

REPORT TO SOPAG FROM
THE RSC ADVANCED FORMS OF DIGITAL DELIVERY
SUBCOMMITTEE
February 13, 2004

In mid-October 2003, SOPAG charged RSC with exploring “advanced delivery mechanisms that could make the circulation of the item from the print archive unnecessary” (see John Tanno’s October 14, 2003 memo “New Charge to RSC” attached as Appendix A). The print archive referred to in the October charge is the Elsevier/ACM “dim” archive, being considered as UC decreases dependence on paper copies of journals and increases dependence on electronic journals. RSC appointed a subcommittee to conduct an investigation of such mechanisms. The subcommittee was composed of Robert Freel (UCLA), Scott Miller (NRLF) and Charlotte C. Rubens (UCB).

This charge was broadened in Tanno’s December 8, 2003 memo (attached as Appendix B) in which he stated the investigation should “include all formats not currently well-served through digital delivery.” In his December 30 memo to RSC, CDC and HOSC on “UC ILL of Special Collections Materials,” Tanno further suggested that “This investigation can also serve to inform how special collections materials could be scanned and delivered electronically.”

The Subcommittee noted the expansion of the charge, and particularly the nature of the type of material that the RLFs or campuses may now be expected to reproduce in paper or digital form for delivery to users. This expansion of the charge leads RSC to recommend that the report in hand be considered a preliminary investigative report and more detailed exploration of different aspects of this report will include appropriate staff with expertise in the relevant areas (ILL, Special Collections, Preservation/Conservation, etc.).

Materials Received at the RLFs

In order to determine which materials are not being served adequately by existing operations and technology, the Subcommittee analyzed the percentage and type of requests received by the RLFs.

Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the volumes received in the RLFs are less than 16” high, and therefore fit within the scanning area of the Minolta PS7000 scanners already in use at the RLFs. Based on requests for materials received in the past, and the nature of the material being deposited in the RLFs, it is expected that the RLFs will continue to be able to fill 99% of requests for document delivery by scanning and delivering via the web (or paper), using the current equipment and software located at each Facility.

Materials not served adequately

The Subcommittee determined five types of materials that are not served adequately:

Maps, Microfilm, and Oversized

Less than 1% of requests received by the RLFs are for microfilm (.7%) or maps (.1%). It is, however, conceivable that if a Shared Government Information Collection is developed and deposited at an RLF, requests for these types of materials may increase. Oversized materials account for a very small portion of the requests received, but do fall into this category. File size is the main issue for delivering service from the map and oversized collections. The best available delivery mechanism for this material would be by downloading the files to a CD-ROM or electronic files using compression programs.

Color

Requests for color copies have not been historically made, but we estimate that between 5-10% of requests would benefit by being delivered in color. This is especially true in the biological science fields, which will have many journals in the dim archive. Although there are planetary scanners that provide color copies, at this time, they use proprietary software and are not standards compliant. The attached spreadsheet includes information about these scanners as well as a flatbed scanner which can be used to provide color copies and is compatible with Ariel, the software used for web delivery by all of the campuses and the RLFs.

Special Collections

Special collections materials housed in the RLFs are not served directly to the library user. Instead, requests are mediated through the owning library to the RLF, and the materials transported back to the library for supervised use. At the NRLF, special collections account for about 8% of items circulated each year to the campuses for use by library patrons. Approximately 25% of the circulated special collections material consists of manuscripts and archives. Per their request, staff at the owning library performs all scanning and photocopying of special collections. If RLF staff were to become responsible for determining whether an item can be scanned or copied, and responsible for creating and delivering the copy, special training to properly handle these materials would need to take place.

To summarize, based on current requests, to provide excellent service for fewer than 1% of the total requests received would require microfilm, map, and oversized scanners and software at the RLFs. In addition, service for a larger proportion (up to 10% of document delivery requests) would require color scanners. To assume responsibility for serving special collections materials, extensive training and probably special equipment unknown to this committee would be required.

Attached is a spreadsheet (Appendix C) that provides a snapshot of some of the equipment currently available to fill these needs, although a thorough investigation has not been completed. This spreadsheet is provided only to give an idea of the type and cost of some of the equipment available to provide service for these inadequately served materials. An alternative to purchasing

such equipment and providing and maintaining training for RLF staff on said equipment, is to have the RLFs work or contract with the lead campuses, which do own some of the more specialized equipment (i.e. the Zeutschel and Widecom scanners, as well as complex camera scanners used for special projects for special collections and preservation units).

We recognize that there are a small number of other materials which may be deposited now or in the future, for which we cannot estimate use or need (i.e. video, etc.). We assume if requests for these materials begin to materialize, the service issues will be revisited.

Operational and Policy Issues

The advanced delivery mechanisms used in ILL need to be easy to learn and use, and need to be efficient for the high-volume production environments in the RLFs as well as the campuses. They also need to provide a common output that is easy for users to download and view.

