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Introduction

- Bergen County Cooperative Library System (NJ)
- Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries – CARL
- Lakeland Library Cooperative (MI)
- MOBIUS (MI)
- SAILS Library Network (MA)
- MINEVRA (ME)
- Black Gold Cooperative Library Network (CA)
- Colorado Library Consortium – CLIC
- The Library Network (MI)
- OWLnet Public Library System (WI)
- Libraries of Middlesex Automation Consortium (NJ)
- Washington Idaho Network (WA)
- Library Services Centre (Ontario, Canada)
About OCLC

- WorldShare Metadata Services (cataloging)
- WorldShare Interlibrary Loan (sharing resources)
- WorldShare Management Services (cloud-based integrated library system)
- WorldCat Discovery Services
- CONTENTdm (manage digital collections)

- 16,857 members in 113 countries
- WorldCat has 321 million bibliographic records
- Illinois libraries have contributed 89 million holdings
- Revenues were $213,575,500 in 2014
- Reserves of $266,911,900 in 2014

- OCLC costs of $4.2 million to be allocated among Illinois libraries
- Costs allocated based on historical use of OCLC services
- Lack of transparency and equality in pricing using the existing process
- In some cases, costs of OCLC are equal to or exceed membership charges in a shared ILS consortia
Exploring Alternatives

- Breadth—size & diversity of the database
- Quality—adherence to standards, duplicate records
- Ease of Use—User interface to accomplish tasks
- Costs of Use

Cataloging Alternatives

- Online Access, such as SkyRiver
- Other libraries, using Z39.50
- Internet resources
- Vendors that supply physical and electronic resources
- Outsourcing cataloging vendors

Online Access

- SkyRiver
  - Breadth—70 million records
  - Quality—Good
  - Ease of Use—Excellent
  - Costs—Low and no per record charge
### SkyRiver Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Records/Year</th>
<th>Cost/Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Gold Cooperative</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>$1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four County Lib. System</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland Lib. Cooperative</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>35,747</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshores Library System</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library Network</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWLNet Public Lib. Sys.</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAILS Library Network</td>
<td>38,696</td>
<td>52,462</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County Lib. Coop.</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td>$34,064</td>
<td>41,387</td>
<td>$.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ignoring Suffolk County

### Other Libraries

- **Z39.50**
  - Breadth – Quite large
  - Quality – Good
  - Ease of Use – Easy but time consuming (in some cases)
  - Costs - Staff

### Internet Resources

- **Social Cataloging Sites**
  - Breadth – Large
  - Quality – Mixed – short records
  - Ease of Use – Time consuming
  - Costs - Staff
Material Vendors

- Suppliers
  - Breadth: Good
  - Quality: Mixed (Mostly good)
  - Ease of Use: Batch loading, duplicates
  - Costs: Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Size of DB</th>
<th>Cost of Copy Cataloging</th>
<th>Cost of Original Cataloging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>40 cents</td>
<td>AV edited = $1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodart</td>
<td>15 million</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingram</td>
<td>17 million</td>
<td>40 cents</td>
<td>$10 to $12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Tapes</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>0 to $1.20</td>
<td>$10 to $12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OverDrive</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>0 to $1.50</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outsourcing Vendors

- Library Services Centre
  - Breadth: Moderate (current materials)
  - Quality: High (authority control)
  - Ease of Use: Simple
  - Costs: Low (batch loading)
Comparison of Cataloging Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Source of Records</th>
<th>Size of DB</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Cost per Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SkyRiver</td>
<td>LC +</td>
<td>70+ million</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Varies – $2 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other libraries</td>
<td>LC + others</td>
<td>75+ million</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet resources</td>
<td>Members &amp; libraries (LC)</td>
<td>100+ million</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material vendors</td>
<td>LC &amp; publishers</td>
<td>17 million or less</td>
<td>High generally</td>
<td>40 cents to $4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td>LC, other libraries</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
<td>High – authority control</td>
<td>$1 to $3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interlibrary Loan Alternatives

- Messaging software
- Reduce the number of ILSs – merge consortia and grow membership in remaining consortia
- Create a RAILS regional catalog/ILL system (overlay project)

Comparison of ILL Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Operation</th>
<th>Number of Fulfillment Requests Last Year</th>
<th>Cost per Fulfillment U.L. Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California - MARC/RLIN</td>
<td>1,095,000</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut - shared</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas - INTEGRAL</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland - MDNet</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts - MELMAC</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota - MNLINK</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York - NYLINK</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina - NCRL</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OhioLINK</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northwest Knowledge</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Knowledge</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Knowledge</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Data for OCLC
# = Only 1 library
Implications

- Significant cost savings by embracing one or more cataloging and ILL alternatives
- Accuracy of holdings in RAILS member libraries in OCLC will decline over time
- RAILS member libraries will have more fiscal and administrative control over the way services are delivered

Recommendations

- Investigate a SkyRiver Master Agreement
- Create a Cataloging Center
- Create a RAILS Regional Catalog/ILL System (overlay project)
- Make the RAILS Regional Catalog Discoverable
- Encourage Libraries to Evaluate the Purchasing of Materials in Lieu of Using ILL
- Periodically Offer a Webinar on Cataloging Alternatives

Over To You

- Joe AT JoeMatthews.Org