

REPORT TO MLA BOARD

- I. DATE - May 7, 2021
- II. NAME OF COMMITTEE – National Information Standards Organization (NISO)
- III. MEMBERS – Nara Newcomer, NISO Representative; Kimmy Szeto, alternate NISO Representative
- IV. BOARD ACTION REQUIRED
 - None
- V. BRIEF SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES
 - This report contains all votes since 2020-09 due to Nara missing the 2020-03 report. All reporting is now up to date.
 - Kimmy Szeto is now fully onboarded and active as the alternate rep.
 - We voted “revise” on Systematic Review - ISO 9230:2007, Determination of price indexes for print and electronic media. Notated music & AV are apparently excluded from this standard and we do not recommend inclusion. We do recommend revision to clarify that notated music and AV are excluded. Thank you to Paul Cary, Notes Contributing Editor for Music Price Index for valuable input on price indexes for music materials. Whether this standard is indeed revised will depend on votes of other NISO members. Voting closes 5/17/2021.
 - Michelle Urberg continues to represent the music and AV communities on [NISO's Video & Audio Metadata Guidelines Working Group](#). The WG is currently discussing use cases for transferring metadata. Geoffrey Wood, Metadata Librarian, Rutgers University Libraries resigned the WG due to increased job responsibilities.
 - NISO released their [2020-2023 strategic plan](#)
 - NISO released a revised version of its recommended practice: [RP-19-2020, Open Discovery Initiative: Promoting Transparency in Discovery](#).
 - Appendix 1 contains NISO's response to comments we made on [Revised NISO Open Discovery Initiative Recommended Practice](#) during the public comment period
 - Appendix 2 – a separate spreadsheet - contains a record of all ballots cast since 9/2020, in an updated format. Ballots with MLA relevance include text in the “Comments to MLA” column. The “formal comments” column contains official comments submitted as part of the voting process.
- VI. IMPLICIT BIAS TESTING REPORTING
 - Both the representative and alternate have completed implicit bias testing/training.

Respectfully submitted,

Nara Newcomer, MLA Representative to NISO

Kimmy Szeto, MLA Alternate Representative to NISO

(Appendix 1 follows. Appendix 2 is a separate Excel spreadsheet)

Appendix 1: Replies to earlier comments and voting pools joined

NISO responded to comments Nara made on [Revised NISO Open Discovery Initiative Recommended Practice](#) during public comment period:

- Comment 988: 3.2.1.2 p. 17, Table 2,
 - Row: Full Text Flag
 - Row: Open Access Designation
 - (I presume the examples in table 2 are intended as models, not just descriptive of what providers actually do even if their practice does not match NISO standards?)
 - Table 1 on p. 15 states that "if an item is open access, this status should be indicated with "free to read" and otherwise left blank."
 - The Open Access Designation row does not follow Table 1's recommendations. The Open Access Designation row contains 4 instances of "N", one instance of blank, and one instance of "free_to_read". Table 1's instructions dictate either "free_to_read" or blank. "N" is not an option.
 - Proposed solution: Complete the Open Access Designation row boxes with either "free_to_read" or "blank" as dictated in Table 1.
 - NISO response: Thank you for your feedback. The ODI Standing Committee has added the updated Table 2 to reflect this feedback.
- Comment 987: 3.2.1.2 p. 17, Table 2,
 - Row: Full Text Flag
 - Column: Media Content Recording
 - (I presume the examples in table 2 are intended as models, not just descriptive of what providers actually do even if their practice does not match NISO standards?)
 - The full text flag is blank. It should be filled in. Table 1 on p. 15 states that "Full Text Flag" should indicate whether "for non-print-media, a full-length or high resolution version" is available to the DSP for the purpose of indexing.
 - Proposed solution: Fill in the Full Text Flag row for the Media Content Recording column. It should probably be "Y" since Alexander Street Press generally includes the entire recording.
 - NISO response: Thank you for your feedback. The ODI Standing Committee has added the updated Table 2 to reflect this feedback.
- Comment 986:
 - Glad to see a reference to the Music Discovery Requirements (MDR) on p. 11. I worked on both versions of the MDR and I am the Music Library Association representative to NISO. There is now a new version of the MDR, see recommended update info below.
 - Link to the revised (current) Music Discovery Requirements at: https://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/BlankCustom.asp?page=mdr_es
 - update the text to reflect the current version. Suggestion:
 - The Music Discovery Requirements "explores discovery needs specific to and especially important for music materials, particularly scores and recordings. Music materials pose unique demands that must be considered for successful discovery." First released 2012, with a revised version released 2017, with official support and endorsement from the

Music Library Association. ?Discusses the issues? and when possible gives concrete recommendations for display and indexing. Two appendices compile technical details of the specific indexing recommendations in spreadsheets.?

- NISO response: Thank you for your feedback. The ODI Standing Committee has added the updated the Music Discovery Requirements to reflect this feedback: The Music Discovery Requirements "explores discovery needs specific to and especially important for music materials, particularly scores and recordings. Music materials pose unique demands that must be considered for successful discovery." First released 2012, with a revised version released 2017, with official support and endorsement from the Music Library Association. The document discusses the issues and when possible gives concrete recommendations for display and indexing. Two appendices compile technical details of the specific indexing recommendations in spreadsheets.