Providing service for some of these specialized collections, particularly for archival materials or special collections, poses special problems, some of which we do not yet know. However, we can deduce from the CMI study that given a choice, the majority of users will select the electronic copy to which they have immediate access, over a print copy. In the course of that study very few items were requested from the RLFs. Although it is difficult to predict what the future demands and needs for the shared print collection will be, we can assume that providing service from special and archival collections, such as the shared collections will require some new policies and procedures, training, equipment and software

Policies and Procedures

The dim archive material is expected to comprise a very small percentage of the annual deposits taken into the RLFs. According to SRLF staff, the material which has been processed so far is designated as "University of California Libraries at the SRLF," and as "building use only," if loaned. Users can access them on-site or at any UC library. A user who really needs to see the original print copy should not have any problem accessing the shared print titles. However, there has only been one request thus far for delivery to a UCLA library.

In any case, the RLFs need:

1. To be able to know when they receive a request, whether it is for an item from the dim archive, so they would know not to circulate the item, but to deliver a digital or paper copy.
2. To be trained to handle the archival and other material properly, for web or paper delivery, as well as hardcopy delivery of the item to a library, if required.
3. To know which materials, if any, would be excluded from reproduction.

4. To know which materials could be delivered via the web, CD or other electronic means, and which (if any) are impractical to provide in any format other than paper;
5. To be trained or briefed about copyright considerations for reproducing these materials, especially if the scope of their responsibility expands to include Special Collections (manuscripts, etc.).

Specific procedures for all of these things should be jointly developed or coordinated by a group with membership from the RLFs, CDL, IAG and Preservation. If it is decided special collections materials would be included in RLF activity, HOSC should assign an operations liaison to the RLFs to arrange training, follow-up and ongoing consultation.

APPENDIX A

Date: Tue, 14 Oct 2003 16:54:17 -0700
Reply-To: "John W. Tanno" <jwtanno@UCDAVIS.EDU>
Sender: UC Libraries Resource Sharing Committee List
<UCLIBRSC-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU>
From: "John W. Tanno" <jwtanno@UCDAVIS.EDU>
Subject: New Charge to RSC
Comments: To: uclibrsc-l@ucop.edu
Comments: cc: SOPAG-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU
To: UCLIBRSC-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU

Dear RSC:

When the University Librarians discussed SOPAG's recommendation to implement the Elsevier/ACM Shared Print Collection Pilot Project as outlined in the final report of CDC's Working Group on the UC Shared Print Collection Pilot, they expressed an interest in an exploration of advanced delivery mechanisms that could make the circulation of the item from the print archive unnecessary. This interest arose from a concern that circulating issues from the "dim" archive would put those issues at risk. While the Pilot Project is currently in the process of being implemented, SOPAG is asking the RSC to undertake a research project to identify state-of-the-art mechanisms for document delivery, taking in to consideration the following issues:

- 1) The need to handle archival items carefully to prevent damage to them in the process of making digital or paper copies for delivery to users.
- 2) The need to provide a high-quality substitute for the original article, that could include images, maps, graphs, etc., which may be in color, oversized, or otherwise challenging to reproduce.
- 3) The operational policies and procedures necessary to effectively use the advanced delivery mechanism.
- 4) The costs for acquisition and maintenance of the mechanisms.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this charge and if SOPAG can be of any assistance to your efforts. Thank you. Best, John.

John W. Tanno Telephone: (530) 752-2110 Associate University Librarian FAX:
(530) 752-6899
The University Library EMAIL: jwtanno@ucdavis.edu
100 North West Quad
University of California
Davis, CA 95616-5292

APPENDIX B

Date: Mon, 8 Dec 2003 17:12:12 -0800
Reply-To: "John W. Tanno" <jwtanno@UCDAVIS.EDU>
Sender: UC Libraries Resource Sharing Committee List
<UCLIBRSC-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU>
From: "John W. Tanno" <jwtanno@UCDAVIS.EDU>
Subject: Fwd: New Charge to RSC
Comments: To: uclibrsc-l@ucop.edu
Comments: cc: SOPAG-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU
To: UCLIBRSC-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU

Dear Claire:

While I believe the charge already implies it, SOPAG asked that I make sure that RSC understands that the investigation into "advanced delivery mechanisms" should include all formats not currently well-served through digital delivery. Thanks. John.

Date: Tue, 21 Oct 2003 09:42:58 -0700
To: cqb@library.ucla.edu
From: "John W. Tanno" <jwtanno@ucdavis.edu>
Subject: Fwd: New Charge to RSC
Cc: SOPAG-L@LISTSERV.UCOP.EDU

Dear Claire:

One thing that was lacking in the email below giving a new charge to RSC was a timeframe for reporting back to SOPAG with the results of your research. Do you think Valentine's day, 2004 would be a reasonable date for completing your report? Thanks for your willingness to take on this new task. Best, John.

John W. Tanno Telephone: (530) 752-2110
Associate University Librarian FAX: (530) 752-6899
The University Library EMAIL: jwtanno@ucdavis.edu
100 North West Quad
University of California
Davis, CA 95616-5292