

Action Item 1: Remote Identity Verification

Proposed Change to Policy:

Proposed by: Stephen Houser, Director of Twin Lakes Library System

Stephen is applying for a grant to test the viability of online library card applications with remote identity verification. If the technology proves viable, should the PINES Executive Committee approve the use of this technology for identity verification?

Identity Verification Process:

User takes a picture of identification documents (driver's license, e.g.) and software confirms veracity of document (see here for example process: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7hnucc6dfuE>). Additional available verification features include a. prompting patron to take a selfie and confirm identity through facial recognition and b. 'live confirm', which prompts user to move their head from side to side to confirm that they are not taking a selfie of a picture. Some of these additional features add cost. All of the vendors I spoke with utilize OCR and can pre-fill forms, and can work with either iOS, Android, or web pages. Georgia has barcodes on the back of the license, so the pre-fill should theoretically be perfect (more on that below). None of the services offer deduplication procedures or call to any databases, so that would be a separate process. They also offer geolocation services. Pricing is between \$2-\$4 per transaction, depending on volume and features.

I see a few ways that this could be used:

1. A more robust method of authenticating digital card user registration.
2. A method for all patrons to register or renew from home.
3. A method for deployed military personnel who reside in Georgia to register or renew.
4. A method of registration for patrons that are homebound and for libraries that would like to deliver materials to patrons.
5. An in-library setup to facilitate the registration process, save staff time, and ensure near-perfect data entry. The vendors I spoke with suggested an iPad on a stand would suffice as the necessary hardware for this process.
6. Improving accessibility (the grant proposal will be written to target this process to meet ADA requirements for patrons who may or may not be GLASS eligible). We would require the chosen vendor to offer screen reader compatibility.

With all of the above, the registration process would be less involved than the current process and would keep the library registration process in line with what users might expect from commercial sectors.

Because of a minimum volume requirement for many of the vendors (stated at 12,000 per year), a pilot site would need to be a sufficiently large system or would need to be a PINES-wide pilot.

Outstanding questions to be resolved during testing:

1. How would the data get from the identity verification system into Evergreen.
2. How would the process work to check for existing cards to prevent duplicate accounts.
3. How would the process work for renewals of existing accounts.
4. How would physical library cards be assigned and distributed (Assigned by staff? Sent out by mail?)
5. How much of the process can be automated, and how much would require staff involvement.
6. How to determine residency remotely (would a driver's license suffice, or would more documentation be necessary?)
7. Is there an expectation for patrons to be able to use their accounts immediately, or would they need to wait until they received a physical card?

Survey Results:

The following summary is based on survey results from 43 PINES Subcommittee members and Directors representing 27 library systems. One question was asked:

If the technology for remote identity authentication is tested to be viable, do you think it should be allowed under PINES policy?

Summary of All Responses:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	19	44%
No	13	30%
Not Sure	11	26%

Responses by Circulation Subcommittee Members Only:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	5	50%
No	4	40%
Not Sure	1	10%

Responses from Other Subcommittee Members and Directors:

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	14	88%
No	0	0%
Not Sure	2	12%

Comments

Comments For:

- I can see this working well in an urban setting but in a rural setting, it might not get as much use. A lot of poor or elderly people don't have smart phones or wi-fi/internet at home, so they wouldn't be able to register from home.
Would we charge the patron for this service? Or would we have to absorb the cost into our budgets?
As for waiting for a physical card to arrive, why not send them a scanned version of their card until they can come to the library to pick it up?
- If this would have to be a PINES-wide pilot I would not be in favor of any state PINES dollars going toward this. I feel like we have other places that could use the money more.
- Would like to see how it works on pilot system for at least a year.
- Yes, if the outstanding questions are resolved, and if issues of added costs to the libraries can be resolved: e.g. can a library charge a "convenience fee" for remote registration?

Comments Against:

- Has this been tested or considered by any other Evergreen users?
- sounds too complicated with too much room for variation and error
- What does tested for viability mean? Who decides the level of authentication? Would this be active or passive authentication? Conceptually, it has possibilities however, in my respectful opinion, there are still too many outstanding questions to move forward.

Other Comments:

- I have two questions. Who is going to fund this after the grant runs out? Also, is the grant to cover just Twin Lake patrons or all PINES libraries?
- The primary benefit I see of this is more consistency for IDs when creating patron accounts (as some libraries are still entering the information incorrectly), but the possibly \$4-per-trnx is cost-prohibitive.
- There are so many variables that are unknown at this point. We have concerns about the fee per transaction, among other things.
- Would the cost be picked up by individual libraries or by PINES funding?