SHARES Packing and Shipping Task Force

Final Report

Submitted to the SHARES Executive Group

June 2015

Contents

SHARES Packaging and Shipping Task Force

Executive Summary, Final Report

Submitted to the SHARES Executive Group, June 2015

In September 2014, the SHARES Executive Group formed a SHARES Packaging and Shipping Task Force and issued the following charge:

●Study current packaging and shipping practice within SHARES, including shipping costs
● Identify and explore issues and difficulties that arise from these practices
● Make recommendations on SHARES packaging and shipping policies and guidelines going Forward

A call for volunteers went out over the main SHARES discussion list. Special effort was made to include multiple museum library and non-US perspectives. The group began its work in October 2014 with the following members:

- Autumn Mather, Art Institute of Chicago
- Jenny Lee, University of California, Los Angeles
- Jessica McGivney, New York University
- Lauri Perkins, Winterthur Museum, Garden & Library
- Linda Dols, University of Arizona
- Marjory Lobban, University of Edinburgh
- Mary Radnor, University of Chicago
- Susan Stone, University of Toronto
- Tracy Luna, University of Tennessee at Knoxville
- Dennis Massie, OCLC Research

The task force conducted two surveys – one on current practice and the other on policy preferences – and also consulted cost data and other information compiled by the SHARES Executive Group in 2013 and 2014.

Task force members felt that in formulating policy recommendations they would be making a statement about the sort of consortium they want SHARES to be. With that in mind, they took these as their guiding principles:

1) SHARES members value flexibility.
2) SHARES members want to know what to expect, and what is expected of them.
3) SHARES must make no policy or provision that discourages lending.
4) SHARES partners should assume the best of each other and try to help each other achieve improved performance.
5) SHARES policy should take the diverse nature of the consortium into account.

The group decided it was important to focus on addressing actual problems rather than trying to come up with perfect, unassailable policies that would fit every possible situation.

The task force submitted the following policy recommendations to the SHARES Executive Group:

Packaging and use:

1) Borrowers must comply with all use and handling instructions set by lenders.
2) Lenders should contact the ILL contact person or the SHARES liaison at Borrowing institutions that fail to comply with use and handling instructions. Lenders should assume that Borrowers want to know when they are not in compliance with use and handling instructions and will welcome the chance to correct the procedures that led to the non-compliance.
3) Lenders must use their best judgment to protect their materials and may cut off a Borrower if, after contacting the Borrower, they are not satisfied that the problems which led to non-compliance with use and handling instructions will be corrected.
4) If efforts to correct the problems fail, Lenders should notify the institutional SHARES liaison of any Borrower they cut off, in writing, and copy the OCLC SHARES coordinator.
5) Borrowers who are cut off by a Lender should be encouraged to use the situation to approach their own administrators in hopes of securing more resources or more influence on mailing and handling operations.
6) Borrowers who are cut off can work with the OCLC SHARES coordinator to document that problems leading to non-compliance have been corrected, and to be reinstated as a partner of the Lender that suspended their borrowing privileges.

Shipping Method:

1) Lenders should use their own best judgment about how to ship a particular item.
2) Shipping with tracking and insurance is strongly recommended as a SHARES best practice.

Pricing:

1) Those libraries shipping returnables between the US and Canada must declare a pricing policy -- $10 or $15.
2) Those who charge $15 will do so because they must recover shipping costs. Those who charge $10 do so because they benefit from the US/Canada relationship in the SHARES context and don't want to discourage the lone SHARES Canadian institution from participating.
3) This proposed policy has a precedent in the "sharing returnables overseas" policy, where SHARES institutions can opt in or out as long as they make their policy known.
4) Those shipping cross-border can, if shipping costs are extraordinary in a given case, query the borrower and charge the full amount of shipping costs. It is understood that this method of cost recovery is cumbersome and will be used when costs far exceed the normal $10 or $15 fee.

5) Shipping between the US/Canada and between the UK/Continent are different situations with different costs and should not be in the same pricing category, though SHARES has long regarded both of them as "cross-border."
6) UK and European SHARES libraries should come to an agreement on what the loans should be worth. Currently such loans affect less than 10 libraries. They should work with the OCLC SHARES coordinator to establish a price that is to their own satisfaction. SHARES can make adjustments as the membership grows or changes.

