NISO’s New Collaborative Learning and Planning Process

by Pat Stevens

“We’re not in Kansas anymore, Toto.” The excitement and confusion that Dorothy experiences when she wakes up in Oz are familiar to many non-digital natives as they experience the Technicolor digital world. Possibilities once only dreamed of as Over the Rainbow are now everyday events, and undreamed of inhabitants—some seemingly benign and some not so—are part of the every day landscape.

Unlike with Dorothy, there are no ruby slippers to return home and for most of us this digital world is really too promising, to make return desirable. While Dorothy found a Yellow Brick Road to follow; the issue today is often a plethora of promising roads. Deciding which to follow is challenging and mustering the resources to explore more than a few is impossible. One lesson to learn from Dorothy is how helpful it can be to work with others in deciding where to go and which path to follow. Dorothy and her companions had quite different goals but they recognized that each would be helped if they could reach the Wizard.

Taking a less magical and more mundane view, organizations today, both large and small, find that innovation done in isolation can be fruitless. Without shared planning and innovation, the infrastructure needed to make the innovation practical, the partnerships needed to make new services useful, and the readiness of users to take up the innovation may simply be lacking. This is true of libraries who want to offer new services like institutional repositories as well as for software providers, publishers, and information brokers planning for the next product generation.

NISO recognizes that creating standards is often an important component in collaborative innovation. Standards often define the environment and express the rules of the road that govern this environment. In the past, NISO and other standards organizations could follow developments. Now, standards often emerge as part of the building process. It became clear to NISO and its Board during its recent strategic development process that this earlier insertion of the standards development process requires NISO to change the way it works. The result was a commitment to an ongoing process of engaging the NISO members and the NISO community in collaborative planning that will help create a world in which multiple goals are achievable.
A Look into the Future

So, how can a collaborative planning process work? One way to answer this question is to look at what activities would happen inside NISO once such a process is implemented. One critical aspect is that learning about the environment becomes a continuous and ongoing part of the planning. So, in a very real sense, this is a collaborative learning process. And the collaboration extends beyond NISO, as the learning process is done in partnership with organizations who share an interest in a particular aspect of the environment. These additional expertise and resources allow NISO to reach further and learn more.

Some learning efforts continue to use familiar methods and tools: roundtable meetings, white papers, surveys, and simple listening-in as members of the community discuss shared issues. Roundtable meetings bring leaders with different perspectives together to discuss discrete issues like rights expression or identifiers, help the community develop a better understanding of shared problems, and help NISO identify where it can best help the community take action. White papers provide another means for exploring new areas of interest. In fact, NISO often uses white papers to seed discussion at a roundtable or to crystallize the discussion from a roundtable. So, rather than a set of isolated events, the methods create an opportunity for ideas to emerge and be tested through ongoing discussion.

NISO will also use new learning methodologies to scout ahead. For example, NISO may work with initiatives that are actively prototyping new applications. Like the Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI), a group of implementers may identify the need for a standard in advance of NISO involvement and even begin crafting a standard in the process of creating a solution for a commonly shared problem. It is important, that NISO and its community understand these efforts as learning engagements. If the effort helps NISO define a useful standard, then success is clear. If the effort reveals that a different approach is required, the success may be harder to see. If the community understands that it pointed the way to a better approach, it is easier to see that this is indeed just a different kind of success.

While the tools and approaches will evolve as NISO learns and its needs evolve, every year the NISO community will take the time to integrate what it is learning into its ongoing plans for standards development, publications, and education and use the information to revise and extend plans for ongoing scouting. NISO will use a set of living and lively documents that community interaction shapes and drives to inform that planning.

This description paints a broad picture of learning that is quickly used to plan and implement. Before looking at the details of how this process will work, it is useful to look at how NISO developed this view of an organization that plans collaboratively. While the willingness to engage the unexpected is an important element in any learning-based planning process, sustained success depends upon both a solid organizational infrastructure and an open process.

Planning Infrastructure

The understanding of the need for comprehensive and on-going planning emerged from a process of engagement among the NISO Board, its members, and the broader community. Through funding from the Mellon Foundation, NISO had the opportunity to ask a Blue Ribbon Panel of experts led by Clifford Lynch to review NISO’s work and the Board’s initial plans for the future. After absorbing the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel and preparing a Strategic Directions document, the Board asked Roy Tennant of the California Digital Library to review NISO’s standard processes and recommend changes that would enable NISO to work more effectively.

The Blue Ribbon Panel posed fundamental questions about NISO’s role and its work. In particular, the Panel noted that: “NISO has proceeded in its standards development in a largely opportunistic fashion, without broad architectural models for how its standards fit into the world of information technology, networks and digital content.” [1, p.5] Its recommendation was that NISO “develop a well-synthesized framework that looks at the needs and priorities of that constituency, the technical standards landscape relevant to that constituency, and the ecology of other standards-related organizations relevant to that constituency. From this will follow a roadmap and priorities for standards development and for partnerships, collaborations, and other relationships with other players.” [1, p.2]

In his report, Roy Tennant also stated that “the Board should create and maintain an architectural overview of the standards landscape, as identified in the Blue Ribbon report and the NISO Board’s NISO Strategic Direction document...A primary deliverable of the architectural overview is the identification of key areas of possible standards development to which NISO will commit to being active.” [2, p.16]

The Board took up the recommendation that NISO develop such a Framework. A group of Board members under the leadership of Lorcan Dempsey will publish its initial work in the next few months. As it evaluated this recommendation, the Board recognized that creating the initial Framework was an important step but that by itself the Framework would be of minimal use. Creating the roadmap and identifying priorities for standards development requires an ongoing process of planning that evaluates NISO’s standards strategy and the Framework itself on a regular basis. This understanding led to a decision to create a group that has the authority
to direct NISO’s standards strategy without being tied down with the detailed implementation of that strategy. This responsibility will be held by an Architecture Committee that reports to the Board of Directors. Besides ensuring that the NISO Framework remains a living document, this group is also responsible for using that Framework to determine where NISO will focus its efforts.

