Meeting Room 2, Brettenham House, London

Papers

A: Terms of Reference
B: FOLIO overview

Attendees

Ann Rossiter	AR
Anna Franca	AF
Christine Wise	CW
David Prosser	DP
David Summers	DS
Joy Palmer	JP
Liam Earney	LE
Mark Hughes	MH
Mark Toole (Chair)	MT
Neil Grindley	NG
Neil Wilson	NWi
Nick Woolley	NWo
Richard Parsons	RP
Ross MacIntyre	RM
Siobhán Burke	SB

Apologies

Anne Horn
Fiona Parsons
John Tuck
Paola Marchionni

Actions

1. SB to produce a report on the status of the Sero recommendations
2. SB to adjust the ToR as detailed in item 2.
3. SB to ensure missing ToR sections are added.
4. RM to respond to Ebsco regarding FOLIO board membership.
5. SB to add a prioritisation item to the agenda for the next meeting.
6. SB to arrange the next meeting in September.

Agenda/Notes

Item	Activity
1	**Introductions** Attendees introduced themselves, their role and institution.
2	**Why is Jisc establishing this group?** – Are Terms of Reference right? (Paper A) The Terms of Reference were discussed in detail including a request for a report on how each of the recommendations from the Sero report have been taken forward, or not, ahead of the next meeting. ACTION: SB to produce a report on the status of the Sero recommendations Each of the core aims were either approved or edits were suggested as follows: 1. Approved; but discussion about the need to maintain the group as strategic. As LE pointed out, this was the first time that Jisc has had a group with such a wide brief. NWo was keen to understand the touch points with other parts of Jisc e.g. Scholarly Communications. 2. Include a reference to HE for now when referring to 'the sector'. 3. Approved 4. Approved 5. Approved 6. Change 'vendors' to 'providers'; add 'maintain' so 'to help foster and maintain constructive relationships…'

Item	Activity
	7. Approved
	8. Change 'Jisc's services' to 'Jisc's systems and services'
	9. Approved
	ACTION: SB to adjust the ToR as detailed above.
	There was a question over governance and how other Jisc groups relate. E.g. the Jisc Collections Content Strategy Group (JCCSG). LE explained that this group would report back to the Digital Resources Leadership Team and influence operations. LE also envisaged issues being raised at JCCSG meetings but then handled by this group. RP suggested that a diagram would be helpful.
	Other points included:
	• RP is representing SCURL not SHEDL.
	• Missing sections of the ToR to be added. ACTION: SB to ensure missing ToR sections are added.
	• CW asked if a statement about the responsibility of members could be included, for example, declarations of interest. CW informed the group that she had to declare an interest in FOLIO as a member of the FOLIO product council.
	• DP asked for clarity of communications – what could be shared? MT suggested that everyone be open unless otherwise stated or agreed. Minutes could be redacted so any draft to be offered with that option, when required.
3	**Current status of Jisc activity (short & medium term plans)**
	The following presentations were delivered from Jisc:
	• UK / National Digital Library – JP
	• Library Transformation – SB
	• Jisc Collections – LE
	• NBK – NG
	o DS queried the incentive for OCLC with regard to the partnership with Jisc for the NBK service. NG/JP suggested that payment was an element but the main incentive for OCLC was getting a foothold in the UK market.
	o AR asked what risks were identified as part of the NBK project. NG presented the risks as detailed in the Jisc business case.

Item	Activity
	There was a lengthy discussion around the wider role of libraries and Jisc's part in that amongst the group. Common themes emerging were the need for a vision/roadmap/timeline of Jisc's plans for the future and also how it could be used to help libraries makes the case for Jisc. This would need to be strategic and therefore touch on other relevant areas such as open access/scholarly communication; research data as well as ensuring that Jisc is not missing opportunities in any areas. Any strategic direction should also be dictated by the community and their representative bodies, but that this group can help with prioritising those community demands. *Detailed comments are captured below.* DP commented on JP's presentation where the graphic shows the 3 inter-related areas in libraries as he felt there was too much emphasis on the financial whereas OA services appear to be 'compartmentalised out'. NWo also commented that the presentation talked about business processes, but we need to talk about outcomes in supporting scholarship; digital scholarship is missing. Need to explain better how Jisc is helping libraries to achieve their goals to support scholarship. AR suggested that advocacy needs to be done by the community, as a community, and it shouldn't be Jisc doing this alone. NWo pointed out that what Jisc presents as its portfolio will influence perception of libraries. MT – need to join the narrative around libraries from SCONUL, RLUK and Jisc. Though different sets of stories/perspectives required for different VCs. DS – show the powers that be 'what we can do'. AR – show not tell. Also we need to NOT present a narrow view, so don't exclude OA and other areas. JP – Jisc needs to tie itself to broader strategy aims and how it's helping to achieve them. DP suggests diagrams that present the services as part of a coherent whole would be useful. NG is struck by the confidence of libraries at conferences. Has seen many presentations on library space, which is no longer just a place to store physical assets. Though recognises that advocacy is still key and asks how Jisc can help with that. RP suggests that libraries are confident in the students coming into their space, but less confident on their view of resources and the threat of the internet. AR suggests that in the post-truth world, this is an important role for libraries and a selling point. NWo – bring in Learning Analytics. MH commented that SCONUL and libraries should own the advocacy space and give steer to Jisc. Also there should be a commonality of language. AF said this had to be about impact, but it was different at different institutions. The national digital library (NDL) is a template, but suggests parking this for now. CW thinks the NDL could be revisited in 6 – 12 months as the NBK will have started to address these questions. AR spoke of a project already underway to

