Identity Management Advisory Committee Charge

June 9, 2022

Scope

Although identity management encompasses differentiating entities of many types, creating identifiers for them, and relating them to each other, this committee will focus primarily on persons and corporate bodies as an initial scope.

Background

The latest two PCC Strategic Directions documents (2015-2017 SD3 and 2018-2022 SD4) have called for leading a shift from text string based authority work, largely applicable within the library realm, to minting identifiers and managing identities, serving numerous new purposes and done in collaboration with new partners.

The PCC Task Group on Identity Management in NACO since its establishment in March 2016 has pursued these goals through education, presentations, a published article, identification of issues plus resolutions to these challenges, and pilots to explore the feasibility of working in different registries. As the most recent Strategic Directions document exhorted, we needed to "Accelerate the movement toward ubiquitous identifier creation and identity management at the network level." To better reflect the longer-term nature of the work and energies involved in this paradigm shift, as well as the significant PCC focus on identity management work, the Identity Management Advisory Committee (IMAC) was formed in June 2022.

Charge

Reporting to the PCC Policy Committee, the PCC Identity Management Advisory Committee is charged to:

1. Advise the PCC on general and specific issues relating to identity management and the new roles identifiers can and are playing in the information ecosphere. The primary focus will be persons and corporate bodies, although IMAC may advise PCC about other types of entities as requests come to the committee. The areas that the Committee can productively focus energy and attention on includes but is not limited to:

    a. The minting of identifiers in quantities sufficient to cover the entities contained in library metadata;
    b. The various registries where identity management work can practically be contributed and what degree of coordination across registries is desirable;
    c. The feasibility of collaborating with other potential new partners on identity management work and what impediments or obstacles could be reduced;

d. How identity management can best be integrated into library workflows, including a migration path from traditional methods of authority control to an identity management approach in library metadata;

e. The ways existing library-created identifiers can effectively serve needs upstream (e.g. publisher workflows) and downstream (e.g. reputation management efforts, linked data projects, etc.);

f. The identification of core training, in collaboration with the SCT, needed to foster these developments;

g. The flexibility in or modification of standards that would better support identity management efforts; and

h. The identification of and advocacy for tools and applications needed for supporting, managing, and assessing this work.

2. Assist with the integration of identity management work into the PCC community. This may be accomplished through white papers, topical meetings with committees, and task groups, and informal conversations as needed. IMAC will serve as a central resource in support of PCC identity management efforts, and consultation with IMAC will be written into the charges for PCC task groups whenever appropriate. Standing committees and task groups participating in identity management initiatives should actively seek out IMAC involvement (rather than requiring IMAC to insert itself into existing discussions). The Committee will:

a. collaborate with PCC task groups to ensure that understanding of the issues is consistent and complementary and recommend best practices for identity management;

b. respond to questions about identity management from PoCo;

c. advise the PCC Policy Committee on courses of action it can take in support of identity management work in cooperative cataloging;

d. monitor the general PCC discussion list and any relevant more specific discussion lists and respond to questions related to identity management, as appropriate; and

e. comment on drafts of reports or work plans being developed by the PCC as they relate to identity management.

3. Each year that it is in place, IMAC will submit a work plan to the PCC Policy Committee by April 15 and will provide an activities report written or orally by October 15. The Identity Management Advisory Committee will be considered ongoing until such time as identity management considerations are routinely handled by standing committees.