The Blue Ribbon Panel also asked the NISO Board to examine NISO’s broader role within the community. It noted: “One important perspective that emerged from the planning panel discussions was the role of NISO as a builder of communities of common interest, not just around standards but around applications of technology that involved standards; the Metasearch Initiative was cited as an example of such an activity. It is clear that a greater emphasis on this kind of community building could be a way forward for NISO in terms of creating value for its members, and also in serving a public interest mission...The panel observes that taking the alternative, long-term, community-building oriented path may be a better match to the kinds of institutions that make up the great majority of NISO’s membership and constituency, or that NISO would like to attract to its membership and constituency.” [1, p.7]

In its continuing work, the Board took up the notion of building communities that share long term interests. It agreed with the Blue Ribbon Panel that “the boundaries of libraries have become ever more indistinct and permeable.” [1, p.6] The Board also noted that the same was true of scholarly publishers, information brokers, software developers and other organizations that make up its membership and the communities they serve. In examining how to build long-standing communities, the Board came to the conclusion that focusing on key areas of functionality that were used across a broad spectrum of organizations could help define communities that could serve as the focal point for shared work to develop solutions for common problems. “A focus on functionality calls for NISO to provide leadership in addressing the fundamental issues of providing access to trusted information in today’s environment, both to its dues-paying membership and to the wider community that engages with NISO on selected projects.” [3, p.8]

The Blue Ribbon Panel also noted that NISO needed to re-think the approach that it used in managing its programs. In particular, it commented “as the world moves away from a publication-oriented standards process, NISO needs to recognize that there are real disadvantages to a multiplicity of standards committees being continually launched and discharged, and a highly granular approach to standards development. This fosters re-invention, turf wars, lack of coordination, and ponderous process.” [1, p.13]

To address this issue, Roy Tennant recommended in his review of NISO’s standards process that “the NISO Board should appoint Standing Committees for each of the main areas identified by the architectural overview.” [2, p.16]

In evaluating these recommendations in the context of each other, the Board concluded that these standing committees would work best if they were structured to bring together thought and action leaders from a variety of organizations who are interested in shared areas of functionality or service. In this way, they could serve as the focal points for building communities of common interest identified by the Blue Ribbon Panel.

The Board sees these Topic Committees as the focal point for developing coherent plans for a specific area of work. They are also responsible for directing the implementation of those plans. In the word of the Tennant report “actively soliciting draft specifications and standards, appointing Working Groups as required to accomplish specific tasks.” [2, p.16]

Pulling this together, we have three levels of organizational structure:

- **The Architecture Committee** sets strategic direction for NISO’s overall standards work. As part of that work, it charters Topic Committees that plan for and manage a discrete area of standards work.

- **Topic Committees** serve as the focal point for a community of organizations and individuals who are interested in advancing work in the defined area. NISO members can designate a representative for each Topic Committee of interest. This representative will follow the work of the committee, provide feedback, and vote on proposed work items and standards.

- **The Board of Directors** provides oversight and ensures that the work continues to serve NISO’s mission: “NISO fosters the development and maintenance of standards that facilitate the creation, persistent management, and effective interchange of information so that it can be trusted for use in research and learning.” [3, p.4]

In the context of the description of the year’s work; the Architecture Committee and the Topic Committees share responsibility for defining and managing NISO’s learning experiences; the Architecture Committee, the Topic Committees, and the Board are responsible for integrating what was learned into plans for the future and ongoing work.

**Process**

The intention is that the Architecture and Topic Committees communicate among themselves about what they are finding and how best to use the information in setting direction. It is also critical that there is ongoing
communication with NISO members and with other interested parts of the community.

Some of this communication will happen via the person-to-person interaction essential to most successful organizations. The Chair of the Architecture Committee is either a member of the Board or serves as an ex-officio member; chairs of the Topic Committees serve as ex-officio members of the Architecture Committee. In addition, everyone involved in this process is actively engaged through their work with other organizations inside and outside NISO. This provides opportunity to clarify and amplify written communication and helps build a sense of shared purpose.

The more formal process of planning happens through the creation, community review, and revision of documents that live on the NISO website. Looking from the center out, this begins with the NISO Framework. Once the initial document is published, NISO will ask both its members and the community for a thorough review. Even once the Framework is stabilized, NISO will remain open to suggestions for extension and amplification. Linked to the Framework are the set of Topic Areas where NISO has chosen to focus its work.

So, now looking from the circumference, each Topic Committee has a portfolio that presents a three-year look forward at the work done in their Topic area. Each includes:

- **Descriptive outline** – Provides a short overview of the work covered, a high-level model of interaction and exchange, and a set of objectives.

- **Learning plan** – Briefly describes current and upcoming work directed at learning about the environment and the needs of members and the communities they support. In any year, this might include plans for one or two roundtables and white papers as well as outreach to organizations or initiatives who are working in new areas.

- **Standards development plan** – Briefly describes plans for future standards work and the work of currently active standards working groups. [Standards in this context also include other types of documents such as recommended practices and technical reports.]

- **Implementation plans** – Describes work planned to support implementation of the standards work that the Topic Area manages. As standards are highly related, any activity might support implementation of multiple standards.

While the plans are revised by the Topic Committee on an ongoing basis, the committee also formally reviews its portfolio every year. As part of that review, the committee:

- Revises the portfolio plan based on the outcome of learning exercises.

- **Asks for review from the area representatives and the Architecture Committee.**

- **Presents its revised portfolio to the Architecture Committee.** In doing this, the Topic Committee may recommend that it be disbanded or that a new Topic Committee be created to take up a portion of its work.

Again, once a year, but working from the center, the Architecture Committee reviews all of the Topic Committee portfolios. As a result of the portfolio reviews, the Architecture Committee may choose to realign work across the Topic Committees, disband a committee, or create a new Topic Committee. They may also use the portfolios to identify needed changes to the NISO Framework. After this step, the Architecture Committee reviews it actions with the Board who formally approves any changes to the Topic Committee structure. Once this review is complete, the Architecture Committee publishes this work as the updated NISO action plan.

**Start Up**

Creating this organizational infrastructure within NISO will be an incremental process, with ongoing testing and refining of the approach. At its meeting in September, 2006, the Board decided that it would begin by appointing an Architecture Committee and three initial Topic Committees. The Board has identified three areas as likely targets for the first Topic Committees. The descriptions that follow will be refined by the Architecture Committee and the Topic Committees themselves.

**Discovery to Delivery** services are central to the work of information organizations inside and outside the NISO membership. The NISO Metasearch Initiative focused on one aspect of this process and highlighted many key issues that are involved in the larger process. The Committee formed around this topic will be asked to examine how to make discovery to delivery services accessible to users inside and outside an organization’s own information portal. This will require that the Committee work with organizations that focus on how information is used in a particular context, for example, IMS Global in e-learning.

**Content and Collection Management**, particularly electronic content, as part of larger collections, aggregations, or databases, makes discovery and delivery possible. Today it requires traditional metadata standards that support describing and organizing information, as well as standards that allow for the exchange of rights and license information. This NISO Topic Committee manages existing working groups such as the current License Expressions WG and would be responsible for developing relationships with standards groups like DCMI and METS, in the immediate
community, as well as organizations like MPEG-21 in the broader world.

