



KBART Monitoring Group Report

February 2009

1. Report

Some considerable time has been spent editing the report. We now have a clear structure and several completed sections but the editing process has (as expected) raised several issues that require further discussion, whether in terms of agreeing what will and won't be included in this phase I report, or the precise details of the recommendations that we will make. We think it's important to take our time at this point to ensure that we are providing guidelines that will both resolve the problems we've identified but will also be achievable and supported by the stakeholders we are addressing.

The report encompasses the more fundamental recommendations from the original research report from which KBART was developed, including:

- File format
- Mandatory and optional fields
- Common approaches for presenting data within fields
- Handling of packages
- Frequency of data update
- Collection mechanism

2. Testing

A selection of volunteer stakeholders will soon begin testing the report's recommendations to check that what we believe will work in theory does actually work (and make a difference) in practice.

3. PR

KBART's authority is already being recognised both as we speak at conferences and as members are consulted for advice by others in the community. Lately, we've spoken at:

- Charleston (November 08)
- Online Information (December 08)
- ALA Midwinter (January 09)
- ER&L (February 09)

Forthcoming presentations include:

- Council of Science Editors (March 09)
- [ACRL](#) (March 09)
- [UKSG](#) (April 09)
- [NASIG](#) (June 09)

We continue to strive to find opportunities to address publishers.

KBART's progress will also be presented at a NISO webinar on 8th April – for more information, see <http://www.niso.org/news/events/2009/kbart09>

4. Next steps

We expect to release the final report for review by monitors and sponsoring committees in April. We will then review and incorporate feedback and aim to release the report publicly in June. Thereafter the group will progress with KBART Phase II. The scope for this remains under discussion but may incorporate any of:

- Non-text materials
- Localised holdings transfer
- Greater automation
- Requirements for a centralised solution (how to fund, how to manage etc)
- Increased focus on subscription agents' role

We plan to liaise with OCLC to clarify other aspects of OpenURL maintenance responsibilities and assess how else KBART might usefully direct its activities. We've also recently held discussions with CrossRef about how they can complement KBART's work by providing related services to their members. CrossRef will likely proceed with developing a service that offers to collate its members' KBART-related data for onward distribution to, or collection by, link resolver managers.

www.uksg.org/kbart

www.niso.org/workrooms/kbart

Charlie Rapple, Peter McCracken

26 February 2009