

**Proposal for Ballot by NISO Voting Members****Ballot Dates: December 19, 2007 – January 18, 2008****If approved, this proposal will result in the formation of a new NISO Working Group.****NISO Proposed Work Item on Institutional Identifiers****Work Item Title: Develop a standard for Institutional Identification in the publishing and library environment****Short Name: SINPLE (Please suggest alternatives)****Suggested alternative: Digital Identifiers For Institutions & Libraries (DIFIL)****Background and Problem Statement:**

Many transactions take place in the supply chain between libraries and their content providers. In the electronic era any mistake in these transactions may lead to the customers not receiving their content. One of the major issues is the lack of a common way of identifying the institution with its multiplicity of libraries, departments, campuses or offices.

There are two main initiatives currently under way, one led by libraries the other by publishers. The library initiative is the WorldCat Registry, which seeks to identify the world's libraries and collect information about them; the other is Ringgold's Identify which has identified institutions which subscribe to academic journals. Hosting services, such as Atypon, have also proposed a central registry of IP addresses.

The Journal Supply Chain Efficiency Improvement Pilot (JSCEIP), originally constituted as HighWire Press, HighWire publishers, the British Library, Swets, and Ringgold, initiated a Project to look at the supply chain and the uses of an institutional identifier in that chain. Part of the work has shown that it would improve efficiency but that implementation will require work from all parties and a commitment by all parties to use such an identifier. It has also been shown that there are many more players involved in the supply chain than originally thought.

One main issue is the question of what metadata should be collected with the identifier and what uses can be made of that metadata. A minimum set of data is required as criteria for unique identification, other data may be used to support the business models of respective organizations. Privacy and security issues will also need to be considered.

The institutions and their metadata represent a highly volatile data set. In the existing Ringgold Identify database, for example, approximately 30% of the records are changed in some way every year. While the options for maintaining local data remain the responsibility of the owning agency (in this case Ringgold), making such registry data available across heterogeneous systems requires identifiers that are based upon public standards. NISO has traditionally played a role in the promulgation of identifiers commonly used within the library and publishing communities, working both nationally and internationally

Other institutional identifiers exist for some of the transactions (e.g. SAN, IPEDS, GLN, MARC Org Code, ISIL) and there may be a need to look at the relationship of these identifiers to the work of this institutional identifier.

**Statement of Work:**

- Project Goals: To develop a standard which can be implemented in all library and publishing environments, and will meet the needs of the majority of participants. A corresponding goal would be to develop a business model for the maintenance of such a standard.
- Specific Deliverables and Objectives:
  - Background review of existing Institutional identifiers and their standards, including SAN, ISIL, MARC organization code, others.
  - A description of the identifier itself, the metadata associated with it, and the uses that can be made of that metadata.
  - A survey of the participants in the supply chain to expand the work done in the JSCEIP project in describing the benefits to the participants.
  - Establishing the options for the maintenance of the identifier and metadata and accessibility.
- Process: Appoint a Working Group to build a consensus from within the industry. Build a wider advisory group of all potential users of the identifier.

**Partners and Participation:**

The stakeholders include: libraries, information departments, academic administrators, publishers, aggregators, subscription agents, ERM vendors, fulfillment system vendors, manuscript submission vendors, CrossRef, bibliographic agencies, license negotiators, publishers' distributors, hosting services, database providers, citation services, OCLC, Ringgold.

Publishers are already using Ringgold's identifier for marketing, customer support, and manuscript systems (Open Access) and CrossRef will be using it for author attribution within the Author Registry (CrossReg). ERM vendors are looking to use the identifier when working with publishers to populate the holdings in the ERM. OCLC and Ringgold are working together to look at cross-working between the Ringgold database and WorldCat Registry.

The Working Group should include (at a minimum) librarian, subscription agent, publisher, ERM vendor, hosting service, OCLC, Ringgold.

**Timeline:**

- Appointment of Working Group or other Participants – 1 month
- Approval of initial Work Plan – 2 months
- Completion of Information Gathering – 4 months
- Completion of Initial Draft – 6 months
- Completion of Final Draft – 8 months
- Ballot Approval and Publication (For ANSI/NISO Standards) – 11 months

**Funding:**

Funding will be needed mainly for meetings, No external sources of funding have been approached.

Submitted by: Helen Henderson, Ringgold and members of the JSCEIP including Robert Jacobs, Swets, John Sack & Kristen Fisher Ratan, HighWire, Greg Malar, Rockefeller University Press and Chair ICEDIS, Richard Gedye, Oxford University Press and Chair COUNTER, Ruth Jones, British Library, Hazel Woodward, Cranfield University.