Usage Intelligence or information about what users are using and how they are using it is becoming increasingly critical to every organization for both strategic and daily planning. It is also important in justifying how dollars are spent and other resources allocated. This Topic Committee will look at how to work with organizations like Project COUNTER and a variety of library and publishing organizations who are working to define effective performance metrics. They would be responsible for identifying and filling gaps such as was done with the Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI).

Year One
The focus of the Topic Committees in their first year will be to produce the initial portfolios. The Architecture Committee will work with the Topic Committees to agree on the format and style for the standards portfolio and assist them with the development of the first portfolios. The Topic Committees will assume responsibility for managing ongoing standards development work and active Maintenance Agencies. But, because this bootstrap work is so critical, the Topic Committees will be relieved of any responsibility for managing any part of the existing NISO standards portfolio. The NISO office will manage all standards reviews and revisions during this initial year.

NISO recognizes that changing the way it works cannot be done by the Board and the NISO staff alone. Success requires that NISO’s community is willing to engage with NISO in a new way and that over time they come to trust NISO as a place where they can come together to plan for a future. Just as the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, the Cowardly Lion, and Dorothy learned that sharing Head, Heart, Courage, and Magic Shoes could enable them to reach their goals.
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MEMBER SPOTLIGHT
Endeavor Information Systems: Emphasizing Interoperability and User Interface Design
by Cynthia Hodgson, ISQ Editor

Endeavor Information Systems, headquartered in Des Plaines, Illinois, has been developing library management software systems since 1994. Its products include the Voyager® integrated library system, Meridian™ for electronic resource management, Curator™ for local digital content creation and management, Journals Onsite™ to manage digital journal collections, Analyzer™ to produce reporting and analysis in conjunction with any of the previously listed Endeavor products, Discovery: Finder™ for federated searching, and Discovery: Resolver™ for OpenURL linking. While these products can be used independently from one another, Endeavor has built in interoperability between them and utilizes standards to enable interactions with other software applications. “Integrated Library Systems used to be monolithic,” states Sara Randall, Director, Strategic Products. “Except for importing of MARC records, there wasn’t much interaction with other systems. Now we want users to be able to discover content in unlikely places and integrate and exchange that content between systems, whether it’s an Endeavor product, another provider’s system, or a Web-enabled resource.”

Standards are critical for enabling Endeavor to support and facilitate communications and information exchange. Kathryn Harnish, Director, Product Management explains: “Standards provide easier import and export of data, enable application sharing, and allow non-proprietary implementation and development. Additionally, our customers have created a rich data repository with their ILS and we want to ensure it can effectively interface with Web technologies.”

Earlier search support in their products was done using the Z39.50 standard. Newer products are utilizing both the SRU (Search/Retrieve via URL) and SRW (Search/Retrieve Web Service) standards, which build on Z39.50 features for a Web environment. Use of the NCIP (NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol) standard illustrates the move to a more transaction-oriented type of exchange. “Initially we used NCIP to support consortial borrowing functions,” Harnish states. “We are now seeing a growing interest in the self-service aspects of NCIP,
especially in our customers outside the U.S.” ONIX for Serials is another transaction or message-oriented standard that Endeavor is utilizing. Meridian is the first ERM system to implement the ONIX Serials Release Notification (SRN) format for exchanging information about the publication or electronic availability of a serial resource. Implementation of a second ONIX format, Serials Online Holdings (SOH), which exchanges information from publisher management systems to libraries, is underway.

The Meridian ERM product is a tangible example of how Endeavor products are improved by using standards. “We wanted to manage usage statistics across multiple vendors,” explains Sara Randall, Director Strategic Products. “The COUNTER Code of Practice provided a standard reporting mechanism and the new NISO SUSHI protocol lets us automate and simplify the collection of the data.”

Products such as Discovery: Resolver only exist because of a standard. This hosted resolver system (also available for local implementation) was designed to support the OpenURL San Antonio profile. “Our hosted solution for link resolution is popular,” asserts Sara Randall, “because Endeavor handles the maintenance of the knowledgebase, which is critical to accurate link resolving.”

Endeavor has a history of involvement with the development of NISO standards. Sara Randall co-chaired the Metasearch Initiative task group on Search/Retrieve which developed the Metasearch XML Gateway and two sets of metadata elements for use in metasearch—all published NISO Recommended Practices. Endeavor is hoping the XML gateway protocol will encourage more content providers to make their resources available to Endeavor’s federated search products. Likewise, Harnish is a member of the NISO License Expression working group that is developing a single standard for the exchange of license information between publishers and libraries. According to Harnish: “We’d like to see a method for automatically importing publishers’ license information into our ERM—something along the lines of what the SUSHI protocol accomplished with usage statistics.” Additionally, Endeavor is a member of the NCIP Implementers Group that is developing a revision to the standard.

Endeavor’s acquisition by Elsevier in 2000 provided the company with the unique opportunity of utilizing Elsevier’s User Design Group. In the last two years, Endeavor has launched a Usability Initiative and has redesigned the interface to many of their products, starting with functions directed to public end users. The World Wide Web Consortium’s Web accessibility guidelines are of growing interest to the organization in the design of these public interfaces. The interface for librarian functions is also being addressed. “We changed the way the DLF/ERMI defined functions were grouped in our Meridian interface,” Sara Randall points out, “to better reflect the librarians’ actual workflow.”

In looking forward, Harnish expects to incorporate more Web services elements into all of the core products. “We particularly like to utilize Web services technology where no standards exist,” she explains. Endeavor’s vision for the future is of a more hybrid library system—an integrated framework for managing both physical and digital collections with enhanced search capabilities, advanced data exchange, user-focused interfaces, and workflow oriented functionality. They are well on their way to accomplishing that vision.

For more on Endeavor Information Systems, visit their website at www.endinfosys.com.
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“This is an incredible opportunity at a key juncture in NISO’s evolution,” said Carpenter. “Standards development is the single best example of where cooperation serves the interests of the library, publishers, and technical-provider communities. I am excited about implementing NISO’s strategic plan, which is focused on improving the efficiency of information standards development, expanding the scope of NISO’s services, and enhancing involvement of each of NISO’s key constituencies.”

**Web Services & Practices WG Recommends Best Practices**

The NISO Web Services and Practices working group has completed their charge with the issuance of NISO RP 2006-01, *Best Practices for Designing Web Services in the Library Context*. Included in this document is a discussion of the document service interface, looking at four model types: information model, behavior model, action model and process model. Best practices are explained in the areas of HTTP caching, filtering of user input, reuse of output formats, security, and throttling. Typical output formats used in web services—DTD, XML schema, RDF, Relax NG, and DSD—are described. An appendix provides an overview, for those new to web services, of the typical types of services used in a library context: discover, locate, request, deliver, and common services. The appendix also includes a brief introduction to interoperability issues.

