

## NISO Plus - KBART Phase III: Unresolved Questions

11 February 2021

17 Participants - 9 Voted - 35 Cards - 2 Comments - 16 Votes

### How are you using KBART today?

I support publishers who need to make KBART data available to customers. (0 votes)

We (publisher) share KBART files with institutions subscribing to our content. We offer generic KBART files and customized files as well. (1 votes)

We (platform) provide KBART files in demand for libraries (0 votes)

As a content subscriber (library) we use KBART files to cross-check content coverage & verify our metadata, or to auto-load holdings into our Library Management System in order to enable discovery & access (2 votes)

#### Comments

- Same -- well put.

We (publisher) share KBART files with institutions subscribing to our content. It is uploaded every other month into our digital library (0 votes)

We are a publisher that creates KBART reports for every collection offered as a subscription as well as a global record for all those who have single title subscriptions. I also create custom reports on request. Each report is updated any time there is a change to our content offering. (when new volumes publish) (0 votes)

I'm with a content provider. We do not currently provide KBART complaint files. We have extensive information in our title lists. If my team has questions related to creating compliant lists, where do we turn? (0 votes)

we add holdings/update holdings in WorldCat via KBART (0 votes)

Identify non-KBART Content providers and provide the necessary support and assistance. (0 votes)

## **How would you like to use KBART that is not possible today?**

Would love to program automatic changes/updates to our KBART files. Currently we are updating them manually. (0 votes)

authority control fields for authors, e.g, ORCIDs (2 votes)

More automation. Cover content types not currently supported (0 votes)

Make connections to preceding/succeeding titles (0 votes)

Straightforward map/crosswalk to other schema for metadata (e.g. MARC or Dublin Core) (1 votes)

Identify and use effectively all possible key identifiers (Persistent identifiers etc.) (0 votes)

Linking related ISBNs. I wouldn't want it in KBART per se, but maybe an extension of KBART. (1 votes)

## **What additional content types do you wish KBART supported?**

More granular items, from book chapters and articles to 'non-standard' and unpublished materials such as archival materials, manuscripts and ephemera in digital archives. + audio-visual materials - huge demand for streaming media currently! (0 votes)

Video, Audio, archival materials, images, etc (3 votes)

I wonder about Conference materials.... some are audio, some video, some audio with slides. If they are treated just as their media type do they need to be considered a separate content type or do they then have a series or something that links them to the conference or paper etc. (0 votes)

### Comments

- Some are publishing packages of the materials from the conference

What about the newest media types: Simulations especially but there are AR and VR too (0 votes)

## **What additional fields would best support new content types?**

A "content\_type" field :) (1 votes)

Something to indicate OA status. There is the Access type field (Free or Paid) but could there be something at the journal/serial level for OA status? (4 votes)

content, carrier, media fields as per RDA standards - more description for non-traditional and unpublished content like archives and ephemera in digital collections - provenance (0 votes)

Additional contributor fields. For example, if video content types are added Director may be relevant. (0 votes)

KBART for standards (1 votes)

Duration, format, more granular content type (0 votes)

OA model or identifiers that consider that access to content is or can change. (0 votes)

if the meta data was generated only by machine learning (0 votes)

Relevant identifiers for AV and other nontextual formats. (0 votes)

If KBART is to cover more complex content types it will need to have a lot more fields for bibliographic description to handle the complexity of that content (0 votes)

Certainly OA status and machine generated books/journals related content type (future content types) (0 votes)

Accessibility compliance statement such as W3C Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI) (0 votes)

DOI (0 votes)

See Open Discovery Initiative Recommended Practice [https://groups.niso.org/apps/group\\_public/download.php/24113/NISO\\_RP-19-2020\\_ODI\\_Open\\_Discovery\\_Initiative.pdf](https://groups.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/24113/NISO_RP-19-2020_ODI_Open_Discovery_Initiative.pdf)

In particular pages 14-15 Table 1: Core metadata elements to be provided by content providers (0 votes)

As content types are added should we have dedicated KBART file for each content type for readability? (Columns depends on the content type) (0 votes)