Responsibility:

1) As per the US and IFLA ILL codes, Borrowers are responsible for returnable items from the moment they leave the Lender until they are returned.
2) Borrowers have a right to know ahead of time whether or not a Lender sends returnable items overseas with tracking and insurance, so that informed decisions can be made about the level of risk Borrowers wish to assume.
3) Lenders must make known whether or not they routinely ship returnables overseas with tracking and insurance. This information will be made publicly available on the SHARES Web site.

The task force recommends reviewing all SHARES pricing and procedural policies every three years.

SHARES Packaging and Shipping Task Force

Policy Recommendations, with context

Submitted to the SHARES Executive Group, June 2015

Task force members felt that in formulating policy recommendations they would be making a statement about the sort of consortium they want SHARES to be. With that in mind, the task force took these as their guiding principles:

1) SHARES members value flexibility.
2) SHARES members want to know what to expect, and what is expected of them.
3) SHARES must make no policy or provision that discourages lending.
4) SHARES partners should assume the best of each other and try to help each other achieve improved performance.
5) SHARES policy should take the diverse nature of the consortium into account.

The group decided it was important to focus on addressing actual problems rather than trying to come up with perfect, unassailable policies that would fit every possible situation.

The task force recommends that the following policies and guidelines be adopted:

Packaging and use:

1) Borrowers must comply with all use and handling instructions set by lenders.
2) Borrowers who fail to comply with instructions can be cut off from further borrowing from that particular Lender.
3) Lenders should contact the ILL contact person or the SHARES liaison at Borrowing institutions that fail to comply with use and handling instructions. Lenders should assume that Borrowers want to know when they are not in compliance with use and handling instructions and will welcome the chance to correct the procedures that led to the non-compliance.
4) Lenders must use their best judgment to protect their materials and may cut off a Borrower if, after contacting the Borrower, they are not satisfied that the problems which led to non-compliance with use and handling instructions will be corrected.

5) If efforts to correct the problems fail, Lenders should notify the institutional SHARES liaison of any Borrower they cut off, in writing, and copy the OCLC SHARES coordinator.
6) Borrowers who are cut off should be encouraged to use the situation to approach their own administrators in hopes of securing more resources or more influence on mailing and handling operations.
7) Borrowers who are cut off can work with the SHARES coordinator to document that problems leading to non-compliance have been corrected, and to be reinstated as a partner of the Lender that suspended their borrowing privileges.

Issues addressed by these "Packaging and Use" recommendations: *SHARES libraries often lend rare, valuable, fragile, or oversized materials. Lenders have a right to expect that Borrowers will adhere to all handling and use instructions issued as a condition of the loan. Lenders have requested guidance about what to do when use and handling instructions are not honored.*

Borrowers sometimes report a lack of control or influence over packaging and mailing operations at their home institutions. When this lack of control starts causing them to be unable to borrow materials needed by scholars, Borrowers may be able to leverage the situation to improve local processes.

Shipping Method:

1) Lenders should use their own best judgment about how to ship a particular item.
2) Shipping with tracking and insurance is strongly recommended as a SHARES best practice.

Issues addressed by these "Shipping Method" recommendations: *At one time it was standard SHARES practice to ship every returnable item in a box, and also to pay for tracking and insurance. Some SHARES institutions, especially those that lend rare, valuable, fragile or oversized material, believe that these should still be hard and fast rules in every instance when a returnable is shipped.*

Others feel that not all returnable items require the extra protection of a box or tracking and insurance. They want to be able to use their own judgment about how to ship (unless of course a lender has issues handling instructions, which must in every case be honored).

SHARES members value choice and flexibility. Hard and fast rules should be instituted only when necessary.

Pricing:

1) Those libraries shipping returnables between the US and Canada must declare a pricing policy -- $10 or $15. This information will be shared publicly on the SHARES Web site.
2) Those who charge $15 will do so because they must recover shipping costs. Those who charge $10 do so because they benefit from the US/Canada relationship in the SHARES context and don't want to discourage the lone SHARES Canadian institution from participating.
3) This proposed policy has a precedent in the "sharing returnables overseas" policy, where SHARES institutions can opt in or out as long as they make their policy known.

4) Those shipping cross-border can, if shipping costs are extraordinary in a given case, query the borrower and charge the full amount of shipping costs. It is understood that this method of cost recovery is cumbersome will be used when costs far exceed the normal $10 or $15 fee.
5) Shipping between the US/Canada and between the UK/Continent are different situations with different costs and should not be in the same pricing category, though SHARES has long regarded both of them as "cross-border."
6) UK and European SHARES libraries should come to an agreement on what the loans should be worth. Currently such loans affect less than 10 libraries. They should work with the OCLC SHARES coordinator to establish a price that is to their own satisfaction. SHARES can make adjustments as the membership grows or changes.

