

KBART Phase III Proposal

Since the publication of the revised KBART Phase II Recommended Practice (RP) in 2014, the KBART Standing Committee has identified both needed clarifications and revisions to the KBART RP as well as substantial additions and new areas of work to cover.

KBART Explanation

KBART recommends best practices for the communication of electronic resource title list and coverage data from content providers to knowledge base (KB) developers. KBART specifies file format, delivery mechanisms, and fields to include, and it applies to both serials and monographs.

When the need for a group to work on KB data was identified in 2009, knowledge bases were primarily used in link resolvers, federated search, A-Z journal lists, etc. The products that use KB data have changed dramatically in the last decade. KBs now, in addition to link resolution, also provide the foundation for electronic resource management systems (ERMs), are used in conjunction with COUNTER data, provide rights/holdings information to discovery systems, provide data to library catalogs, and other uses. All of the major vendor products are also more widely adopted worldwide than during Phase I. KBART needs to iterate and evolve to better fulfill all of these needs and uses.

If a knowledge base contains inaccurate information or is not updated regularly, these varied discovery and management tools will fail. By providing a recommended practice for communicating information from content providers to knowledge base developers, KBART helps ensure the integrity and functionality of knowledge bases.

Problem Statement

Since the introduction of the KBART Phase II recommendation, various stakeholder communities have identified several needs:

- 1) The current Phase II RP only provides for serials and monographs. Content providers who need to include multimedia and other non-book/non-journal formats (videos, databases, blogs, websites, etc.) are forced to add a field to the end of their KBART file to identify such content, with no published recommendation on how to communicate this. At best this causes confusion; at worst content providers eliminate valuable data from their KBART title lists.
- 2) Since the Phase II RP was published, the Standing Committee has fielded many questions asking about various recommendations. The current Phase II RP is in need of edits and some re-work in order to better communicate the intent of some of the recommendations, to clarify uses with examples, and generally make it more readable and useful for the community.
- 3) The KBART Standing Committee and the KBART Automation groups' relationship with each other is unclear, and the library information community does not understand the distinctions between the two groups, or what unifies them. Additional concerns below highlight future research and work that may fall (at least in part) under the KBART umbrella that would further confuse the relationship if left unaddressed.
- 4) Currently the endorsement process only has one tier for content providers. The lack of a multitiered approach causes several issues:
 - a) Content providers who do achieve a "Gold Standard" should be rewarded, for which there is no provision in KBART Phase II.
 - b) Content providers who are unable to attain 100% compliance due to technical limitations (such as inability to provide a journal's title history) may be dissuaded from attempting endorsement, even though the KBART Standing Committee may have been willing to issue an endorsement.
 - c) It is not currently clear if knowledge base vendors can apply for endorsement or what standards should apply to them.
 - d) Adoption of KBART Automated reports is not considered in endorsement.
- 5) Global content has little support in KBART Phase II. KBART metadata does not identify translation of items or represent author names or item titles in multiple languages.
- 6) Some content providers ask if there is an XML schema for KBART data or would prefer to communicate the data in an XML format as opposed to text. The need for this varies among providers and content types. Examples of reasons that could be driving this request are multiple date ranges, multiple ISBNs, etc.

Additional Problems

The KBART Standing Committee has identified other problems in the industry that are related to information distributed to, or impacted by, knowledge bases. These problems stem both from new access models used by content providers and libraries and from the purpose and scope of knowledge bases having changed since the focus on the efficacy of knowledge bases that led to the creation of KBART a decade ago.

1. With KBART Automation, some of what KBART is used for by the industry falls outside of the original KBART mission statement as it was created back in KBART Phase I almost a decade ago. This is due to the natural growth and adoption of KBART over the years.
2. Hybrid open access at its core is article/chapter level data. KBART Phase II attempted to get around this by proposing a strict *paid vs. 100% free* decision in the `access_type` field, with a suggestion to use the “notes” field to indicate hybrid open access. When working with book/journal level data, as was the case with Phase II, it was out of scope to dictate what percentage of free content warrants the Hybrid OA indicator.
3. Article/chapter level access information. Content providers are beginning to sell content on an article and chapter level instead of the book and journal level. Currently KBART and knowledge bases do not have the ability to accept this data to allow customers to review and access content that is available to them. This particularly impacts information seeker/library patron/end user experience in library discovery systems, which use KB data for rights information. For example, when the KBART file shows full journal/title level access but the content provider has only sold partial access, the KBART listing is both incorrect and causes the user to see articles/chapters of content they do not have access to in their discovery search results.
4. There are many NISO and other affiliated/related groups that work on areas that are adjacent to, overlap, inform, or are dependent upon KBART. In these instances these groups should all collaborate on larger shared goals throughout their work cycles.

