



December 19, 2019

Web Meeting, ICOLC Coordinating Committee

Present: Rick Burke (Chairing for Gwen Evans), Anita Cocchia, Celeste Feather, Teri Galloway, Lucy Harrison, George Machovic, Kjell Tjensvoll. Not present: Anita Cocchia, Gwen Evans, Sandrine Malatoux

Agenda

1. Update on ICOLC SC planning (Rick M.)
2. Update on Futures (Teri)
3. Update on OCLC ALA Midwinter planning (we have a room scheduled and OCLC's commitment to attend) so the update would mostly come from Lucy.
4. Update on elections for Europe/Asia/Africa/Oceania/S. America et al (Rick B/Kjell)
5. Update on web task forces (Celeste)

Update on ICOLC SC planning (Rick B.; Rick Moul absent) - Columbia

Check 475\$, 505\$ with Eventbrite and credit card fee.

Three themes that Program committee is working on: industry consolidation, Open Access, ROI and value of consortia. Want to try a longer break session of 30 min with posters for consortia to share ideas on these themes.

Get consortia to voluntarily present how they value their services

Vendor grille – four vendors being considered:-

1. ACM (price model to move to OA)
2. OCLC
3. ProQuest – acquisition of innovative
4. EBSCO – same issues. Good and bad to talk about EBSCO. How they go forward in light of acquisition of Innovative by ProQuest.

Things are moving along smoothly with draft program to be posted in January.

Update on Futures (Teri)

Teri gave a run through of the findings and differences between Charleston and Luxembourg then proposed that repeating this exact exercise at the SC meeting may not be fruitful, but that instead would take the findings so far and use a survey to take the open-ended feedback that we have so far and confirm and prioritize the feedback....using a rank and extent of agreement/disagreement type of survey framework.

So for example, is it just the thought of one individual that we should be focused on assisting the Global South consortia or is this a high-priority for everyone?

Teri will draft an instrument for the Futures group to approve, send it out ahead of the SC meeting and then use the meeting time to present and discuss those findings.

Update on OCLC ALA Midwinter planning (we have a room scheduled and OCLC’s commitment to attend).

This is the background for the meeting – Lucy shared a document entitled “OCLC WorldCat Discovery and GALILEO Libraries.” Surveyed those served in GALILEO, but we need a broader response from other consortia. .

Respondents feel OCLC is too expensive and that there is a lack of transparency.

A high-level summary of the results is in the table below, followed by comments provided on the survey.

Table: OCLC-Related Costs for GALILEO Libraries, FY2018-19

	Cataloging	ILL	Bundled	WMS	Estimated Hours/YR	Total Subscription	Total In-Kind
USG	\$622,075	\$271,879	\$121,039		43,800	\$1,014,994	\$1,471,680
TCSG	\$49,268	\$7,222		\$5,934	5,950	\$62,423	\$199,920
Privates	\$35,054	\$28,596	\$216,852	\$304,649	9,600	\$585,151	\$322,560
GPLS	\$395,228	\$106,074			4,000	\$501,302	\$134,400
All	\$1,101,625	\$413,770	\$337,891	\$310,582	63,350	\$2,163,869	\$2,128,560

Costly both in direct costs and time in in-kind and that is just from those who replied to survey.

Too expensive, increases too high, 4-6% and higher.

Business model – being charged to use our own work.

“What is known must be shared” mission is criticized.

Conclusion:

Conclusion:

WorldCat cannot exist without the effort of individual libraries who create and improve bibliographic records and add their holdings to them. Charging libraries an additional fee to display their own work free of charge to the world is not only unfair and counter to OCLC’s stated mission as a member-driven non-profit organization, but also results in a poorer product for everyone.

- We would like OCLC to display – at no additional charge, and in any WorldCat interface – the holdings of any library that pays a cataloging fee.
- Additionally, we would like OCLC to clarify how its current business model is balancing costs, revenues and long-term sustainability, especially in light of certain recent events (e.g., some states deciding to drop FS/WCD; the consolidation of other library ILS vendors; new resource sharing platforms under development).
- We would also like to understand how the work that member libraries perform – and without which some OCLC products cannot function – is factored into that business model.

OCLC acknowledged that WorldCat cannot exist without us.

Alternatives for resource sharing potentially include Ex Libris, Project ReShare

Lucy was congratulated on a great effort. Rick noted about being charged for putting data in and for taking data out, and it seems absurd that this is a non-profit organization whose business models are unfair to libraries.

Teri: what existing options do we have if we were to walk away from this? I think they perceive we have no alternative. They pay 4x as much in fees as compared to their statewide Louisiana ILS, SirsiDynix.

Celeste: noted a possible strategy of targeting the members on the board.

Rick: concerned that their payment for board service may make it hard for them to speak out.

George: we are only seeing the expenses and double dipping. What about asking them to be more transparent.

Lucy: explain to us why you charge so much?

Teri: Banking on the idea that we are not organized enough to get the meaningful answers to our questions

Rick: don't think they buy into the idea of transparency.

Celeste: they are struggling a bit. Layoffs often happen in summer months. Have a conference center and 5/6 story building. Two floors that have nothing to do with OCLC. Tax free status as a non-profit. Always renting out office space.

Top echelons have good salaries. 500 plus employees. Not best corporate community citizens.

Kjell: does not have anything to do with them.

Lucy will plan to send out something to the larger ICOLC group soon, so that everyone has an opportunity to provide feedback prior to the ALA Midwinter meeting. The discussion at ALA will then inform the plans for a further discussion with OCLC at the full ICOLC meeting in South Carolina.

Update on elections for Europe/Asia/Africa/Oceania/S. America et al (Rick B/Kjell)

Two candidates submitted – Patrick and Pim Slot volunteered. Election pending.

Update on web task forces (Celeste)

Celeste – we met and people volunteered and work was done. Target date for Sept 21. Enthusiastic responses from volunteers.

Notes prepared by Glenn Truran and Rick Burke.

ICOLC Coordinating Committee

Rick Burke, Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium | SCELC

Anita Cocchia, British Columbia Electronic Library Network | BC ELN

Gwen Evans, Ohio Library and Information Network | OhioLINK

Teri Galloway, The Louisiana Library Network | LOUIS

Lucy Harrison, Georgia Library Learning Online | GALILEO

George Machovec, Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries | Colorado Alliance

Sandrine Malotau, Consortium unifié des établissements universitaires et de recherche pour l'accès aux publications numériques | Couperin

Kjell Tjensvoll, Norwegian Electronic Health Library | NOKC

Glenn Truran, South African National Library and Information Consortium | SANLiC

Celeste Feather, ex officio for administration, LYRASIS