Issues addressed by these "Pricing" recommendations: *For years, countries considered by the SHARES Executive Group to be on the same "land mass" were expected to charge and to pay the normal domestic SHARES fee for a returnable item, $10. This was true of transactions between the US and Canada, and between the UK/Ireland and Europe. In recent years it has become clear that $10 does not begin to cover the shipping costs for either of these situations.*

The number of transactions involved and the number of institutions affected are both rather small. We currently have only one SHARES institution in both Canada and on the Continent; 6-8 US libraries do 75-80% of the lending to the Canadian institution, the University of Toronto, and 6 UK/Irish institutions do most of the lending to the European institution, the Royal Library of Denmark. Some of the lenders report that they are starting to reconsider lending across the border because of the cost.

The situation is further complicated by three factors:

1. *One institution does most of the borrowing in each of the scenarios, as we currently have one Canadian institution in SHARES and one located on the Continent in Europe; any price change would have an enormous negative impact on two institutions.*
2. *Average shipping costs are much more in one scenario than in the other, so a one-size-fits-all policy is not a realistic or fair option.*
3. *In the survey results, not a single possible pricing option put forth by the task force was favored by a majority of respondents.*

This is an instance where task force members decided to deal with the actual problems being addressed rather than trying to craft the perfect one-size-fits-all policy. Their recommendation allows lenders some flexibility to do what they need to do without pricing the borrowers out of SHARES. This policy could be revisited if the Canadian or the European SHARES contingent expands.

Responsibility:

1) As per the US and IFLA ILL codes, Borrowers are responsible for returnable items from the moment they leave the Lender until they are returned.
2) Borrowers have a right to know ahead of time whether or not a Lender sends returnable items overseas with tracking and insurance, so that informed decisions can be made about the level of risk Borrowers wish to assume.

3) Lenders must make known whether or not they routinely ship returnables overseas with tracking and insurance. This information will be made publicly available on the SHARES Web site.

Issues addressed by these "Responsibility" recommendations: *For years, all returnables shipped overseas between SHARES partners were sent with tracking and basic insurance. More recently, higher shipping costs and a larger volume of requests led some Lenders to experiment with shipping overseas via the postal service. Costs proved to be lower, and few problems were reported.*

Some SHARES Borrowers continued to assume that all returnables requested from overseas would be sent with tracking and insurance. In a few instances, items that they requested never arrived, and these Borrowers found themselves on the hook for replacement costs levied by Lenders because lost items were not insured. This led to some bad feelings.

The situation is exacerbated by the fact that in the UK, by long custom, a Borrower is not responsible for a borrowed item until it arrives from the Lender. According to the US and IFLA codes, the Borrower is responsible from the moment a requested item leaves the Lending institution.

The surveys revealed that some SHARES partners will not be willing to lend overseas unless they can use the lower-priced postal service. They find the procedure of querying borrowers to ask them to pay full freight for more expensive shipping methods to be too cumbersome. So as not to discourage lending, task force members agreed that the use of the postal service without tracking and shipping should be allowed within SHARES, though providing tracking and insurance are considered to be best practice.

There was some support within the task force for finding a way to share the risks more evenly between the borrower and lender. Survey responses showed surprising support for the idea – with many neutral but only 23% disagreeing – that lenders who ship overseas without tracking and insurance should share responsibility for replacement costs equally with the borrower. The task force seriously considered recommending that this policy suggestion be forwarded to the SHARES Executive Group. After further consideration, the recommendation seemed too controversial to really implement, as it would go against the IFLA and ILL codes and discourage some from lending overseas at all.

The revised recommendation keeps the Borrower responsible buts require overseas Lenders to make known whether they routinely ship with tracking and insurance. Borrowers are then fully informed and can decide on what level of risk they are willing to take when requesting.

The task force recommends reviewing all SHARES pricing and procedural policies every three years.

Appendix 1:

SHARES Packaging and Shipping Task Force

Official Charge

September 2014

The 2014 SHARES Executive Group will form a task force to study current packaging and shipping practices within the partnership, with an eye toward making recommendations about official SHARES policy on these matters moving forward.

For years SHARES lenders were required to use expedited couriers for sending returnable items to partners, even to overseas partners. Borrowers were allowed to return their loans via the postal system, however.