Item	Activity
	develop as much as possible in the 'above campus' space – 'a super highway to the future'. NG – trust and collaboration, but trust in the data and it will take time for the NBK to influence the data landscape. JP alluded to a 'spectrum of trust' in the data so it won't have fully reliable data from the outset. MT suggests that authority is a better word than trust. MT also realises that with a long-term project like this, it can be hard to keep enthusiastic and need short-term wins. The group can help with that. JP suggests the need for a roadmap and timeline to also show innovation.
	LE talked about a meeting with ExLibris, where MT was also present, and also the KB+ team, ExLibris customers & Jane Burke from ProQuest/ExLibris. The meeting discussed how the data from KB+ is handled but that errors were creeping in. MT said that mechanisms for notifying will be put in place as well as KPIs around the data on both sides. All parties agreed to meet in 3 months. Jane Burke is keen to partner and work together as ExLibris/ProQuest/Jisc in the KB+ area.
	DP asks how important is good data from publishers – would libraries walk away from a deal over this? MT responded in the negative. However, NWi spoke of a growing international pressure amongst publishers, as better quality metadata can equal value in selling more units (Berlin Book Fair). DP/MT spoke of the knock on costs involved – we're all paying, including ExLibris. LE mentioned that CrossRef 2020 is also looking at metadata.
4	**Developments in the wider environment** – FOLIO and the future direction toward open / closed systems – Other LE presented a brief FOLIO overview and an update following the meeting held between FOLIO and Jisc. CW explained her connection in more detail. SOAS, CW's institution, is an early adopter of the Kuali/OLE LMS system as well as a member of the Kuali Foundation. The nature of the relationship is a collaborative one; where the product is shaped by special interest groups made up of practitioners not just librarians. CW expects more development by the next meeting. MH & NWo need to know more about the governance. RP commented that if it can be remain open source, as KB+ has, then Jisc should embrace it. MT suggests that Jisc can influence it and input a UK focus. AR suggests it would be helpful to have a transparent pricing model. MH mentioned that Ebsco have had a history of funding Open Source initiatives. There could be value in working with them. However, NWo asked how this initiative would support libraries in moving away from the 'walled garden' approach and also whether Jisc has 'spec-ed' what a modern day ILS should look

Item	Activity
	like? RM asked if Jisc should volunteer a board member and the response from all was yes but proceed with caution. ACTION: RM to respond to Ebsco regarding FOLIO board membership. LE again reiterated that we would need to see / know the governance. NWo suggests that we also need to horizon scan to see what else might be out there.
5	**Potential sector / Jisc responses** It was agreed by the group that this item was sufficiently covered in item 3 & 4 above.
6	**Areas of potential future activities for the Advisory Group** MT asked if the discussion had scoped the potential activities sufficiently. NWo – good session today but need to know more; suggest use of a controlled vocabulary; and understand the remit of the group and any sub-groups. The response from Jisc was that this group would not focus on any single service. AR is aware that the community is demanding and that this group could/should influence/determine prioritisation. JP/RM acknowledged that community demand is and has to be present for any Jisc business case. MT asked that prioritisation is added as an agenda item for the next meeting. ACTION: SB to add a prioritisation item to the agenda for the next meeting. MT also suggested that Jisc didn't have to wait for a meeting to ask for input or evidence. JP said that there could be timely requests to the group. NWo asked that updates would be required in order to feel informed enough to make decisions, as there are initiatives happening outside the traditional space e.g. Google books. RP suggested a diagram showing what services the group covers would be useful. JP Research data would be an area to include but in the longer term. MT perhaps a touch point of the group with the relevant Research data group. NWo suggested the need for a 'higher altitude' map to ensure that we're not missing anything.