With the issuance of this Recommended Practice, the Web Services and Practices working group will be disbanding. Areas the group highlighted to watch for developments are the e-learning environment or the connection infrastructure area (such as how to discover existing services and how to connect services to servers and to each other). There was a strong consensus in the group that NISO would benefit from working with existing efforts (such as the UK-based e-learning effort) and also for using the NISO vantage point in the standards world to identify areas where a broader set of standards might bring wider usage and constituency.

**New Edition of Metasearch XML Gateway Guide Published**

An updated edition of the NISO Metasearch XML Gateway (MXG) Implementers Guide was published in August. The previous edition focused on the nuts and bolts of the MXG protocol. The new edition adds key information needed by implementers on prerequisites and decision points and further explains the three levels of implementation.

The NISO Metasearch XML Gateway (MXG) is a low-barrier-to-entry method to expose content to metasearch services and more effectively interoperate with metasearching applications. The MXG protocol defines a simple message and response which allows a metasearch service to query a content database and receive a standardized XML response.

The MXG Implementers Guide is primarily directed to content providers who wish to expose their resources to one or more metasearch providers without expending substantial development resources. Metasearch providers who will be using a content provider’s MXG to access resources will also find this guide useful. Visit the Metasearch Initiative webpage (http://www.niso.org/committees/MS_initiative.html) for this guide and other related Metasearch recommended practices.

**SUSHI Standard Released for Trial Use**

NISO set a new record with the release of Z39.93, *The Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI) Protocol*, as a Draft Standard for Trial Use (DSFTU), after a mere 14-month development cycle. The SUSHI protocol provides an automated mechanism utilizing a web services approach for the request and retrieval of COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of NeTworked Electronic Resources) usage statistics.

The SUSHI protocol is a SOAP request/response web services “wrapper” for the XML version of COUNTER reports. A transaction begins when a client service running as part of an application developed by a library—or running as part of a usage data consolidation service or ILS / ERM system—identifies itself, identifies the customer whose statistics are being requested, and specifies the desired report to the SUSHI server service running at a data provider. In response, the server provides the report in XML format, along with the requestor and customer information—or an appropriate error message. The SUSHI developers envision a system in which the client system is programmed to retrieve...
reports automatically on a scheduled basis for all the COUNTER-compliant vendors with which the library does business. Although initially conceived for handling of COUNTER reports, SUSHI was designed to also accommodate non-COUNTER reports that meet specified requirements.

“The approach to this initiative represents NISO’s new strategic direction in standards development,” stated SUSHI co-chair, Oliver Pesch, Chief Architect and Senior Vice President at EBSCO Information Services. “The problem was clearly scoped, pilot implementations were developed to validate assumptions, and in the end, the draft standard was proven to work before it was released for trial use. This approach, coupled with an energetic and dedicated committee, allowed us to create the SUSHI draft standard in record time.” Adam Chandler, SUSHI co-chair and Information Technology Librarian at Cornell University Library, added, “NISO provided the infrastructure required to move SUSHI from a good idea to an industry standard.”

NISO is issuing the SUSHI protocol as a DSFTU to gain field experience before the standard is balloted. The SUSHI trial period runs from September 20, 2006 through May 20, 2007. A number of data providers and ERM system vendors have already committed to implementing SUSHI. NISO welcomes additional participation in the trial. Further information on the standard can be found on the SUSHI webpage.

APA, NexTag, and PLS Join NISO

NISO welcomes three new voting members: the American Psychological Association, NexTag, Inc. and the Publishers Licensing Society, Ltd.

The American Psychological Association (APA), headquartered in Washington, DC, is the largest association of psychologists worldwide. They are a major publisher in the field with both print and electronic publications as well as producers of software and well known databases, such as PsycINFO. Their Librarian’s Resource Center (http://www.apa.org/librarians) provides a wealth of information for those who administer and use APA products. APA is a user of the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) and OpenURL, both NISO standards. Linda Beebe is APA’s primary representative for NISO and Janice Fleming is the alternate.

NexTag, Inc. (www.nextag.com), headquartered in San Mateo, California, is an online comparison shopping website established in 1999 and named in 2005 as one of the fastest growing U.S. companies. Over 11 million shoppers per month use their proprietary Search And Match (SAM™) technology to compare prices on millions of products and services. Their side-by-side search results show pricing that includes tax and shipping based on the shopper’s zip code. Initially focused on products, in 2004, NexTag expanded to include Services Shopping® with comparison shopping for mortgages, travel, cars, real estate and online education programs. A UK version of their website (www.nextag.co.uk/) is also available. NexTag’s primary voting representative is Minjen Mao; the alternate representative is Trieu Nguyen.

The Publishers Licensing Society (PLS) (www.pls.org.uk) was established in 1981 by the U.K. publishing industry to oversee a collective licensing scheme in the U.K. for book, journal, and magazine copying and to identify good copyright management practices for both print and digital information resources. PLS owns and directs, with the Authors’ Licensing and Collection Society, the Copyright Licensing Agency (www.cla.co.uk), which provides licenses to institutions and individuals who want to photocopy parts of copyrighted works. Over 1800 publishers are currently represented. PLS, located in London, is a member of EDItEUR and the International DOI Foundation and is a co-sponsor of NISO’s License Expressions Working Group, which is developing a standard for the exchange of license information between publishers and libraries. PLS is owned by the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, the Periodical Publishers Association, and the Publishers Association. Alicia Wise is the primary representative to NISO; Lydia Murray is the alternate.

Z39.71 Holdings Standard Maintenance Revision Approved

ANSI and NISO voting members have approved a maintenance revision of ANSI/NISO Z39.71, Holding Statements for Bibliographic Items. The revision includes minor updates, corrections, and editorial clarifications that were identified during the systematic review of the standard. Among the changes are:

- References to USMARC updated to MARC 21
- Additional guidance on the use of punctuation and separation characters
- Additional guidance on the use of codes vs. textual values
- Updated and corrected examples

Download Z39.71 from: http://www.niso.org/standards
By some recent measures the amount of funding that is being earmarked toward electronic resources in libraries has surpassed 35% and is well on its way to 50% of material acquisition budgets. With this in mind, launching a NISO seminar on Managing Electronic Collections was well timed and extremely well received.

One hundred and eighteen librarians, publishers, and automation vendors gathered in Denver, Colorado, from September 28 to 30, 2006 to listen to compelling presentations from industry leaders on a wide range of topics related to electronic collections. Held at the Magnolia hotel in its playfully decorated ballroom, the seminar touched on topics from usage statistics to repositories and from electronic resource management (ERM) systems to licensing terms.

The sessions were split into three broad topics, roughly grouped on each of the three days, with the first day centered on the user and the measurement of user experiences. The second day was focused on repositories, support systems, and rights management issues. The final day concentrated on exposing collections and maximizing their use.