As shipping costs kept rising, many SHARES lenders began experimenting with using the postal service to save money, including methods that lack insurance and tracking. Mostly these experiments have gone well. But some issues about expectations and security have cropped up as a few such shipments have gone astray.

According to the SHARES pricing structure, Canada and the US are part of the same "land mass" so returnables sent between the two countries are charged at $10. The same is true between the UK and the Continent, and between Australia and New Zealand. But users report that the shipping costs to send returnables between these destinations are significantly more than $10.

There have also been debates about what types of library material should be shipped in boxes and what types might be safely transported in jiffy bags.

SHARES, with its policies and guidelines, has always worked to strike a balance between speed and affordability, flexibility and trust, convenience and security. What should our policies and guidelines regarding packaging and shipping be as we move into the resource sharing future?

Members of the SHARES Shipping and Packaging Task Force will work in the coming months to:

● Study current packaging and shipping practice within SHARES, including shipping costs
● Identify and explore issues and difficulties that arise from these practices
● Make recommendations on SHARES packaging and shipping policies going forward

Work will be carried out primarily through monthly conference calls. The group's goal will be to make policy recommendations to the SHARES Executive Group by January 2015.

Appendix 2:

SHARES Shipping and Packaging Task Force

Summary of responses to "current practices and preferences" survey

December 2014

We received 62 responses. About half skipped at least some of the open-ended questions.

Among the respondents, 36 self-identified as large academic, 11 as museum libraries, 9 as small academic, 6 as law, 3 as public and 3 as national (some picked more than one category). As expected, the vast majority – 54 – were located in the US, with 3 in the UK/Ireland, 2 in Canada, and 1 each in Australia and Europe.

For 63%, the ILL staff do the packaging (37), for 36% it is done by the Shipping staff (21). One described an arrangement where shipping staff handle outgoing loans while ILL staff package returns. Overall, comments indicate a heavy reliance on student workers. **For 78% of respondents, ILL staff chooses the shipping method.**

Few had different shipping procedures for SHARES and non-SHARES, or for borrowing and lending. Only 15% indicated that they had changed any shipping practices in the past year; most of these involved moving to postal from courier or experimenting with cheaper packaging materials.

Shipping cost information was supplied by more than 40 respondents, with an **average cost of $7.18 for domestic (with a range of $3.50 to $14.50), $20.79 for cross-border (with a range of $7 to $70), and $31.89 for overseas (with that same $7 to $70 range**). Those few reporting in GBP **averaged 5.5 for domestic, 17.50 for cross-border (which includes between the Continent and the UK), and 25.55 for overseas.**

The survey responses make it possible to compare the percentage of libraries that ship to SHARES partners via **Commercial courier, trackable and insured** for Domestic, Cross-Border, and Overseas vs. other methods. The results appear to show a correlation to cost for cross-border and overseas, with a higher percentage of libraries choosing to ship via a non-trackable method:

	Commercial courier, trackable and insured	**Postal service, not trackable or insured**
Domestic	88%	10%
Cross-border	45%	21%
Overseas	38%	20%

Task force members noted a number of trends and highlights in the comments and answers to open-ended questions:

1) Overall, safety of the material was of paramount concern, followed by speed and cost (with speed being more important closer to home, and cost beyond the border). Streamlined workflow always came in last. Among the UK respondents, however, cost was named as the primary concern 2 out of 3 times.
2) Cost, cost, cost. People are eager to learn ways to contain shipping costs.
3) Several commented that the cross-border shipping fee for SHARES ($10) is not enough.
4) Some suggested SHARES might seek consortial discounts on shipping or packaging materials.
5) Many respondents asked for best practices in getting things through customs.
6) One asked about best practices for reporting lost or damaged books to lenders and to shippers; another opined that it is essential to report loss or damage to the shippers and the other library as quickly as possible.
7) Some mentioned online customs forms being a great good thing.
8) Several wished for a comparative evaluation of the various couriers.
9) One called for us to hold shippers more accountable.
10) Several asked if declaring zero value on a cross-border package would result in no replacement check being forthcoming from the shipper if the item is lost. (Answer: no)
11) Quite a few mentioned bundling several items into one shipment as a best practice.
12) Some respondents noted that they sometimes use cheaper/riskier methods when sending their own material that can be easily replaced.
13) UK custom makes lenders responsible for materials that don't reach the borrowing institution. US and IFLA ILL codes say that borrowers are responsible. We need a firm stance from SHARES. Task force members note that this is related to expectations of how lenders will ship materials (Insured? Trackable? This was once a firm requirement.)
14) Several report using all-new shipping material because it streamlines processes and saves space.
15) One suggested that in many cases it must be cheaper for a borrowing institution to buy a book instead of borrowing it from overseas and returning it.
16) Several pined for an easy method for attaching a tracking number to the ILLiad record. Task Force member Jenny Lee of UCLA noted that she developed a procedure for linking the ILL transaction number with the FedEx tracking number from a FedEx Website assigned to UCLA**.**
17) Some said it is hard to get UPS to settle a claim.
18) Some reported that UPS holds your materials hostage if a partner does not pay duty fees, or if a partner does not address the return package to you correctly.
19) Several mentioned that FedEx now requires a commercial invoice for overseas shipments.
20) One mentioned that FedEx will start charging based on package dimensions as well as weight.
21) One described the sticker they place on every cross-border and overseas package: "International Loan between libraries (International Act of 1978) No commercial value."

