Article Delivery Services: Environmental Scan of Content, Services, and Business Models for UC Libraries

Prepared by the CLS UC Article Delivery Service Exploration Task Group
Draft Submitted to CLS, SAG 3, and SAG 2 on May 5, 2014

Introduction

The Collection Licensing Subgroup of SAG 3 charged an ad hoc task group to explore the feasibility of contracting for an article delivery service that can be used by the UC Libraries to supplement existing content delivery options for their patrons. This report will identify major services used by the UC campus libraries and in the marketplace; detail vendor content, services, and models; identify advantages and disadvantages; identify ongoing staff and other resources needed to maintain such services over time; and recommend whether a UC-wide agreement would offer easily implemented, effective services with an advantageous cost.

Background

The dynamic economic landscape of journal subscription prices has made it difficult for the UC Libraries to sustain the cost of system-wide access to publisher packages that contain large numbers of specialized or lesser-used journals that may be of use or interest to a limited number of our users. In early 2013 the former UC CDC suggested that an ad hoc task group be appointed to explore the feasibility of using a commercial article delivery service as a supplement to traditional ILL borrowing methods as a strategy to cope with walking away from UC-wide publisher packages while still providing efficient and cost-effective access to content needed by our academic community. CDC advised that the new Collections Licensing Subgroup of SAG 3 oversee this investigation.

Article Delivery Services Investigation

The Task Group reviewed available literature, webinars, reviews, and commercial services' websites. In order to understand current practices in UC Libraries, the Task Group created and deployed a survey among UC Libraries' ILL contacts.

Commercial document delivery services have long been mainstays in the world of non-academic information providers such as corporate, government, and healthcare libraries and information centers. They make it possible for information managers and even unaffiliated researchers to acquire content by

the individual document, without having to license a big package. Financial pressures on academic libraries, along with the ease and practicality of sharing digital information, have made this approach more attractive to academic libraries; as recently as 2012, 13% of document/article delivery services' business came from the education sector (Outsell, Inc., 2012).

Issues

UC Libraries are interested in learning what options and service providers exist and what depth and breadth of coverage to expect. How easy is it to integrate article delivery services into existing ILL workflows, and how affordable will these services be? We also want to know if and how the use of such services could provide statistics that inform strategic decisions about when to subscribe or license resources, and when that is not necessary or cost effective. Can using these services via a systemwide license provide access to published content in lieu of some of our UC-wide "big deals"? This data will be useful in making scarce financial resources go farther, and it will allow UC libraries to offer more customized and targeted services for the needs of their user groups on their respective campuses.

Another potential advantage of using article delivery services is to ensure copyright compliance and to streamline copyright clearance work away from the library's staff. While this is, of course, a good thing, it could mainstream academic libraries and their users into the expectation that articles and other content always must be accessed behind a pay wall, or that every access of an article represents a small payment. These marketplace concepts are disruptive to publishers' revenue streams, but they also reduce awareness of, and support for, the concept of fair use. Some of these delivery providers offer access to OA content, but this could be an opportunity to engage library users with our UC Open Access policy and with initiatives to identify and provide freely available content for researchers.

UC libraries report using collection development funds to subsidize the use of these services, although UCSF has limited the number of articles users may obtain without having to pay for them. Any UC-wide experiment with using article delivery services will raise questions on each campus about collection funds or other fund sources. Likewise, the use of these services should be linked to PDA and other collection development programs.

Analysis

The state of article delivery services is evolving rapidly. Long-term players like Infotrieve and ingentaconnect have kept up with the times to offer efficient, competitively-priced services designed for effective use by libraries as well as individual consumers. Publishers like ProQuest have entered the arena by providing direct-to-user article delivery services that are powered by their own content and search systems. New players like Deep Dyve use an iTunes-style model that allows one-time viewing at a very reasonable price. Some services offer users cloud storage and other tools, like EverNote. There are non-US based services emerging like The Chinese Source and Subito, which may be more important to us for obtaining content from publishers we do not usually access.

Most services work with publishers or brokers to arrange copyright clearance and collect these fees along with the article delivery fee. Most of these services also allow library clients to set up a mediated or self-service option for their users; most of these arrangements integrate well into existing interlibrary loan workflows, especially via OCLC/ILLiad, and many provide statistical reporting that is COUNTER compliant. Such services also would permit libraries to subsidize the cost of the article delivery or to charge end users for it.