The meeting was launched with an introduction and welcome by Carl Grant, President and COO of VTLS and Chair of the NISO Board of Directors. Carl summarized the changes that have been taking place within NISO over the past year, highlighting the increased pace of standards development and the new leadership. Carl’s remarks were followed by a brief welcome by NISO’s new Managing Director, Todd Carpenter.

Marshall Breeding, Director for Innovative Technologies and Research for the Jean and Alexander Heard Library at Vanderbilt University, opened the seminar’s presentations with a lively exploration of the users who are beginning to fill libraries, colleges, and universities: The Millenial Generation. This generation has grown up with computer technology, particularly the Internet. While they have extremely high competency in search tools and web resources, they also present a number of challenges for library professionals and should be seen as a bell-weather for the types of services that future library patrons will demand. Collections need to be shaped in a way that satisfies these greater demands. While Baby Boomers and Gen X’ers are happier with traditional forms of content and existing modes of service, Millennials will quickly move on to non-library information sources and services if not readily satisfied. This will force librarians to improve their services in order to remain a primary resource for these users. Specifically, Marshall highlighted several ways that these new users’ expectations are driven by their experience using the web. Their familiarity with navigating and dealing with complex information resources has led to a low tolerance for “clunky” and poorly designed websites. Conventional library service, however, requires interactions with many interfaces and resources, often in different locations. Librarians must begin developing the next generation of library interfaces based on discovery environments that are more comprehensive, with better tools, more powerful search functionality, and more elegant presentation. While many libraries are experimenting with these systems, the key to success will be to draw the new generation to library content and services without breaking what works well for those from previous generations. Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of users begin their searching with commercial search engines, the destination should often be the library resources and the library should focus on delivery of those resources. Another key to this success will be tying the local resources into the larger search environment. Readyling library collections for this shift requires more than a “cosmetic touch-up” and this need should prompt institutions to accelerate the work that is already under way.

Following the opening presentation, Denise Davis, Director of the Office for Research & Statistics at the American Library Association, presented Measuring Your Performance to Communicate Your Story. Denise summarized data collection metrics and performance measures in library settings and highlighted three organizations that have used analysis of their operations to significantly enhance the recognition of their work. The Southern Maryland Regional Library Association, Inc. used its 2003 Customer Survey of Maryland Residents About Libraries to obtain state legislative action that added $1 per resident per annum over three years to state aid to public libraries. NISO is currently working to update its Z39.7, Information Services and Use: Metrics & Statistics for Libraries and Information Providers – Data Dictionary standard to include library performance measures.

One specific type of library metrics is electronic information usage statistics, discussed in the next two portions of the day with an introduction to using Project COUNTER data and a Solutions Forum on how organizations use COUNTER statistics to improve their operations.

Peter Shepherd, Project Director of Project COUNTER, reviewed the organization’s mission to develop Codes of Practice to enable credible, compatible, and consistent
publisher/vendor-generated usage statistics for the global information community. Since its launch in 2002, Project COUNTER has seen rapid adoption of its first Code of Practice for Journals and Databases, release in 2003 and updated with Release 2 in 2006. COUNTER reports are now being issued by content providers for more than 60% of the articles covered in Science Citation Index. COUNTER is systematically extending the scope of its Codes of Practice both horizontally, to cover other content types such as e-books, and vertically, to provide more detailed statistics on journals. The Books and Reference Works Code of Practice was released in March of 2006.

The first Solutions Forum of the seminar built on the foundation of usage reporting with presentations of how organizations gather and analyze data to inform their operational decisions. Tim Jewell, Director of Information Resources, Collections and Scholarly Communication at the University of Washington Libraries, described their process and the associated challenges for gathering descriptive and usage data from two publishers. After gathering the data, a number of data elements are analyzed to evaluate titles, including price, rights, dates used, downloads, ILL and faculty requests, citation data, ISI impact factor, and trend data. Tim provided an example of one analytical approach on ranking the Priority of Titles Based on Use that was produced by Diane Carroll at the Oregon Health & Sciences University Library. He concluded with thoughts on the future of analysis in libraries based on the work of Dr. Scott Nicholson at Syracuse University and his articles on the Bibliomining process.

Next on the Solutions Forum panel was Kristen Fisher Ratan, Journal Products Manager at HighWire Press in the Stanford University Libraries, who explored a number of studies undertaken by HighWire Press and participating publishers on collection and usage data analysis. The first study she covered analyzed how usage of an article changes over time and showed a sharp decline in usage within days of publication. Another study, examining the question of whether early versions of an article diminish usage of the final version found little measurable difference in overall usage. Other analyses that individual publishers have undertaken include institutional usage on non-subscribed journals and referring URL data. Kristen ended with future directions that usage data analysis could take including: cross-library comparisons, tracking funding organizations, using usage data to inform the editorial process, capturing usage of dual-hosted content, and understanding individual user behaviors.

The last speaker on the Solutions Forum panel, Jason Price, Science Electronic Resources Librarian at The Claremont Colleges, spoke of the libraries’ application of usage data derived from the COUNTER Journal Report #1. Using the data from the report, Claremont Colleges attempts to answer four questions:

- Which titles should be in our collections?
- Which titles should we cancel?
- Which titles should we add?
- Is this collection a good value?

Jason presented compelling information on the price per use and comparative use data across journal and showed, for example, considerable variation between collections in the price per use of PDF and HTML versions of articles. Within a consortial environment, Claremont is also gathering data on usage of unsubscribed titles and benchmarking that data to make collection decisions. In order to more efficiently perform these analyses, Jason recommended some improvements to the COUNTER standards, including breaking out usage by paid units, such as back files or collections if the subscription is paid as such. Easy compilation of data across multiple years was also a key concern.

The panel on usage data was followed by another Solutions Forum on Visions of ERM, which explored the future applications of Electronic Resource Management systems. Ted Koppel, Verde Product Manager at Ex Libris led off the panel emphasizing that with the near universal acceptance of electronic resource search and delivery tools such as link resolvers and metasearch engines, ERM systems are now critical to the efficient management of e-resources. ERMs are, or will soon become, the library’s corporate memory for all factors related to electronic resources at all levels. In filling that role, ERMs become central to all process and all services within the library, including management not only of rights and use statistics but also financial management and reporting, order processing, report gathering and compilation, and workflow coordination. Although the shift away from print has created an evolutionary change in electronic-resource management systems, print-based systems will need to continue to inter-operate. In Ted’s view of the future, ERMs will feed just-in-time data to any public service applications, such as discovery, link resolvers, metasearch, and other library web applications. ERMs will eventually subsume—and then, expand on—large portions of acquisition and serials functionality and responsibility. Ted also proposed some possible standards that might facilitate ERM systems, including an IP registry to improve flow of address changes from library to vendor, a unique identifier for e-collections, and a standard relating to acquisition transactions.

