

**Ballot Comments and NCIP Implementers Group Response for
Z39.83-200X, parts 1 and 2 – NCIP (NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol)
Ballot Dates: 2008-06-19 to 2008-08-03**

Organizations

Acronyms used for Voting Members:

CDL = California Digital Library

LC = Library of Congress

OCLC = OCLC Online Computer Library Center

Com- menter	Section	Comment	Committee Response	Change Type*
CDL	General	We recommend a yes vote. The NCIP Interest Group has worked very hard in this revision to address implementation barriers and to fix problems that implementers had discovered. This revision tightens the previous standard, and makes it more usable in self-service applications and broker situations. This revision is widely supported by all of the vendors who were involved in creating it, and all have agreed to make the development effort to upgrade their existing applications. The addition of a method for extending the standard at message and element levels and improved error messaging are huge benefits for implementers, and the changes made to scheme/value translation will simplify development for many vendors.		N/A
LC	General	1) it looks like Z39.83-compliant circulation systems AND Interlibrary Loan systems should be able to exchange information. For instance, it would appear that an item Check-In (discharge) in Circ could pass that info to ILLiad (if both were Z39.83-compliant), likewise an item charge in Circ could pass an "item shipped" message to ILLiad - this, if true, is the exciting part of the standard.	You are entirely correct. One of the goals of the NCIP Standard is automating the exchange of information between circulation and ILL systems. The instances you mention are both within the scope and current capability of NCIP.	N/A

**Ballot Comments and NCIP Implementers Group Response for
Z39.83-200X, parts 1 and 2 – NCIP (NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol)
Ballot Dates: 2008-06-19 to 2008-08-03**

Com- menter	Section	Comment	Committee Response	Change Type*
LC	5.1.3 User Object I	2) on the other hand, we saw nothing in "user data" that reflects our current system of "patron groups" - where are patron groups in this revision?	<p>The NCIP element "Agency User Privilege Type" is intended to identify a patron's group. For example, used as part of the Create User message in the example below, the AgencyId conveys the associated entity, and the AgencyUserPrivilegeStatusType conveys the group "Graduate Student" to the receiving system:</p> <pre><UserPrivilege> <AgencyId>Hogwarts</AgencyId> <AgencyUserPrivilegeType>Graduate Student</AgencyUserPrivilegeType> <UserPrivilegeStatusType>Active</U serPrivilegeStatusType> </UserPrivilege></pre>	N/A
LC	5.1.3 User Object	Also, in user data, we saw no way of distinguishing individual users (with personal names, birth dates, etc.) from institutional users (libraries) - this has been a shortcoming in our circ patron data since our Voyager system was implemented, and if the standard included such specifications then we could expect our vendor to follow.	After some discussion to understand your need to associate a personal contact with an institutional borrower, we have asked other implementers how they approach this need. You can always, of course, use the <Any> extensibility feature to embed the information you wish to convey. Some implementers also address this matter in initial set-up of information and accounts.	N/A
LC	5.1.3 User Object	Another shortcoming is the inability to have particular patrons "owned" by larger patron entities (e.g., Congressional offices) - nothing I can find in the new standard, including its extensive Data Dictionary, seems to address that flaw.	We agree that the standard at present does not accommodate this feature. It is possible that this can be accommodated by an extension to the standard so that interested parties can prototype how it should be handled in a future version of the standard. (Such "prototyping via extensions" is how the Implementation Group expects most changes to the standard to occur in the future.)	N/A

**Ballot Comments and NCIP Implementers Group Response for
Z39.83-200X, parts 1 and 2 – NCIP (NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol)
Ballot Dates: 2008-06-19 to 2008-08-03**

Com- menter	Section	Comment	Committee Response	Change Type*
OCLC	General	1) NISO should provide a registry for institution identifiers and other enumerated types, Implementation and Application profiles, and extensions. The absence of such a registry has been an obstacle to comprehension and adoption in version 1; it will become a greater problem now that NCIP supports extensions, since without it NCIP could become more of a non-standard standard with many discrete islands of interoperability.	Thank you. NCIP-IG has discussed the need for this sort of central caching of such information and has, to some extent, used its ncip.info site as a gathering spot for posting such things. NCIP-IG agrees that there may be a general role for NISO in serving as a central access point, not only for the needs of the NCIP-implementing community, but for those implementing other standards as well.	N/A
OCLC	6.3 The Data Dictionary	<p>2) 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. making an optional element mandatory), but not loosening of rules, as would be the case if a non-repeatable element were allowed to repeat. We have thus far encountered two cases where the obvious solution is to repeat a non-repeatable data element; unfortunately NCIP won't allow it, even in version 2. The instances are:-</p> <p>A) Bibliographic Record Id is not repeatable in Bibliographic Description of Accept Item. But why can't an initiator send an OCLC number and an LCCN if it has both for the record?</p> <p>B) Request Item does not allow a combination of Bibliographic Id and Item Id, and it does not allow either to be repeated. But why can't an initiator send the two ids?</p> <p>If these (and other elements) are allowed to repeat it will also be necessary to specify the semantics. In the first example (Bibliographic Record Id) it seems obvious that they are both valid. But where the</p>	Thank you for the detailed description of the specific, as well as the general, problem. We have considered both the specific and the general problem. The specific issue may, of course, be dealt with by using the <Any> extensibility feature. NCIP-IG opts to put this well-thought-out problem into the collection of outstanding points to be considered for the next version or, nearer-term than that, for a draft that implementers agree to test.	N/A

**Ballot Comments and NCIP Implementers Group Response for
Z39.83-200X, parts 1 and 2 – NCIP (NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol)
Ballot Dates: 2008-06-19 to 2008-08-03**

Com- menter	Section	Comment	Committee Response	Change Type*
		<p>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.</p> <p>As a minimum therefore, the implementation group should address the above 2 examples. This is however also a request that the implementation group take a detailed pass through the schema and, unless there are clear reasons not to, make all non-repeatable elements repeatable. Should it become apparent in future implementations that something is now repeatable which shouldn't be, it would be easier to restrict it by an implementer's agreement than to expand it by an extension (which is what we'd have to do if we don't make these elements repeatable).</p>		