One investigation in a university medical library outside of UC found that using these services was slightly less cost effective than purchasing articles directly from the publishers (Brown, 2012). A different finding, based on a beta test, found that the use of a single service, ReadCube, was far more cost effective than participating in so-called "big deals" for licensing (England and Jones, 2013). While some university libraries are deploying article delivery services, there does not seem to be much published or presented analysis of cost savings or staff and end user efficiencies associated with their use. Additionally, there is little published information to be found regarding their use as a strategy within libraries' PDA programs or collection budgets.

SIPX, a cloud-based commercial service spun off from Stanford, offers user-friendly management of content, copyright clearance, and end user options. It was not included in this analysis as it is being marketed currently as a service to be used for integrating course materials into a university's course management system (Yu, Russell, and Lee, 2011; SIPX, 2013). Instructors upload readings to the course management system, the SIPX software checks to find if the content is owned or licensed by the university, also searches for OA content, manages appropriate copyright clearances, and can ensure instant and easy PDF access to articles, reducing the cost of labor to check copyright/fair use status, and leveraging the library's existing licenses and subscriptions. It can lower significantly students' cost for purchasing readings for a course.

Recommendations

The review of available services reveals there could be value in a UC-leveraged use of one or more of these article delivery services. It is time for UC Libraries to explore ways in which we can best utilize the promise and potential of these services.

It is not expected that all UC libraries would participate in a shared agreement; however, 3-4 campuses must be willing to participate in order for us to pursue a UC-wide agreement with an article delivery service.

Five UC ILL units have reported beginning to utilize commercial article delivery services, but none of them have used the services on a regular basis. They report satisfaction with their experiences to date. The survey revealed that some of the libraries that have not tried these services indicated that they were thought to be cost-ineffective. This perception will need to be overcome to include the number of libraries to make a shared agreement possible.

Another issue in need of investigation is the subject and publisher coverage offered by these services. Most of these services have agreements with one or more STM or STEM publishers. While their coverage is expanding, it is not clear that a single article delivery service will fulfill the needs of users from all subject areas. Reprints Desk in particular is being utilized in some ILL departments in UC libraries, with positive reports. Reprints Desk, ingentaconnect, and the Copyright Clearance Center seem to offer the broadest coverage across subjects. These should be included in any study. It may be necessary for SAG 3 to recommend which of the STM/STEM coverage services should be included in a further investigation or UC pilot.

Two other criteria could affect the choice for considerations: price per article and delivery method. ReadCube and DeepDyve offer rental or pay-per-view mechanisms, and they tend to be the least expensive for one-time readers; other services offer more traditional pricing per article/pdf.

The CDL Collection Development Program staff should negotiate any agreement, but in order to do so, they must consult with CDOs, SCOs, and ILL staff at participating campuses to understand issues of work flows, indexing/search issues, and other implementation and use considerations. Any agreement must contain service level agreements that can be enforced, and campuses need to be able to opt in or opt out depending on how the service is working for them. This would suggest a trial period with assessment milestones.

Service Providers/Vendors

Among information managers surveyed for Outsell (2012), the most frequently mentioned full-service providers were Infotrieve, the Reprints Desk, and the British Library. In the survey conducted during April 2014 of UC libraries' ILL contacts, five of the ten campuses reported using or signing up to use one or more services. The Reprints Desk is the most frequently cited provider, but others mentioned are ProQuest, Infotrieve, Rapid ILL, PubMed, OCLC, and Linda Hall Library. The survey respondents reported very little use of these commercial services—at most once or twice a month. Boalt Express is an in-house, fee-based service operated by UC Berkeley's law library. Only two campuses reported having a commercial article delivery service approach or pitch to them. Those vendors were Reprints Desk and Copyright Clearance Center.

There is a long and growing list of providers, including for-profit, non-profit, and government article delivery suppliers. The ones with the greatest popularity and utility are shown in the charts below, although others may emerge or find a more significant market with academic libraries than they do now. These article delivery service providers use various models for delivery and pricing. Most tend to specialize in the sciences, but a few do offer broad, general coverage. They are available to individuals on a pay-per-view or subscription basis, and they are or can be made available through libraries' ILL workflows, and with academic library account pricing. One possible exception is Deep Dyve, which does not yet appear to have enlisted academic library clients.