Tina Feick, Vice President of Customer Relations at Swets Information Services echoed a similar theme, stressing the complexity of new publisher pricing models and packages, licensing and rights management, and open access as several areas that present new challenges in providing comprehensive electronic access. Libraries lack the time and resources to manage all of these
processes and the difficulty is compounded by a lack of overall standards, consistency, and transparency. From Tina’s perspective, subscription agents are facilitators of the whole e-resource supply chain, serving as a neutral party serving the needs of both libraries and publishers by providing essential information and support of e-resources to facilitate greater efficiency and improved access. Key among the services that feed into ERM systems are tools to improve selection, seamless ordering, registration, activation, and renewal as well as improved data exchange between publishers and ERM systems.

The next segment of the day was an introduction to the Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI) given by the co-chairs of the SUSHI working group: Adam Chandler, Information Technology Librarian at Cornell University Library, and Oliver Pesch, Chief Architect and Senior Vice President at EBSCO Information Services. SUSHI is a protocol that automates the retrieval of COUNTER reports and facilitates their integration into a library’s ERM system. Experience with the gathering of usage data has pointed to the fact that retrieval is the bottleneck preventing wider use of COUNTER reports since individual reports have to be separately retrieved from every content provider. SUSHI enables library systems to automate the regular collection of COUNTER usage reports from content providers that have installed SUSHI compliant servers. Broad adoption of this standard will help reduce the staff time at libraries needed to compile usage data and will improve the ability of institutions to more frequently analyze the use of electronic resources at their institutions. The SUSHI protocol was developed in only 14 months by a dedicated team of librarians, content providers, and ERM system vendors. The draft standard for trial use was released in September 2006 and has already seen several implementations.

The first day of the meeting ended with a discussion of usability testing presented by Andrea Jazpon, a PhD student at Drexel University. Andrea’s presentation was based on the application of usability analysis she performed while a consultant for the Goddard Space Flight Center.

Day two began with a lively presentation by Herbert Van de Sompel, Team Leader, Digital Library Research & Prototyping at the Los Alamos National Laboratory’s Research Library, entitled Exploring New Applications of Scholarly Usage Data. Herbert presented research conducted in conjunction with Dr. Johan Bollen that used item-level usage information to build better collections and improve recommender systems. Based on data gathered at LANL and nine other California State University libraries, the research project used data mining techniques to explore structural patterns in usage data based on the creation of item/agent networks. This research is part of a larger quest for alternative metrics, which are usage- and/or citation- based, to assess the impact of scholarly items and, by extension, their creators. Much like Amazon.com’s recommendation service, the LANL experiments explored structural quantification of user behavior data to provide recommendations of related content to the object a user had found using other search methods. The results of this analysis are not search results per se, but rather are the comparative results of activity by other users who accessed the same or similar content. The analysis provided an alternate measure of impact, based on social network status as opposed to simple hit-rate popularity. In addition to recommendations based on networks of use links, the results could also be used in collection management, in which clusters of related documents provide indicators of community interest. Further research on this topic will be conducted through 2009 by LANL and is funded by a grant from the Mellon foundation.

Repositories are becoming a common institutional feature these days and many in the audience indicated that their institution either had developed or would be developing a repository. The Solutions Forum panel presenting case studies on structured repositories included presentations from Leslie Johnston, Head, Digital Access Services at the University of Virginia Library, JoAnn Sears, Mathematics/Science Librarian, Shapiro Science Library at the University of Michigan, and Herbert Van de Sompel from LANL.

Leslie Johnston began the panel with an overview of the Fedora implementation that the University of Virginia is using for its repository. She discussed the workflow, policy, and content decisions that UVA has taken to implement the service, among them the foundation of a centralized Digital Library Production Service to handle new collection building, migrate legacy digital collections, and provide media conversion services for vendor supplied files and born-digital scholarship collected from faculty.

Herbert Van de Sompel focused his second presentation on the topic of the aDORe Effort at Los Alamos and the concept of a federation of institutional repositories that will allow for multiple, parallel applications on top of stored content. The goal is to create an environment that provides for a uniform approach for ingesting, storing, and disseminating data collections as well as to guarantee long-term accessibility of stored content. By using a highly modular, standards- and protocol-based structure, the system can easily ingest and format collections for broad dissemination and management.

JoAnn Sears rounded out the panel on repositories with a case study of the University of Washington’s Deep Blue project and its use of subject selector participation in the project. Based on the D-Space platform developed by MIT, the collection launched in May of 2006. In its first
few months, the project has grown modestly through the participation of approximately 50 selectors working on 20 collections. At the time of the presentation, the collection contained roughly 32,000 items of varied scope from University of Michigan College of Engineering Technical Reports to Transportation Research Institute and Biological Research Station papers. In addition to promotion, one of the key roles of selectors is the facilitation of copyright arrangements. UM has gone so far as hiring an Intellectual Property Rights Specialist in the Library to help field questions regarding copyright.

A growing issue related to the proliferation of institutional repositories and the practice of authors posting content to their own websites is the topic of Journal Article Versions. Peter McCracken, cofounder, Director of Electronic Content Management at Serials Solution presented the work currently underway by the joint NISO/ALPSP working group on article versions. Chaired by Cliff Morgan at John Wiley & Sons, the committee began work in September of 2005 and is nearing the completion of a document defining and scoping the various versions of articles that may exist. At present, the committee has identified five key stages in the publication process stage: Author’s Original, Accepted Manuscript, Proof, Version of Record, and Updated Version of Record. As an article goes through these steps, “value” is added at each stage. Agreeing on this common terminology should alleviate some of the confusion among authors, librarians, and users about what is meant by each type of article and when an article version may appear.

The second half of the day was a practicum on managing rights and license information. A License Expression Working Group (LEWG), jointly sponsored by NISO, the Digital Library Federation (DLF), EDItEUR, and Publishers Licensing Society (PLS) are currently exploring methods and structures for the automated exchange of license information.

Karen Coyle, a Digital Library Consultant began the practicum by providing a background on the current state of copyright and some of the challenges faced by librarians, particularly surrounding materials published between 1908 and the 1940’s when works may or may not be in the public domain. Despite these difficulties, it is critical that consistent metadata be provided with electronic versions of content. The key data elements in the structure proposed by the LEWG included: creator(s), rights holder(s), publishing information, and creation information. The issues of dealing with unknown or unspecified information are also critical and are being explored.