Forty-eight respondents provided contact information and expressed a willingness to be contacted by task force members with follow-up questions.

Appendix 3:

SHARES Shipping and Packaging Task Force

Summary of responses to "policy preferences" survey

March 2015

Who responded: We received 88 responses. More than half (56%) self-identified as large academic, with 20%identifying as small academic, 14% museum, and 9% law. The vast majority of respondents (87%) are located in the US, with 6% in the UK and Ireland. The other 7% are scattered across Canada, Australia and Europe. One respondent skipped the question.

General policy questions: About 9% of respondents Disagreed with the notion that borrowers and lenders should use their best judgment when packaging items for shipping; another 11% were Neutral. One might presume that these folks prefer hard and fast rules rather than leaving things to the packager's discretion.

Meanwhile, 26% Strongly Agreed that everyone should ship everything in a sturdy box with adequate padding, with another 18% Agreeing. Twenty-seven percent were Neutral on this question, which was the most common response. Surprisingly, only 23% Disagreed, and 6% more Strongly Disagreed.

More predictably, 98% either Agreed or Strongly Agreed that borrowers must comply with all use and handling instructions imposed by the lender. (One person was Neutral, and another Disagreed.)

When it came to the need for clear guidelines about consequences for repeated failures to comply with restrictions, 82% Agreed or Strongly Agreed that guidelines are needed. Only 7% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed, with 11% remaining Neutral.

General policies	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
Use best judgment	32%	49%	11%	9%	0%
Sturdy box, padding	26%	18%	27%	23%	6%
Comply w/ restrictions	71%	27%	1%	1%	0%
Guidelines for consequences	26%	56%	11%	5%	

On requiring tracking and basic insurance: For domestic shipments, only 11% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed with the necessity of shipping with tracking and basic insurance, with another 16% staying Neutral on the issue.

Seventy-three percent Agreed or Strongly Agreed that tracking and basic insurance on domestic shipments should be required.

On cross-border shipments, the same 11% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed, with the Neutral contingent growing to 21%; still, 68% Agreed that tracking and basic insurance should be required on cross-border shipments.

For overseas shipments, 13% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed with the notion that tracking and basic insurance should be required, with 23% remaining Neutral. Sixty-four percent Agreed or Strongly Agreed that tracking and basic insurance should be required for overseas shipping.

Track & Insure	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
Domestic	39%	34%	16%	9%	2%
Cross-border	35%	33%	21%	10%	1%
Overseas	33%	31%	23%	12%	1%

On being allowed to choose one's own shipping method, rather than having the method mandated by the group: For domestic shipments, the most common response was Neutral at 32%, followed by Disagree at 28%. Those who Agreed or Strongly Agreed added up to 37%, while those who Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed were at 32%. In other words, feelings were evenly spread across the spectrum of possible responses.

For cross-border shipments, there was a dramatic shift, with the most common response being Agree at 47%. Only 12% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed, with 24% remaining Neutral. Nearly 65% Agreed or Strongly Agreed that they need to be able to choose their own method for cross-border shipments. Results were nearly identical for overseas shipping and cross-border shipping: 66% Agreed or Strongly Agreed, 24% Neutral, 10% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed.

Choose own method	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
Domestic	11%	26%	32%	28%	4%
Cross-border	18%	47%	24%	9%	3%
Overseas	18%	47%	24%	9%	1%

On the borrower wanting to know what method the lender is using to ship: During discussion, we realized that it would have been better to rephrase this question to make it more about knowing whether the package would be trackable and insured rather than using the word "method."

