

**NISO SERU Working Group**  
**[www.niso.org/committees/seru/](http://www.niso.org/committees/seru/)**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**3-1-07 Conference Call**

**Participants**

Linda Beebe  
Todd Carpenter  
Clint Chamberlain  
Karla Hahn  
Selden Lamoureaux  
Judy Luther  
Chris Matire  
Bob Oakley  
Zac Rolnik  
Kim Steinle  
Karen Wetzel

**Agenda**

Review sample timeline.  
Review statement of shared understanding.  
PR planning  
Registry

**Timeline**

The group reviewed the timeline that began with the October 10, 2006 meeting, documented the work done in January and February, forecast a first public draft of the statement of understanding in mid-March, called for a launch of the pilot by the time of the ALA Annual meeting in June, and continued to a January 2008 decision on adoption. The feedback from the discussions at the ALA Midwinter meeting was very positive, even before potential users had seen a draft. The hope is that the statement might be in use by June 2007. The group will get reactions, then start the formal NISO process in early 2008.

**Review of the Statement**

The group reviewed suggestions that had been exchanged in email, some of which had surfaced at the breakfasts at ALA.

*ADA/Accessibility*

After discussion, the group concluded that anyone needing accessibility clauses would most likely need to sign an actual contract. Therefore, the decision was not to add any language related to ADA.

*Termination*

The question was this: what happens if a library has purchased access to a journal with the SERU statement of understanding, and part-way through the subscription, the journal is sold to a publisher who requires a license? The group noted that acquiring publishers acquire assets “as is,” and the “as is” in this instance would be a SERU understanding. Librarians would expect to have the SERU understanding apply through the entire subscription.

*Purchase Document*

There had been some discrepancy in language in the draft statement. The group agreed to use the term “purchase document,” rather than “purchase order” or “purchase agreement.” The group agreed that a sentence referring to the guidelines was needed for the purchase document. The following sentence has been proposed: “In the absence of a separate license agreement, the \_\_\_\_\_ Library follows the SERU guidelines, as published at [http://www.niso.org/committees/SERU/SERU\\_comm.html](http://www.niso.org/committees/SERU/SERU_comm.html).”

### *Perpetual Access*

The question of what would be included in perpetual access was raised. The group has found it difficult to articulate the fact that perpetual access does not generally include retrospective material within the statement. The group discussed the idea of addressing this issue in new FAQs related to the statement.

They agreed to change the header “Archival and Perpetual Rights” to “Archiving and Perpetual Access.” They adopted a suggestion to include at the end of “How SERU Can Be Used for Subscription Sales” the following sentence: “Furthermore, the purchase document can also be used to describe specific business conditions that may have an impact on the sale, such as limits to simultaneous users or clarifications on authorized users.”

### *Various Other Issues*

There was a discussion about whether the term “publisher” might be construed to mean only publishers, not aggregators or vendors. The group decided that it would not, and suggested adding an explanation in the new FAQs.

They decided not to add some additional language to the “Framework” section and to the “Inappropriate Use” section. The feeling was that the statement might begin to sound too much like a contract. The group decided to add a note about differing views of inappropriate use to the new FAQs.

In the third paragraph of the “Inappropriate Use” section, the group decided to change the first two sentences to read “When questionable activity such as systematic downloading is detected, publishers should notify the subscribing institution as soon as possible. If the subscribing institution detects inappropriate use, the institution should notify the publisher as soon as possible.”

In the third paragraph of the “The Subscribing Institution and its Authorized Users” section, the group changed the last sentence. It now reads “Alumni are not considered part of the authorized user community.”

The group agreed that lower case, rather than initial caps, would be used for language such as “subscribing institution” or “publisher” when the words are used within a sentence. Again, the desire is to avoid having the statement look like a contract. The statement will be copyedited before it is released in the next version, which will likely be 0.3.

## **PR Plan**

The group reviewed and expanded the SERU Conference Schedule. Among the conferences to be added are the North Carolina Serials meeting in March, ICOLC and the Texas Library Association in April, MLA in May, and SLA in June and IFLA in August. NISO will give a standards program at ALA, and Todd will include SERU. He will also include it in the NISO licensing meeting on June 11.

NISO is developing a robust calendar for the web, which will include standards meetings at conferences, and this may be useful for tracking SERU PR. He will include SERU in his next column for *Against the Grain*.

The SERU postcards were mailed to members of the group, and most had received them. They agreed it's very good looking and that it should be posted to the NISO website. The remainder will be kept at NISO, and members can request them from Karen when they need them for meetings. They agreed that the card should be reprinted now to assure that the quantity will be sufficient for the Spring meetings. Members are to send Karla Hahn an email about where they will be exhibiting.

Judy Luther had created a Power Point on SERU for conference presentations, which Chris Matire has edited. She will email it to the members of the group for their use.

The group also discussed the use of listservs, such as LibLicense, ERIL, SSP, ALPSP, and possibly the directors of law libraries. The intention is to reach as many people as possible with the message.

The group also reviewed the list of publishers who have expressed interest in signing on to a registry. Judy Luther will expand the list and email to the group.

## **Registry**

The group explored options for registry development with NISO staff. The group determined that ideally a registry would be launched in conjunction with the anticipated pilot phase. The registry will include both publishers and libraries.

During the pilot, the expectation is that registering indicates a willingness to use the SERU mechanism for at least some transactions for some products. It will not be assumed that registering necessarily indicates a commitment to use the approach with all of a publisher's products. When SERU is submitted for NISO adoption, a more sophisticated registry may be developed.

Karen Wetzel at NISO will manage the registry during the pilot phase, adding organizations on request. An organization wishing to participate in the pilot phase can be directed to Karen prior to the actual release of the registry (i.e., there may already be organizations on the registry when it is first released for the pilot phase).