Nathan D.M. Robertson, Electronic Resources Librarian at the University of Maryland, Thurgood Marshall Law Library, gave a perspective on the issue of rights management from the librarian’s point of view. Of particular interest was the issue of ambiguity in licensing terms where some terms and allowances are deliberately left vague and are thus open to interpretation. Systems that manage rights information might not be capable of addressing such ambiguity.

Sylvia Bonadio, Senior Licensing Manager/Library Relations at Springer provided the publisher’s perspective on licensing and rights information, describing the process by which orders and licenses are created and managed within her organization. Many challenges exist in the development and negotiation of a site license for digital content, including inter-departmental involvement of marketing, sales, legal, and customer service functions. Additionally, maintenance and renewal of those terms can be an administrative burden. Springer is developing an integrated document management system that will help to facilitate the storage and retrieval of license information, but owing to the complexity and detail for each customer’s record, standardization of the process is unlikely to happen quickly or easily – despite the quite obvious need. XML as a medium of exchange for license information has several advantages including the ability to encode common clauses, deal parameters, and links to actual license text. Sylvia’s view was that publishers would take up the LEWG proposals if rewarded by better dissemination of, and compliance with, their license terms.

Following Sylvia’s presentation, the three panelists engaged in a roundtable discussion of the many issues covered during the afternoon session. Led by Todd Carpenter, topics such as Creative Commons and Open Access rights were discussed. A spirited exchange centered on the future work of the License Expression Working Group and the widespread acceptance of the electronic encoding of licensing terms.

The last day of the seminar began with a keynote by Mike Teets, Vice President, OCLC Global Product Architecture on the topic of Exposing Collections and Maximizing Use. Mike’s presentation summarized lessons from OCLC’s Open WorldCat experience and incorporated some results of the OCLC report, Perception of Library and Information Resources. The data from the report pointed to the trend away from libraries and library systems toward Internet search engines as the primary point of departure for most students’ research. While library systems tended to rank highly in terms of trustworthiness, they are often trumped by the speed and convenience of search engines. Of particular interest in Mike’s presentation was data on the actions of users following the search of a topic. A 2005 IDC.com white paper indicated information professionals spent 9.5 hours searching and 9.5 analyzing, of which 3.5 hours of each task is wasted in not finding the information that was being searched. This is borne out by the post-search activity of users of OCLC’s WorldCat. Users click
through to some version of the content they were searching for after only about 50,000 of the more than 1,000,000+ displays of search results. More than 80% of users go on to perform another search, indicating they were unable to find that information they were seeking or that the information was not in a readily available inter-linked format. This presents significant issues with the level of customer service that institutions are providing.

The last session of the conference was a Solutions Forum on opening collections via web services and other tools. Web services can help to make collections available where users are working, often when that is outside the walls of an institution. Web services can be used to integrate multiple collections, content, or services into seamless offerings.

Candy Zemon, Senior Product Strategist at Polaris Library Systems began the forum with a discussion of web services in a library context. She provided some background of the work done to this point, both by NISO and the World Wide Web Consortium, focusing on the former VIEWS project that was superseded by the NISO Web Services and Practices working group. Web services tend to be lightweight and dynamic, and are generally specific to a context between two applications. Many applications from search and delivery to order and fulfillment information can be exchanged using web services. In order for these systems to be “plug and play” and operable in many different types of organizations, they must rely on broad adoption and adherence to standards. The working group’s guidelines are documented in the NISO Recommend Practice, Designing Web Services in the Library Context, published in the summer of 2006.

The second forum speaker was Tim Bucknall, Assistant Director at the Jackson Library and Head, Information Technologies and Electronic Resources at the University of North Carolina in Greensboro. His presentation on Drawing Users in by Maximizing Web Connections to your E-resources offered data affirming the success of a strategy to use context-sensitive linking and display that brings library resources to the user’s web page at the time of need. Building on UNC Greensboro’s implementation of the BlackBoard system, the library is using web services and standards to serve simultaneously targeted content from the library’s collections. Tim described many of the pros of using web services for this integration, including the modular design, and the expandable nature of the tools. The services are also relatively portable, cheap, and seamless allowing the placement of context sensitive library resources in highly trafficked areas. However, there were also a number of cons to this approach, which made the implementation difficult. The services required significant content management and the use of non-library developers and expertise to launch.

Wrapping up the solutions forum on web services, and the seminar as a whole, was Leslie Johnston, Head, Digital Access Services at the University of Virginia Library. Leslie introduced the DLF Aquifer initiative, a collaborative effort among some Digital Library Federation (DLF) members to develop and test a suite of library tools and services for faculty and graduate student researchers. Aquifer inter-operates with institutional repositories, content management systems, e-learning systems and citation management systems supporting a wide entire range of library and academic services.

The Managing Electronic Collections seminar was supported through the generous sponsorship of several organizations, for which NISO is extremely grateful. Amigos Library Services, the Bibliographical Center for Research (BCR), and PALINET co-sponsored the seminar. The Solutions Forums were sponsored by Ex Libris, Swets Information Services, and Thomson Scientific. OCLC and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) sponsored the evening receptions and Innovative Interfaces sponsored the breaks during the meeting. Electronic copies of all of the presentations are available via the NISO website at http://www.niso.org/news/events_workshops/Collections-06-Agenda.html. Audio recordings of the meeting are also available for purchase by contacting the NISO office.

**NCIP Implementers Group Meeting Report**

by Candy Zemon

The NCIP Implementers’ Group devoted a full two and one half days, in Denver on September 25-27, 2006, to grappling with a list of eight broad issues, each of which either hinders or is perceived to hinder the spread of implementation of the NCIP protocol. The eight points identified prior to the meeting through email discussion and other input were:

1. Extension mechanism
2. Smaller messages, more efficient information exchange
3. Replace the dtd with the schema
4. Reduce the transport options
5. Fix defects that have been reported
6. Reduce number of profiles: fewer and simpler profiles, either along the current three-pronged model or along services (authenticate, request, etc.)
7. Better implementers’ guides posted prominently
8. Investigate scope of adding ILL functionality

The issues, which range from complexity and fragmentation of documentation to technical issues such as extension mechanisms, were further developed during
Displaying commendable zeal, the group discussed, broke into small groups to address aspects of specific issues, shared and informed, received comments, and took on action items—all in the service of dealing with the identified speed bumps.

The NCIP protocol is implemented (in test or in production at customer sites) by 80% of the companies represented at the meeting, representing a total of many individual libraries. The combined experience of this group has isolated several issues that need to be addressed so that ongoing implementations can proceed apace. Input from various library and corporate venues had identified a further number of issues perceived to be barriers by potential implementers of NCIP. The group systematically looked at each of the eight issues, seeking solutions or proposing specific research to determine appropriate solutions. Various group members volunteered to do research, to write proposals to be posted on the email list for discussion, and to work with small groups to hammer out documentation of various sorts to be made available to current and potential implementers as well as to interested parties in general. A follow-up phone call in November will focus on progress on these action items.

