

# SHARES Meeting:

## The Afternoon Session

Yale University  
17 October 2008  
New Haven, CT

# SEG Rethinking SHARES Pricing Structure Subcommittee Survey Results

- About two thirds of SHARES responded
- 3 out of 4 said current pricing “just right”
- 10% think SHARES pricing is too high
- 25% think pricing for returnables is too low
- 25 % have changed non-SHARES pricing in the past year

# SHARES Pricing Survey Results, cont.

- 75% said returnables between Canada and US should be treated as domestic
- One respondent said perhaps an in-between price for Canada could be considered - higher than \$10 but lower than \$30
- Respondents split 50-50 on whether UK and Europe returnables should be charged as domestic
- 60% were in favor of treating returnables between NZ and Australia as domestic

# SHARES Pricing Survey Results, cont.

- The idea of considering other pricing models drew numerous comments and ideas
  - Most popular: 40% like the idea of charging only for overseas returnables
  - 30% think we should consider no charges at all
  - 30% think priced service levels, such as Rush, might be worth a try
  - Least popular model: strenuous objections to the idea of high-volume lenders setting themselves up as premium suppliers offering high-end service for a higher fee

# SHARES Pricing Survey Comments

- We charge the same for domestic returnables and all non-returnables, when returnables cost more to process.
- Keep SHARES pricing under the market price.
- Extra fees for special handling.
- Condition if sending multi-volumes overseas.
- Would be useful to see what others are paying for shipping.
- Do big institutions feel it's a burden to get so many requests?
- Current system compensates net lenders without gouging net borrowers.
- Don't change it!

# SHARES Pricing Survey Next Steps

- Closer analysis to see if institutions of folks with similar answers share other characteristics as well - big, small, net lender, net borrower, etc.
- Explore shipping costs
- Perhaps some follow-up questions delving into more detail about alternative models.
- Make a recommendation to the rest of SEG

# High-Performing Lenders Survey Results

- Art libraries biggest group among 70+ respondents
- Only one answer by one respondent indicated a suggested criteria of a high-performing lender is “unimportant” - long loan period
- Only 24 answers indicated a neutral feeling about a suggested criteria -- and 10 of those were for quality of packaging
- 35% of respondents ranked the suggested criteria and skipped the rest of the survey
- 65% provided detailed comments

# Most important criteria (% very important)

- Prompt response 86.4%
- Quality of scanning/copying 77.3%
- Fast delivery 69.7%
- Quality of holdings in WC 69.7%
- Supply rare and hard-to-find 67.2%
- Quality of packaging 53.0%
- Willingness to renew 44.6%
- Long loan period 21.2%



# Most often mentioned by name

- Fast: COO, PUL, JPG
- Prompt: COO, PUL, YUS/CGU/JPG
- Scan/copy: COO, JPG, PUL
- Packaging: JPG, MZA, PUL/BP1
- Rare: JPG, PUL, COO
- Holdings: FUG, UPM, PAU, COO 2 each
- Can't believe: PUL, JPG, CGU/YUS/COO

# Survey Comments: Other Criteria

- Supply article electronically (5)
- Scan special collections material (4)
- Supply media (3)
- Copy long articles (2)

# Survey comments: Packaging

- Liked
  - Easy to open
  - Well-wrapped
  - Top quality materials
  - Bubble wrap and boxes
  - Proper reinforcement
  - Standardization
  - Good quality control
  - Neatness
  - Green practices
- Not so much
  - Packaging that spills
  - Takes too long to open
  - Jiffy bags
  - Peanuts
  - Over taping

# High-Performing Lenders WG - next steps

- Analyze comments after each question
- Follow up with high-performing lenders
- Identify and share best practices
- Arrange for Webinars, podcasts, Wiki, panels

# Library X ILL Data Analysis

- Six years of peer-to-peer ILL data analyzed by OCLC Research
- 181,398 borrowing requests sent to 3,049 suppliers
- 11% sent to one supplier - MNU
- Top ten suppliers received half of all requests
- Top 100 received 80% of all requests
- Top 1500 received 99% of all requests

# Library X ILL Borrowing by Material Type

- Monographs: 61,332
- Serials: 97,372
- Other: 10,866
- Type not included: 11,828

# Library X Monograph Requests in Detail

- 61,332 requests for monographs
- 37,214 associated with OCLC number
- 20,366 unique items requested (that is, requested only once)
- 45% of requests represented either multiple attempts to fill the same request, or multiple requests from different parties

# Library X Monograph Requests in Detail, cont.

- How widely held are the materials Library X tends to borrow?

• 10 or fewer:	5,847	29%
• 11-50	5,650	28%
• 51-100	2,448	12%
• 101-250	3,184	16%
• 251-500	2,030	10%
• 501-1000	912	4%
• More than 1000	295	1%



# Library X Monograph Requests in Detail, cont.

- What % of Library X monograph requests (with OCLC numbers) could be filled by ARL institutions?
- 94%
- What % of Library X monograph requests (with OCLC numbers) could be filled by LVIS institutions?
- 68%
- Including those requests without OCLC numbers would drive these percentages down significantly.

# Questions for Library X

- Why so many to one supplier?
- Why so many more serials than monographs?
- Are you in a direct consortial borrowing arrangement?
- Do you belong to RAPID?
- Do you use direct request?
- What are collection strengths?

# More questions for Library X's data

- How does proportion of serials vs monographs change over the six years of data?
- What are fill rates of ARL and LVIS groups?
- Response times?
- How were dissertations counted?
- Any correlation between fill rates and how widely held an item is?
- Do materials requested more than once share any characteristics?
- What % of requests were for things owned by Library X?

# Latest on the Library X analysis

- Answering questions based on requests without OCLC numbers will be labor intensive
- Will work with Library X to identify a set of high-priority questions we can answer
- All SHARES transactions since August 1, 2007, have gone through WCRS
- Programs and Research is exploring the technical and legal issues involved in getting that data
- Library X agrees looking at current environment more useful than at previous environment
- Will see if trends noted in Library X are present across the group

Library X =

• NYU