Statement of Work: Project Goals

Summary of project goals

1. Clarify the recommendations in the current RP
2. Improve and clarify the KBART endorsement process
3. Add support for additional content types, and expand support of existing content types
4. Improve the usefulness of KBART for non-English/European language content

5. Ensure the KBART mission statement accurately reflects the modern usage of KBART along with the needs of KBART Automation
6. Create a recommended roadmap for future NISO work to communicate article/chapter level data that would work in conjunction with KBART. The roadmap should include both future work needed and suggest who could work on this project

Details related to the above project goals

Areas of clarification and improvement to the existing KBART RP include:

- Gaps in coverage (including supplements)
- Title changes and title histories for serials, with respect to publisher ability to provide this data
- Expanded information on what file(s) to create and what metadata to include
- Clarifications and additional information on data fields, as identified by content providers, librarians, and the KBART Automation Working Group
- Handling of items withdrawn/no longer available for purchase
- More examples of correct implementation of the RP, preferably for every field or recommendation
- An overhaul of the endorsement process will be investigated:
 - Branding and focus of the program
 - Varying levels of endorsement
 - Endorsement of knowledge base vendors vs. content providers
 - Role of KBART Registry in the endorsement process, and its structure/presentation

The increase in popularity of non-textual content, and textual content that doesn't fit the traditional serial and monograph formats that the KBART Recommended Practice assumes, has led the Standing Committee to identify areas to cover in an expansion of KBART's recommendations. KBART can also be adapted to better support KBART Automation and, finally, to address issues in content discovery and access:

- Support of additional content types, both textual (blogs, transcripts, websites, manuscripts, datasets, etc.) and non-textual (audio, video, images, etc.)
- Improved support for global content, including those with non-Latin characters
 - Translated title
 - Transliterated title
 - Names of authors/editors
 - Language of content
- Addition of a document that serves as a guide to the files available from the provider and their attributes
- Inclusion of sample license language for support of KBART files and automation

- Investigate the reason for the ask of supporting other file formats for KBART besides tab-delimited text. Identify what the issues we are trying to resolve by adding alternative file formats.

Expanding the KBART Recommended Practice to cover more content types, global content, and methods of data transmission would make KBART more broadly applicable across the electronic content that libraries license and access. This would incentivize content providers to adopt the KBART RP. Additionally, it would provide guidance for content providers who are already using the KBART framework to transmit information for non-serial/monograph content.

Creating a solution for article/chapter level data is not solvable within KBART Phase III and may necessitate participation of other NISO working groups. However, any proposed solution needs to work in conjunction with KBART to avoid potential issues for KBART stakeholders, such as a KBART file providing incorrect title level data to Knowledge Bases or when customers use KBART to see what content they have access to (see section “Additional Problems”, point 3 above). As part of KBART Phase III a recommended roadmap will be created for what work needs to be done in the future; along with what groups and technical experts may be needed to accomplish this task.

Process

Generally the Standing Committee will meet via telephone and web conferencing to create the deliverables.

More specifically:

- Initial work: Form a series of subgroups to tackle deliverables in parallel
 - Create subgroup to analyze current landscape and make recommendations for scope of work (including distinctions between mere clarifications and substantive additions or revisions)
 - Create a subgroup to gather and document use cases
- Meet as group to discuss recommended solutions
- Make recommendations for addressing missing items
- Develop a specification
- Document the specification
- Circulate the specification as draft
- Obtain and review feedback
- Create final recommended practice
- Develop education and awareness documentation
- Create a recommendation for how adoption and compliance could be tracked—could be related to promotion and education

- Contribute to KBART web presence with FAQs, PPTs, etc.; determine the best location for such materials

Timeline

- Identify working areas and needed subgroups (1 month)
- Identify areas of expertise needed and recruit new members (1 month)
- Review/Outline Period (7 months total):
 - Research new recommendations needed for amending current KBART recommendation. Emphasis on what Providers currently send and what Knowledge Bases can utilize (4 months)
 - Subgroups to create outline of new recommendations, amending current format (3 months)
- Complete initial draft (2 months)
- Circulation of draft for 30-day public comment period (1 month)
- Initial coordination of marketing and education elements needed (3 months)
- Incorporate requests from public comments and complete the final draft for publication (2 months)

Total Time Projected: 17 months