Subject Areas and Delivery Streams

Vendor	Subject(s)	Delivery Mode	Integration
Reprints Desk	All subjects; specializing in STEM content	Instant access to PDF; link delivery for subscription, open access and print collection content	Pre-order workflows including Swets, Ovid, CCC, PubMed, etc.; via e-mail; via reprintsdesk.com; Article Galaxy Platform
British Library Document Supply Service	All subject areas and languages, with focus on STEM	Secure or encrypted PDF; Ariel; mail	Interface via BLDSS: integrates with Google Scholar, PubMed, Primo
Linda Hall Library	STM	E-mail; Fax; FedEx; Odyssey; Ariel	E-mail; DOCLINE; fax; ILLIAD; RapidILL
Infotrieve	STE; now includes CISTI	Web or mobile interface; mediated or self-service; can integrate rights management; can integrate client holdings to fulfill requests with article already licensed by client before ordering from Infotrieve	Mobile Library via web; search within client's databases; search within Infotrieve's digital and print holdings
Deep Dyve	Mostly STEM; includes Nature, Wiley, Oxford Univ. Press, Highwire, Sage, Taylor & Francis, and OA like PLoS PubMed Central, ArXiv	Current viewing interface renders article pages as screen images; printing prohibited	Web interface; Google Scholar
Copyright Clearance Center	"Get It Now" service covers mostly STEM journals but also university presses; Pubget adds Annual Copyright License for reserves, course mgt. systems	Pdf delivered to ILL department or to patron	OCLC IFM or ILLiad; also unmediated link on library's website

ProQuest LLC + Udini	Periodicals, scholarly journals, magazines, newspapers, newswires, dissertations/theses	Cloud based; user stores, retrieves, works with items via cloud	Cloud based; runs on Summon software; NOT available to libraries
Ingentaconnect	Among the most comprehensive collections of scholarly & professional research articles, including OA	Free to search and browse; Open URL	Can be used to manage electronic journal subscriptions; deliver to individual or via library's ILL workflow
ReadCube	Approximately 100 journal titles from Nature Publishing Group, Frontiers, and John Wiley & Sons	PDF via cloud	Labtiva, Inc. software = ReadCube application (reference manager) + software as a service-based reading platform called Web Reader. PDF documents delivered to user desktop. Integrated search with Google Scholar, PubMed, Microsoft Academic.
FIZ Karlsruhe AutoDoc	STEM articles, patents, proceedings, grey literature, research reports	FIZ intermediates between request and locates outside source	Automatic full text delivery to link in your library's web site, via Open URL; or e-mail, SED, fax, mail.

Prices and Turnaround Times

Vendor		Turnaround Time	Price	Copyright/Redistribution Policy
Reprints Desk		Most orders fulfilled within minutes	$15 per document; volume and configuration	Options for reuse, internal sharing and distribution

		discounts available	
British Library Document Supply Service	Options are immediate download, scan on demand, or loan. Standard is 2-4 working days but usually 48 hours. Digital content within minutes; 2-hour rush available	US, per article: $14.95 for electronic delivery; $18.95 airmail; US, 24-hour guaranteed $27 (electronic); US, 2-hour guaranteed $43.50 (electronic); additional fees for copyright can average $27; VAT	No redistribution of articles; reprints service available for multiple copies
Linda Hall Library	24-48 hours if citations provided are correct	Academic $12 per article; 25 cents additional per page over 50 pages; color copies on request for additional $1 per page No extra charges via e-mail, Ariel, or fax; $8	Copyright compliance restricts redistribution