The group’s work on identified hurdles, real and perceived, comes at a time when the NCIP protocol documents (Z39.83) are approaching their 5-year reaffirmation cycle. As the group solidifies proposed approaches to the problems discussed, the output of those proposals will be presented in a manner to aid orderly consideration of reaffirmation. There will be an accompanying plan indicating the phases and specific milestones foreseen in the upcoming year or two.

In a separate smaller meeting a group of interested parties continued a discussion held at previous meeting on the potential of policy exchange transactions. Work on use cases to be undertaken over the next several weeks will inform the subsequent approach to a mechanism to provide support for hypothetical checkout transactions, policy information harvesting, and automated request deflection capabilities.

In short, the Denver meeting was very productive. The group worked through detailed consideration of the troublesome areas and is now tasked with producing specific proposals and documents for further discussion on its email list. Transition to the new maintenance agency (Envisionware) is underway. A mid-March face-to-face meeting in Atlanta is planned.

### DAISY Consortium Updates Digital Talking Book DTDs

The DAISY Consortium, the maintenance agency for ANSI/NISO Z39.86, Specifications for the Digital Talking Book, has announced maintenance updates to two XML Document Type Definitions (DTD) that accompany the standard. The dtbook DTD has been updated to resolve several issues submitted by implementers, and the new DTD for dtbsmill has corrected a minor issue. The updates are fully compliant with the current version of the standard and do not impact content produced under the previous versions of the DTDs. Developers of new content are encouraged to utilize the updated files.

The DAISY Consortium provides an extensive support website for the standard, which includes both the updated and the previous DTDs. An online form is available for implementers to submit any issues. All issues and their current status or resolution are posted to the website. A future directions page lists approved requests for inclusion in the next revision of the standard.

The new DTDs are available from: [http://www.daisy.org/](http://www.daisy.org/)
## In Development

Listed below are the NISO working groups that are currently developing new or revised standards, recommended practices, or reports. Refer to the NISO website (www.niso.org/committees/) for links to each group’s webpage, which contain member lists, minutes, and working documents.

DSFTU stands for Draft Standard for Trial Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKING GROUP</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Identifiers</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chair: R. P. Channing Rodgers</td>
<td>Pre-standards research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Rights Expression</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chair: Denise Troll Covey</td>
<td>Pre-standards research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange of Serial Subscription Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;Joint Working Project with EDItEUR&lt;br&gt;Co-Chairs: Priscilla Caplan, Richard Gedye</td>
<td>Field testing&lt;br&gt;Serial Release Notification (SRN), v 0.91&lt;br&gt;Serials Products and Subscriptions (SPS), v 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>License Expression</strong>&lt;br&gt;Joint project with DLF, EDItEUR, and PLS&lt;br&gt;Co-Chairs: Nathan Robertson, Alicia Wise</td>
<td>In development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metasearch Initiative TG1, Access Management</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chair: Mike Teets</td>
<td>Working with Shibboleth project to incorporate metasearch requirements into the next version of the Shibboleth specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metasearch Initiative TG3, Search / Retrieve</strong>&lt;br&gt;Co-Chairs: Katherine Kott, Sara Randall</td>
<td>Field testing the NISO Metasearch XML Gateway (MXG) protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networked Reference Services</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chair: Sally H. McCallum</td>
<td>Z39.90 – 200X, Question/Answer Transaction Protocol&lt;br&gt;To be issued as a NISO Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFID</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chair: Vinod Chachra</td>
<td>In development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Versions of Journal Articles</strong>&lt;br&gt;Joint project with ALPSP&lt;br&gt;Chair: Cliff Morgan</td>
<td>In development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## New Recommended Practices

NISO Recommended Practices are “best practices” or “guidelines” for methods, materials, or practices in order to give guidance to the user. These documents usually represent a leading edge, exceptional model, or proven industry practice. All elements of Recommended Practices are discretionary and may be used as stated or modified by the user to meet specific needs. They are available for free download from the NISO website (www.niso.org).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NISO RP 2006-01</td>
<td>Best Practices for Designing Web Services in the Library Context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEARNING LINKS

Introducing unAPI
Discusses a method for extending the ‘clipboard’ copy-and-paste paradigm onto the Web to support the reuse of library information in Web 2.0-style services.
http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue48/chudnov-et-al/

A Metadata Schema Registry as a Tool to Enhance Metadata Interoperability
Describes the basic requirements and functions for a metadata schema registry. Discusses an experimental metadata schema-driven software tool generator.

METS Implementation Meeting: JCDL 2006 Workshop Report
Report of a workshop for METS implementers to share experiences, discuss issues, and provide feedback on continuing development of this metadata standard.
http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july06/hoebelheinrich/07hoebelheinrich.html

OpenSearch and SRU: A Continuum of Searching
Describes a method for exposing library content to metasearch engines through a local search interface. Includes discussion of the NISO Metasearch XML Gateway.
http://www.al.org/ala/lita/litapublications/ital/252006/number3september/2503sept.htm

Repository Librarian and the Next Crusade: The Search for a Common Standard for Digital Repository Metadata
Los Alamos National Lab project to develop a standards-based digital research repository. Compares five metadata standards considered for use in the project.
http://dlib.ejournal.ascc.net/dlib/september06/goldsmith/09goldsmith.html

ShibboLEAP: Seven Libraries and a LEAP of Faith
Martin Moyle. Ariadne, Issue 48, Summer 2006
Describes the ShibboLEAP Project, in which seven University of London institutions implement the Shibboleth authentication protocol. Identifies critical success factors and challenges for implementers.
http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue48/moyle/

Standards for the Electronic Expression of Licensing Terms
BIC/EDITEUR Seminar, July 5, 2006.
Presentation slides from the seminar addressing the issues of why to express licensing terms electronically, benefits for libraries and publishers, ONIX for Licensing and JISC PALS 2 projects, ERM systems use of license terms, and tools.
http://www.bic.org.uk/events-news.html#1

Why Metadata Matters
Introduces basic metadata concepts and explains metadata’s role in records and information management. Provides metadata schema and standards sources.

CALENDAR

November 2006

November 2-3  Discovery to Delivery
a NISO Workshop
Beltsville, MD

November 3  NISO Annual Meeting
(following the workshop)
Beltsville, MD

December 2006

December 19  ONIX Publisher License System Implementation Workshop
Boston, MA

January 2007

January 12  NISO Board of Directors Meeting
Washington, D.C.

January 22  NISO sessions at ALA Midwinter
Seattle, WA