

RFID for Libraries

Standards Australia Working Group IT-019 -01-02

Wednesday November 30th 2005, 1300 - 1600

RMIT - City Campus - 360 Swanston Street, Building 8, Level 5

Attendees:

Alan Butters, Sybis (Chair)

Leona Jennings, GCCC

Peter Dart, Pearson Australia Group

Brian Dunne, 3M Australia

Jan Wild, DA Library Technologies

Craig Anderson, RMIT

Christine Mackenzie YPRL

Apologies:

Lynn Regan, BHSC

Janifer Gatenby, OCLC PICA

1. Welcome and meeting objectives

AB welcomed the members to the second meeting of the IT-019-01-02 working group. CA apologised for the last minute venue change due to building renovations. AB explained that the principal meeting objective was to commence development of the framework document that had been previously circulated with the aim of capturing the benefits of and requirements for RFID systems designed for Australian libraries.

2. Framework document - part 1, Functionality

A wide ranging discussion ensued as members articulated the benefits afforded to libraries by RFID systems from several perspectives with PD providing the publisher's / retailer's viewpoint. A summary of the specific comments during this discussion is presented in the following table. Comments are listed in the order they were made at the meeting.

| Proposed | WG member's comment |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| LJ | Return on investment – productivity benefits |
| LJ | Database accuracy in a climate of increasing accountability |
| JW | OH & S benefits through reduced materials handling |
| LJ | Improved asset management |
| LJ | Streamlined staff processes |
| LJ | Improved service to borrowers – better self serve loans & returns |
| LJ | Better borrower privacy through improved self serve loan and returns |
| CM | Hand held devices may have increased value in the future |
| LJ | Searching for holds and missing books more important than shelf order |
| LJ | Ability to collect statistics on in-house reading |
| LJ | Ability to move away from health concerns with EM security |
| CM | Removal of EM security is a benefit to staff not a selling point to council |
| LJ | Removes false alarm situations that occur with EM security |
| CM | RFID better for A/V as it does not damage magnetically sensitive items |
| LJ & CM | Public libraries favour one-tag instead of two-tag scenario |
| CA | Academic libraries my favour two-tag scenario due to increased risk |
| PD | Fewer tags in the books eases the work on publishers who insert them |
| LJ | Extra tag data and functionality must not come at the cost of productivity |
| BD | There are cost implications if a larger tag memory is required |
| JW | Need to keep an eye on the future and provide for upgrade paths |
| PD | RFID used to determine if returns are genuine |
| PD | Supply chain efficiency – RFID offers many benefits in this area |
| PD | Theft is a key driver for retail – may need multiple tags to be safe |
| PD | Counterfeiting books – RFID could help with authentication |

AB to incorporate these comments into the framework document and the working group will attempt to place them in a priority ranking.

3. Presentation - Data Security (Borrower Privacy)

AB delivered a Powerpoint presentation on security issues aimed at assisting the working group to understand the issues of concern within the library community as

well as the limitations with current standards and technology. Some of the main points of the presentation were:

- ISO 15693 & ISO 18000-3 Mode 1 are not standards that support a secure RFID platform. These standards do not prohibit:
 - Digital vandalism
 - Tracking
 - Hotlisting
 - Profiling
- 13.56 Mhz tags as used in libraries cannot be read from great distances. 3.5 metres is the upper limit due to the laws of physics
- Eavesdropping on tag transmissions is problematic at distances greater than the normal operating range
- Vendors should be encouraged to develop ISO 18000-3 Mode 2 solutions where security is considered a priority

4. Framework document - part 2, Data Security (Borrower privacy)

Following the presentation, discussion returned to the framework document where the issue of an appropriate data model was considered in the privacy context. A summary of the specific comments during this discussion is presented in the following table. Comments are listed in the order they were made at the meeting.

| Proposed | WG member's comment |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PD | The ubiquitous nature of security concerns is the issue - the Danish proposal does not adequately address this. |
| LJ | Communications issue - the privacy concerns are not addressed by the Danish proposal. Acknowledgment at least has to be given to this topic |
| LJ | A statement of facts is needed - what can and cannot be done |
| CM | ALIA should articulate a position on privacy issues for Australian libraries |
| LJ | Australian libraries do take privacy seriously but they are also pragmatic |
| PD | Having a basic RFID patron card is very risky under current standards |
| JW | Concerned that the pendulum is swinging too far - unreasonable fear level? |
| CA | Data model should allow for RFID borrower cards - libraries will decide |
| PD | Make use of the library data more - the tag does not need to make everything explicit when the information already exists on the library's database |

CM agreed to follow up with ALIA re the privacy statement. A general discussion of the data model in the Danish proposal resulted in the following principles:

- The three-segment approach of the Danish group has definite benefits

- A large Mandatory section may be problematic in security sensitive environments
- The primary item ID (typically the library barcode number) must appear in the Mandatory section of the model

This discussion is to be continued at the next meeting.

5. Other business.

JW indicated that New Zealand libraries had expressed a wish to be involved with the working group in some capacity. JW agreed to contact Geoff Chamberlain from North Shore Libraries (representing NZ public libraries) to discuss this possibility further. PD agreed to follow up with IT-019 to determine what, if any, involvement with academic libraries existed within that committee.

6. Next meeting

The previously made decision to meet in Sydney for meeting #3 was discussed. Most members were able to manage limited travel interstate. CM told the group that she was having difficulty traveling interstate at the moment. AB to report back to the group after further private discussions with members.

7. Meeting closed

The meeting concluded at 1600