		FedEx 2-day or $22 overnight; mail $3	
Infotrieve	Most electronic delivery is within 5 minutes. Rush and panic-level services guarantee next or same-day service M-F	$15 per article for a clean citation; $21 if citation needs referencing. Corporate accounts can include volume discounts and multiple payment options including deposit and invoice accounts. Ariel TIFF via e-mail ($0); FedEx $17 avg. Rush, panic, color all additional charges	Redistribution of articles is not authorized
Deep Dyve	Instant download from cloud. Articles available for viewing from 30 days to 1 year depending	"First 5 (minutes) free;" individuals pay-as-you go fee is 99 cents for 24 hour	Content is rented on iTunes model

	on agreement	"rental." Monthly subscription $9.99/20 articles/7 days; monthly $19.99 unlimited access	
Copyright Clearance Center	Electronic delivery is usually faster than traditional ILL, especially nights/weekends	$24-37 per article; some additional fees for copyright clearance	Copyright clearance may include options for redistribution, reserves, course systems
Proquest LLC + Udini	Electronic access upon payment per agreed upon term of access	Individual articles starting at 99 cents each; different levels and time windows for access have different prices, including monthly subscriptions; specialty items, like dissertations, can cost $37	Articles not available for printing; "personal library" within Udini site allows user to store downloads there
Ingenta Connect	Same day: view, download, or save for 24-48 hours,	$10-30 per article through most academic	Copyright limits may prohibit reuse

		upon payment or with contract	library agreements
FIZ Karlsrue Autodoc	Standard within 48 hours; rush within 24 hours; super-rush within 3 hours	Price depends on speed user chooses: $16.95 is standard delivery; $24.07 for rush; $56.84 for super rush; 30-day one time rental $6.98 per article	Copyright terms may prohibit reuse
ReadCube	Same day; downloads as PDF	Price depends on user choice: cloud PDF to keep, or 48-hour rental. Utah trial charges were $3.99 per rental; $9.99 per cloud PDF; $24.99 for PDF purchase	No printing from cloud PDFs without separate negotiation; can be set to IP authenticate and with link from paywall pages of nature.com

Sources:
Outsell, Inc. (2014), Price & Thornton-Verma (2012), and England & Jones (2013)

Resources

Brown, Heather L. (2012). Pay-Per-View in Interlibrary Loan: A Case Study. *Journal of the Medical Library Association,* 100(2), 98-103. DOI: 10.3163/1536-5050.100.2.007

D'Amato, Kristin. (2014). Advisor Reviews: Get It Now. *Charleston Advisor*, 15(3), 28-31. DOI:10.5260/chara.15.3.28.

England, Mark, and Jones, Phill. (2013). Diversification of Access Pathways and the Role of Demand Driven Acquisition – A Case Study at the University of Utah. Presentation at NASIG Conference, Buffalo, NY, June 6, 2013. Retrieved May 25, 2014 at http://media.readcube.com/www/pdfs/NASIG_Proceedings_England_and_Jones.pdf.

Fisher, Erin S., Kurt, Lisa, and Gardner, Sarah. (2012). Exploring Patron-Driven Access Models for E-journals and E-books, *The Serials Librarian: From the Printed Page to the Digital Age*, 62, 1-4, 164-168, DOI:10.1080/0361526X.2012.652913.

Kaufman, Roy S. (2013). Get It Now: Supplement ILL with Always-On Fulfillment. Presentation at NISO Webinar: *Evolving Trends in Collection Development, Part 1: New Models for Journal Article Access*. March 6, 2013. http://www.niso.org/news/events/2013/webinars/article_access.

King, Mindy, Nichols, Aaron, & Hanson, Michael. (2011). Pay-Per-View Article Delivery at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. *The Serials Librarian: From the Printed Page to the Digital Age*, 60: 1-4, 223-228, DOI:10.1080/0361526X.2011.556038.

Oberlander, Cyril. (2013). Articles Just-in-Time: Libraries & Get It Now. Presentation at NISO Webinar: *Evolving Trends in Collection Development, Part 1: New Models for Journal Article Access.* March 6, 2013. http://www.niso.org/news/events/2013/webinars/article_access.

Outsell, Inc. (2012). Document Delivery: Best Practices and Vendor Scorecard—2012 Update. Retrieved April 15, 2014 at http://info.reprintsdesk.com/Portals/28841/docs/outselldocdel-rd.pdf.

Park, William "Bill." (2013). DeepDyve: The 'Rent to Own' Model for Accessing Scholarly Content. Presentation at NISO Webinar: *Evolving Trends in Collection Development, Part 1: New Models for Journal Article Access.* March 6, 2013. http://www.niso.org/news/events/2013/webinars/article_access.

