

Policies Directory Conference Call
December 18, 2001
Updated with Comments January 24, 2002

Attendees:

Russ Fenn	Atlas
Roz Leiderman	NLM
Mark Needleman	Sirsi
Joe Zeeman	TLC/CARL
Ed Davidson	FDI
Mary Jackson	ARL
Kerry Blinco	LIDDAS
John Bodfish	epixtech
Barb Shuh	NLC-BNC

OCLC:

Mark Tullos	Sue DeTillio
Collette Mak	Craig Wright
Don Bohn	Jim McDonald
David Ungar	Pat Stevens

Purpose: This conference call was held as a follow up to the December IPIG meeting. Numerous open issues remain that OCLC needs decisions on in order to implement the Policies Directory. This conference call was an attempt to resolve the open issues.

1. Introductions by all attendees.
2. LDAP vs. X.500
 - a. What version of LDAP: *Mark Needleman:* Version 3 is the latest
 - b. There are security issues with LDAP:
 - i. X509 protocol was brought up as a potential way to help the security issues
 - ii. What should be secure? Authentication/Authorization needs to be secure
 - iii. Look at RFC 3112 and RFC 2259
 - iv. Use of certificates was discussed. *John Bodfish* wants certificates to be used on searches, updates, etc.
 - v. *Mary Jackson* wants to make sure that everyone can view the data
 - vi. *Jim McDonald* brought up the use of LDIF. LDIF is the LDAP Data Interchange Format (RFC 2849 - <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2849.txt>). One possible method of updating is to send OCLC a file with LDIF data.

- vii. *Don Bohn* raised a concern about the administrative overhead of certificates.
- viii. *Kerry Blinco* described the Australian PRIDE Project. It uses user name/password authentication over Secure Socket Layer (SSL). They had the choice to use certificates but did not. The Web application does the updates. Uses LDAP over x.500 database.
- ix. *John Bodfish* liked the idea of doing batch updates of the data by the application
- x. The group reached consensus that security is needed from LDAP.
- xi. *Joe Zeeman* pointed out that searching is “free” but updating is not.
- xii. There does NOT seem to be a requirement to make the updating to the OCLC database real-time. It could be a delayed process. *Mary J.* pointed out that overnight updating would be acceptable.
- xiii. There could be anonymous access via LDAP and updating via LDIF that is not anonymous.
- xiv. Investigation into SASL (simple authentication and security layer) is needed.

NOTE: The following questions refer to field names in the IPIG: Directory Services for Interlibrary Loan – Information Model Diagrams version 0.2. Working Draft as of 2 December 2001

3. The use of Referral was discussed
 - a. Referral is needed on both the server and client side
 - b. *Mary J.* pointed out the Referral is critical in LDAP.
 - c. Referral is automatically supported in X.500 and therefore not an issue in that implementation.
 - d. *Kerry* pointed out that one can associate LDAP with X.500.
 - e. *Collette M.* mentioned that in the beginning of the public use of the directory, there would not be data to refer. She suggested that Referral capability could be added at a later date. This was a problem for the conference call attendees who would like to see Referral available on day 1.
 - f. *Don B.* asked which site would have data to refer: NLC, NII, National Library of Australia and others.
 - g. It is important that everyone use the same schema.
 - h. *Kerry B.* mentioned early 2002 for Australia to have system ready.
 - i. *Joe Z.* stated that Australia libraries are also OCLC libraries. Therefore the problem of maintaining data in two places is an early concern.
 - j. *Don B.* asked *Kerry B.* if there is a tree/schema available? *Kerry* has one but changes are needed and she will send to OCLC as soon as it is updated.

4. ILL Processing Unit – UnitStatus Field
 - a. values are “inactive” and “Active”. Service suspensions are to be used for floods and other situations when the ILL unit expects to reopen at some point in the future.
 - b. *John B.* an Inactive unit can become active.
 - c. If a unit is taken over by another unit: The *absorbed-by* field in *Affiliations* can be used to state that information.
 - d. If a unit is “off-line” for undefined timeframe, a Null value can be placed in the *Suspension Ends* field in the *ILLServiceTimes* field.
 - e. *Don B.* pointed out that all 3 Status fields should be consistent in value.
5. *ILL ProcessingUnit* – *Scope* field:
 - a. *Mary J.* stated that this field is an optional free text field that is used for human readable information. There is no parsing or indexing anticipated for this field. The *Notes* field is additional details on any other fields in the model.
6. How many *Unit Names* are allowed in the *ILLProcessingUnit* ? 1 per language but more than 1 overall but less than 100.
7. *Address.PhysicalAddress..StructuredAddress.Country* field:
 - a. What is the rationale behind this field?
 - b. Why is it simple strings?
 - c. *Joe Z.* has offered to write up a proposal on the use of this field and will post it to the IPIG listserv.
8. OCLC asked *Kerry* when the new version of the model would be available with all the updates.
 - a. *Kerry* initially thinks by the end of the week.
9. *Affiliations* field:
 - a. Why was the *Symbol* field not added? *Mary J.* has offered to post an explanation to the IPIG listserv.
 - b. The *ReasonforWithdrawal* field is no longer valid according to *Mary*. *Mary* will write up an explanation for this as well.
10. *Don B.* and *Joe Z.* will work out *Alias* fields. There were questions on the *Authority Type* field and its uniqueness.
11. *Don B.* will contact *Kerry B.* to understand the *Charges* field. They will post to the listserv their understanding.
12. *ContactInformation*:
 - a. The *Contact Role*: a contact can have multiple roles
 - b. A *Contact* can have multiple addresses
 - c. 1contact role can be executed by multiple people.
 - d. The model is written in the context of the Unit, not a person.
 - e. *ContactPerson*: If no searching on the name is needed, and then it can be a string, otherwise it needs to be structured. No need to search it and therefore it will not be structured
13. *UpdatetoNCIP*: placeholder for *Kerry* for NCIP info ☺
14. *DeliveryMethodsSupported.DeliveryMethod*: *Kerry* needs to fix the diagram. “Other” will be added.

15. *LoanPolicy*:
 - a. What is the standard for *timeDuration*: Barb Shuh says ISO 8601;
 - b. John B. is going to look into this issue and post appropriate definitions and examples to the IPIG list.
16. *Loan Policy*
 - a. Agreement to add Max and Min.
 - b. Mary questioned the need for Min.
 - c. Kerry will think about adding a “Max total” or “Max at 1 time” fields.
 - d. Sue D. to send Kerry an email reminding her of this (At Kerry’s request).
17. *ILLServiceLevels.AverageProcessingTime*:
 - a. Why not added to model? Mary J. says its because the average processing time is impossible to describe.
 - b. Joe Z. pointed out that a unit couldn’t promise an average.
 - c. Mary questioned whether this is an application level feature.
 - d. Consensus was to not add *Average Processing Time* to the directory.
18. *UnitCategorized*: means what library is will service.
 - a. *Library Descriptor*: Describes the Unit itself. (The model is inaccurate on this. Kerry will fix)
19. Don asked if the model should describe the borrowing policies in addition to the lending policies.
 - a. Mary questioned the need for this.
 - b. This was talked about before at IPIG meetings
 - c. Consensus was to NOT add this to the directory.
20. Mary questioned OCLC on the decision of LDAP vs. X.500. OCLC has not made the decision and needs to gather more information to make an informed decision. The next IPIG/OCLC Policies Directory Conference Call will occur once OCLC has gathered needed information and has made a decision.