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Based on a meeting at ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans on Sunday, June 26, 2011. Recognition of the following trends and issues:

- Emergence of Library Discovery Services solutions
  - Based on index of a wide range of content
  - Commercial and open access
  - Primary journal literature, ebooks, and more
- Adopted by thousands of libraries around the world, and impact millions of users
- Agreements between content providers and discovery providers ad-hoc, not representative of all content, and opaque to customers.
Goals of Working Group (2011-2014)

• Define ways for libraries to assess the level of content providers’ participation in discovery services
• Help streamline the process by which content providers work with discovery service vendors
• Define models for “fair” linking from discovery services to publishers’ content
• Determine what usage statistics should be collected for libraries and for content providers
What is the ODI Recommended Practice?

- A technical recommendation
- Assessment mechanism
- A model to enhance fair and unbiased indexing and linking
Why Does the ODI Recommended Practice Matter?

- Simplifies the process of data exchange between participating discovery vendors and content providers
- Ensures participating discovery vendors are following fair and unbiased indexing and linking practices
- Mitigates technical and legal issues that might hinder broader participation by content providers or potential discovery service creators
Recommended Practice

• *Open Discovery Initiative: Promoting Transparency in Discovery* (NISO RP-19-2014) - June 26\(^{th}\), 2014
  – Vocabulary
  – NISO Recommended Practice
  – Mechanisms to evaluate conformance with recommended practice
Vocabulary

1.2 Terms and Definitions – Key areas

- Search Models and Related Concepts
- Data Definitions
- Methods of Data Exchange
- Actors
- License Terms
Vocabulary (Examples)

• Central index
• Enhanced metadata
• Syndication
• Content provider
• Market product
Recommended Practices

3.1 General

- **Oversight Group** – education, promotion, ongoing discussion
- **Conformance Disclosure** – via checklists included in the best practice
Recommended Practices
3.2 Content Providers

• **Participation** — provide core metadata and full-text/original content, as well as full text and enriched content

• **Core metadata elements** — basic citation metadata (author, title, publisher, date, type, format, etc)

• **Enriched content** — indexing data (A&I data like subject headings), full text or transcript, abstracts/description

• **Disclosure** — provide information to libraries related to level of participation

• **Technical formats** — use existing standards to facilitate data exchange
Recommended Practices

3.3 Discovery Service Providers

- **Disclosure** – provide key information in a consistent, usable form to libraries about content indexed to facilitate evaluation

- **Linking** – linking and relevancy methods should not introduce bias to particular content providers; libraries should determine linking choices; annual disclosure related to neutrality

- **Data transfer** – use existing protocols and provide documentation, preferences, and indication on impact on different processes to content providers
Recommended Practices

3.4 Usage Statistics

Provide simple and frequent statistics to content providers
- Total number of searches
- Result clicks
- Total number of click-throughs

Provide simple and frequent statistics to libraries
- Total number of searches per month
- Total number of unique visitors per month
- Total number of click-throughs per month
- Top 500 search queries for the last period
- Top 100 referring URLs to the discovery service for the last period
ODI Standing Committee

• Formed summer of 2014.
• Following the [ODI Recommended Practice](#) document as our guide, this standing ODI committee has the following responsibilities:
  – to promote educational opportunities about adoption of these recommended practices
  – to provide support for content providers and discovery providers during adoption (including championship of self-check conformance lists)
  – to provide a forum for ongoing discussion related to all aspects of discovery platforms for all stakeholders (content providers, discovery providers, libraries), and
  – to determine timing for next steps for ongoing work
# ODI Standing Committee Roster

## Libraries
- Marshall Breeding, Independent Consultant
- Ken Chad, Ken Chad Consulting, Ltd.
- Laura Morse, Harvard University
- Jason Price, SCELC
- Ken Varnum, University of Michigan

## Publishers
- Lettie Conrad, SAGE Publications
- Susan Hillson, APA
- Karen McKeown, Cengage Learning
- Elise Sassone, Springer
- Julie Zhu, IEEE

## Service Providers
- Scott Bernier, EBSCO Information Services
- Rachel Kessler, Ex Libris
- Mike Showalter, OCLC
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# Conformance Disclosure

## Content Provider Conformance Checklist – Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N/P</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Provider makes available to Discovery Service Providers core metadata</td>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and underlying full-text/original content for complete offerings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Provider makes available to Discovery Service Providers, the core</td>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>set of metadata elements (see 3.2.1.2) for each item submitted for indexing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Provider provides the content item and additional descriptive content</td>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for as much of their content as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Provider provides libraries, on request, with a statement of</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation in the discovery services, including disclosure of coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>depth and content depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Provider’s agreements with Discovery Service Providers do not</td>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>include non-disclosure agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The transfer of Content Provider’s data to Discovery Service Providers makes</td>
<td>3.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use of existing standards where applicable and uses one of the metadata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encoding schemes listed in 3.3.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Discovery Service Conformance Checklist – Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N/P</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Service provides content listing for library customers</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking</td>
<td>Discovery Service does not discriminate among Content Providers contributing to the service.</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanisms are offered to enable libraries to establish preferences regarding which platforms to present to users as link targets, and in what order or priority.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Service confirms with non-bias with regard to content indexed and results presented to the user. A statement in this regard is published annually.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Service uses an algorithm that is non-preferential with regard to the Content Provider for generating result sets, relevance rankings, and link order.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link presentation associated with a given result is configurable by libraries.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Why Should Libraries Care about ODI?

**CONTENT, CONTENT, CONTENT**

Discovery system can only be effective if the depth and breadth of indexed content matches the libraries collections

- If discovery systems do not get timely feeds of rich metadata/full text from content providers, libraries are not able to expose their collections to users.

- All content providers (including aggregators) need to provide rich quality data to all discovery systems equally!
Why Should Content Providers/Aggregators Care?

**USE, USE, USE**

If content is not “findable” via library “front door”, access and use will go down.

- Much use of discovery systems is for known item searching.
- If not included in discovery, serendipitous exposure of materials in native platforms is missed, which may impact development of advanced information seeking skills.
Why Should Discovery Service Providers Care about ODI?

- Standard way to deliver metadata to discovery services providers
- Standard for (core) metadata elements included in discovery services content providers
Current Initiatives

- Abstracting & Indexing Service Outreach
- Library Advocacy
- Conformance Statement Support
- Discovery Service Outreach
Q: What can libraries do to ensure that discovery services meet user and institutional needs?
A: A lot!

Q: What can libraries do to ensure that Licensed Content is available discovery systems?
A: A lot!

www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/library_talking_points/
How to Leverage ODI for Your Library

**Discovery Providers**
- Selecting a discovery service provider
- Configuring your discovery service provider
- Advocating for discovery service provider conformance with ODI

**Content Providers**
- Advocating for additional content
- Optimizing configuration of each content provider
- Advocating for content provider conformance with ODI
ODI Participation


- On the web: [http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi](http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi)

- Help with Conformance Checklist: [http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/conformance](http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/conformance)


- Twitter: [@NISO_ODI](https://twitter.com/NISO_ODI)

- Via email, subscribe: [http://www.niso.org/lists/opendiscovery/](http://www.niso.org/lists/opendiscovery/)
Your Questions & Comments

Thank you!

Ken Varnum
varnum@umich.edu
@varnum
Thank you for attending this ALCTS program

Your feedback is important to us!

Please take a moment to complete a short online evaluation form at the URL below:

http://tinyurl.com/alctsaac16