Price, Gary, and Thornton-Verma, Henrietta. (2012, May 17). What ProQuest's Udini Means for Libraries." *Library Journal*. Retrieved May 1, 2014 at http://reviews.libraryjournal.com/2012/05/reference/what-proquests-udini-means-for-libraries/

Reprints Desk Launches Academic Document Delivery Service. (2013). *Advanced Technology Libraries*, 42: no. 6. http://site.ebrary.com/pub/atl/docDetail.action?docID=10756905&page=10.

Schwartz, Meredith. (2013, June 6). DeepDyve: The First Five's Free. *Library Journal Academic Newswire.* Retrieved April 14, 2014 at http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/06/academic-libraries/deepdyve-the-first-fives-free/# .

SIPX, Inc. (2013). SIPX for Higher Education. Retrieved May 22, 2014 at http://www.sipx.com.

Yu, Jiafeng (Camilla), Russell, Martha G., and Lee, Franny. [2011]. Student Attitudes and Preferences for Cost and Format Options in Personalized, Cost Subsidized Print on Demand Course Materials: Stanford Intellectual Property Exchange (SIPX). Palo Alto, CA: MediaX. Retrieved May 24, 2014 at http://sipx.stanford.edu/student_attitudes.pdf.

Submitted to CLS/SAG 3 by the TF:

Susan E. Parker, UCLA (Chair)

Lynn Grigsby, UCB

Sarah McClung, UCSF

Margery Tibbetts, CDL

Jacqueline Wilson, CDL

UC Article Delivery Service Exploration Task Group
DRAFT (revised) Charge for SAG 3 and SAG 2 review
October 25,2013

Background:

With the dynamic economic landscape of journal subscriptions prices, UC Libraries find it difficult to sustain the cost of system-wide access to publisher packages that contain large numbers of specialized or lesser-used journals of interest to a limited number of users. In early 2013 the former UC CDC suggested that an ad hoc task group be appointed to explore the feasibility of using a commercial article delivery service as a supplement to traditional ILL borrowing methods as a strategy to cope with walking away from UC-wide publisher packages while still providing efficient and cost-effective access to content needed by our academic community. CDC advised that the new Collections Licensing Subgroup of SAG 3 oversee this effort.

Commercial services, such as Reprints Desk, DeepDyve, Infotrieve, are examples of companies with robust title offerings that may have business models for licensing at a consortial level.

Charge:

The Collection Licensing Subgroup of SAG 3 charges an ad hoc task group to explore the feasibility of contracting for an article delivery service that can be used by the UC libraries to supplement existing content delivery options for their patrons. The task group is expected to:
- Conduct an environmental scan of existing services used by campuses and in the market place
- Detail vendor content, services and business models
- Detail the advantages and disadvantages of the services including:
    o the ability of the service to seamlessly integrate with existing UC delivery services and workflows
    o Ease of use by end user,
- Identify ongoing staff and other resources that might be needed to maintain the service over time
- Recommend whether a UC-wide agreement would provide effective service at an advantageous cost.
Cost considerations include whether providing a service is a seamless and easily implemented operation.

Assumptions & Caveats:

1. It is not expected that all UC libraries would participate; however, at least three to four UC campuses must be willing to participate in order to pursue a UC-wide agreement for an article delivery service.
2. Negotiation of the the agreement for UC Libraries will draw upon expertise from the CDL Collection Development Program and the Discovery and Delivery Program since the staff in these service areas have the experience, expertise, and infrastructure needed to craft a UC agreement.

Membership Composition:

1. Five members, including the chair, a CLS member
   a. One member serves as the CLS sponsor and liaison
   b. One member from the CDL Collection Development Team(appointed by Ivy Anderson)
   c. One member from the CDL Discovery and Delivery Team (appointed by Patti Martin) who has experience with the technical aspects of access and delivery to address direct service to users
   d. One member who has experience analyzing vendor proposals and services, effective communication and organizational skills, knowledge of journal publishing trends and issues, and expertise about the delivery of services
2. Because of the relationship with resource sharing, the task group will also include a SAG2 representative

Communication

1. *The task force will submit periodic written reports to the stakeholder groups: CLS, SAG 2 and SAG 3.*

Task Force Expected Deliverables:

o Report evaluating and describing:
   1. the state of article delivery services
   2. the advantages and disadvantages of these services, and
   3. recommendations about whether a UC consortial service is worth pursuing.

o Regular progress updates through the channels described in the communication section of the charge.