As it was, for domestic shipments Neutral was by far the most common answer (45%), with only 14% Disagreeing or Strongly Disagreeing. Nearly 41% Agreed or Strongly Agreed that as a borrower they would want to know the lender's shipping method.

For cross-border shipments, the Neutral was again the most common response at 40%, but now followed closely by Agree at 36%. No one Strongly Disagreed; 17% Disagreed. Those who Agreed and Strongly Agreed that a borrower would want to know a cross-border lender's shipping method added up to 46%.

For an overseas shipment, oddly, fewer Disagreed (14%) that they would want to know the lender's shipping method, and Strongly Agree was up to 13%, but Neutral was still the biggest number (37%) closely followed by Agreed (36%).

Know lender's method	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
Domestic	10%	30%	45%	12%	2%
Cross-border	8%	36%	40%	17%	0%
Overseas	13%	36%	37%	14%	0%

On the ability to query the borrower to recover full shipping costs: For domestic shipments, there was little strong feeling for or against this idea, with Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree both clocking in at under 10%. Neutral was the most common response (33%), with Agreed (31%) outpacing Disagreed (22%). In discussion, given what we know about the average shipping costs reported for most domestic packages, we figured querying the borrower would probably only arise in the case of multi-volume sets. There was a significant shift in the response to this question for cross-border loans: no one Strongly Disagreed that they should be able to query the borrower for full cost recovery, and only 20% Disagreed. Agreed was the most common response (34%) just edging out Neutral (still a healthy 33%). Strongly Agreed was up to 13%. So 47% Agreed or Strongly Agreed that they should be able to query the borrower to recover full shipping costs on cross-border shipments.

Recover shipping costs	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
Domestic	9%	30%	33%	22%	6%
Cross-border	13%	34%	32%	20%	0%

On pricing for cross-border shipping: As expected, much of SHARES is neutral on this issue, and those who have an opinion about it are fairly evenly divided.

We offered three choices in the survey: keep it at $10, raise it to $15, or raise it to $20. In every case, the most common answer was Neutral (35%, 47%, 42%).

The $10 and $20 choices resulted in more Disagreeing and Strongly Disagreeing than Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing, by about 10% in both cases.

The $15 choice offered the biggest Neutral response as well as the closest pairing of Agree/Disagree, with Disagree winning by a percentage point. Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree match exactly (4%).

The one clear answer in this section was to the question about whether Canada/US and UK/Europe should be in different pricing categories. Nearly half Agreed (47%) with another 14% Strongly Agreeing. About a third (32%) remained Neutral while only 6% Disagreed.

Cross-border pricing	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
$10	9%	19%	35%	23%	13%
$15	4%	22%	47%	23%	4%
$20	6%	17%	42%	30%	5%
US/Canada & UK/Europe different pricing categories	14%	47%	32%	6%	0%

(analysis continued on next page)

On responsibility: Only 14% Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed with the notion that a borrower is responsible for an item from the time it leaves the lender until it is safely returned to the lender, with another 10% remaining Neutral. Two thirds (76%) Agreed or Strongly Agreed.

The idea that a borrower's responsibility for a lost or damaged item should be limited if the package was not sent by the lender with tracking and basic insurance was popular: 46% Agreed and 19% Strongly Agreed, with 13% Neutral. A bit less than a quarter (22%) Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed.

Somewhat surprisingly, lenders agreed (45% Agreed, 9% Strongly) that if they ship items without tracking and insurance they should share responsibility if items are lost or damaged. A bit less than a quarter (23%) Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed.

Who's responsible?	S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	S. Disagree
Borrower, per codes	38%	38%	10%	10%	4%
Borrower limited if no tracking by lender	19%	46%	13%	12%	10%
Lender shares responsibility if no tracking	9%	45%	23%	15%	8%

Comments from respondents: The comments touched upon nearly every sticky issue that we've discussed during the course of our work on the task force.

One urged us to keep the policy simple. More than one asked that those who do not comply with handling instructions be held accountable. One mentioned that, in their experience, UPS and FedEx require an original receipt of purchase before they will reimburse for a lost book. (We've heard from others that this is not so; perhaps it is a regional thing; it might be a good thing for the Best Practices Group to get on top of.)

One mentioned that they have no control over shipping, as it is all done by mailroom staff. One asked that SHARES come to some agreement about what constitutes "damage;" what on a circulating book would be normal wear and tear may be damage to a special collections item. One mentioned the unfairness of making the borrower responsible in all cases when things go missing.