CLS Deliverables

CLS and SAG 2 will review the report and recommendations of the Task Force and present its evaluation and recommendations to SAG 3 for review and comment. SAG 3 will forward the report and their recommendations to the Coordinating Committee for review and transmission to CoUL for final discussion and approval.

Timeline:

By April 15, 2014 submit a final report with recommendations to SAG 3 Chair (Diane Bisom),SAG 2 Chair (Patti Martin), and CLS Chair (Kerry Scott).

In January of 2014, SAG 2, SAG 3 and CLS jointly charged an Article Delivery Task Force to conduct an environmental scan of current Article Delivery service providers. The group was specifically asked to:

- Detail vendor content, services and business models
- Detail the advantages and disadvantages of the services including: the ability of the service to seamlessly integrate with existing UC delivery services and workflows and ease of use by end user
- Identify ongoing staff and other resources that might be needed to maintain the service over time
- Recommend whether a UC-wide agreement would provide effective service at an advantageous cost.

The Task Force completed its work in June. The report is linked here from the CLS website.

Ultimately, after discussing the report's findings in each of the sponsoring groups, SAG 3, SAG 2 and CLS determined that a system wide approach to article delivery services was premature. We agreed that the best course of action at this time was to distribute the report widely and encourage campuses and the CDL to pursue and/or support locally-focused article delivery pilots.

Further, SAG 3, SAG 2 and CLS agreed to keep the report on our respective project watch lists and review it in a year and assess whether the landscape has changed sufficiently to warrant a second look at system wide opportunities for article delivery services.

The Task Force has provided all of us with an excellent overview of the current options for article delivery services. We strongly encourage campuses to pursue pilots and share the parameters and findings of their pilots with SAG 2, SAG 3 and the CLS. Local efforts may be the most effective method in helping to refine and shape system wide possibilities.

Thank you to the Task Force for all of their hard work. We know that this report will be of great value to the campuses and the CDL.

Sincerely,
Kerry Scott for the CLS membership
Patti Martin for the SAG 2 membership
Diane Bisom for the SAG 3 membership

RE: Article Delivery Task Force Next Steps

Kerry Scott <scottk@ucsc.edu>   Tue, Jul 15, 2014 at 1:28 PM
To: "Parker, Susan" <sparker@library.ucla.edu>, "lgrigsby@library.berkeley.edu" <lgrigsby@library.berkeley.edu>,
"McClung, Sarah" <Sarah.McClung@ucsf.edu>, Margery Tibbetts <margery.tibbetts@ucop.edu>, Jacqueline Wilson
<Jacqueline.Wilson@ucop.edu>
Cc: Patricia Martin <Patricia.Martin@ucop.edu>, Diane Bisom <diane.bisom@ucr.edu>, Rosalie Lack
<Rosalie.Lack@ucop.edu>

Dear Task Force Members,
On behalf of SAG2 and the CLS, we would like to thank you for your work on the Article Delivery Task Force.
Your collective effort has provided the UC libraries with an excellent environmental scan of the current state of this
rapidly evolving service area. Your thorough review of the current offerings has made it clear to both the SAG 2
and CLS memberships that pursuing a system wide pilot would be premature. We do believe that your collective
efforts will serve as an excellent reference tool for campuses that elect to pursue pilots locally. To that end, we
have made the following recommendations regarding next steps for the task force's work:

- The report should be widely distributed among the UCs
- Campuses and the CDL should be encouraged to pursue or support locally focused pilots utilizing one
  or more of the article delivery services referenced in the report.
- If campuses or the CDL pursue or support locally focused pilots they should share their pilot
  parameters and findings with the CLS, SAG 2 and SAG 3
- SAG 2, SAG 3 and the CLS should add a one year review to each of their project watch lists and
  assess the *new* current state of article delivery options at that time and determine if the landscape has
  changed sufficiently to warrant a second look at system wide opportunities for article delivery services.

Thank you again for all of your work on this task force. We appreciate the time and effort that went into this report
and are confident that it will be of great value to the campuses and the CDL.
Sincerely,
Kerry Scott, for the CLS membership
Patti Martin, for the SAG 2 membership

cc: SAG 3 Chair, Diane Bisom, Rosalie Lack, CC Chair