

Massachusetts Library System (MLS)
Mediated Interlibrary Loan Service Models
Review and Evaluation

Prepared by:

Ruth E. Kowal
Strategic Assessment and Planning Services

Table of Contents

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Project overview | 3 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Findings and Observations | 7 |
| Existing Discovery and Requesting Systems | 8 |
| Activity and Related Financial Context | 10 |
| Factors Potentially Influencing Mediated ILL Traffic | 12 |
| Option Review | 17 |
| Conclusion and Steps for Implementation | 22 |
| Appendix A-Interview List | 24 |
| Appendix B-Links to Related Documents | 25 |
| Appendix C-Model MLS Mediated Interlibrary Loan Budget | 26 |

Project Overview

Consultant Ruth Kowal was retained by the Massachusetts Library System (MLS) to provide assessment of and planning services for the provision of regionally supported mediated interlibrary loan (ILL) service. The consultant reviewed current service delivery and ILL operations, evaluated various service provision scenarios, and determined estimated costs for the delivery of mediated interlibrary loan service for MLS member libraries. “Mediated interlibrary loan” refers to returnable item transactions where the borrowing or lending library is not able to engage directly with the owning or requesting library.

Service delivery models were examined for service efficiency and cost-effectiveness, and estimated costs for any one-time changes and/or conversion costs, as well as ongoing costs for year one of a new service model (FY14), and cost considerations for year two and beyond were developed.

MLS requested that the following scenarios be reviewed:

1. Continuation of the current contract with the two existing interlibrary loan centers at the Wellesley Free Library and the Thomas Crane Library (Quincy).
2. Consolidation of all mediated interlibrary loan to a single interlibrary loan center, for which MLS would issue an RFP for service delivery.
3. Consolidation of OCLC lending/borrowing to a single interlibrary loan center and shift non-OCLC Massachusetts lending/borrowing to an internal MLS service delivery operation.
4. Consolidate all mediated interlibrary loan to an internal MLS service delivery operation.
5. Additional scenarios if identified were to be evaluated by the consultant.

MLS requested that any service enhancements to be realized under a particular scenario be identified, and that other related activities, such as a new Virtual Catalog product and/or inter-state delivery services, be incorporated into the review and assessment.

Executive Summary

The project process consisted of a series of interviews (see Appendix A-Interview List) with library professionals in Massachusetts, as well as individuals from other states regarding the provision of mediated interlibrary loan service operations.

A detailed operational review was conducted with administrative and interlibrary loan staff at the MLS contracting libraries, the Wellesley Free Library and the Thomas Crane Public Library, Quincy. The staff at Wellesley and Quincy provided an array of useful statistical information regarding interlibrary loan traffic, as well as anecdotal information on process flow and service delivery.

Research was conducted through a review of relevant literature and interviews with selected organizations and systems in other states. Cost information for the two interlibrary centers was developed and reviewed in comparison with literature findings and the experience of the non-Massachusetts programs. The costs for processing a mediated interlibrary request for the members of MLS were found to be consistent with the cost studies reported in the literature performed by ARL and various academic libraries over the past 20 years, with the average cost in recent studies coming in just under \$20.00* per transaction. The average for the two MLS processing centers is slightly over \$20.00 per member library request transaction.

In virtually every interview the importance of an easy-to-use discovery system was mentioned. Easy discovery, combined with patron initiated requesting, was seen as the desired end goal. The more library users are able to search and make their own requests, the lower the per request cost. This is evident when one looks at the “cost” of a network transfer within the Massachusetts automated resource sharing networks where the borrower identifies and requests to borrow an item on-line. If the sole purpose of the networks was for resource sharing, and all network costs were attached to the provision of resource sharing, the “cost” per network transfer

in Massachusetts is \$1.79. The relatively low-traffic Massachusetts Virtual Catalog “costs” \$1.37 per request. *Note: Cited costs reflect system or ILL Center gross costs and do not include transportation or local library labor costs. Transportation costs for out-of-state transactions are significantly higher than MLS-provided in-state courier costs. See page 11 for more details.*

As improvements continue to be made in options for unmediated interlibrary loan for MLS members, MLS needs to position itself to be able to closely manage service delivery, service consistency, and service cost. Perhaps even more importantly, MLS needs to be able to change service models quickly in response to changes in the larger resource-sharing universe. This means that MLS should seriously consider bringing the mediated interlibrary loan service in-house as a program of MLS. Making that change will position MLS to make needed program adjustments quickly, as well as result in reducing program costs. The reduction in costs will provide MLS with the opportunity to redirect those funds to enhancements to the resource-sharing program or other needed system services.

Findings and Observations

The bulk of Massachusetts Library System (MLS) member library user's interlibrary loan needs are met through the automated resource sharing networks and network transfers. Network transfers, loans between members of a network, have totaled just under 6.5 million loans annually for the past two fiscal years. What cannot be found in the local library network is sometimes, but not always, then searched for and requested via the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners Statewide Virtual Catalog (the Virtual Catalog) database, resulting in just over 80,000 filled requests in FY11. Libraries unable to obtain a title through their resource sharing network, or unable or unwilling to obtain it via the Virtual Catalog, generally turn to their assigned MLS Interlibrary Loan Center at either the Wellesley Free Library or the Thomas Crane Public Library in Quincy. The two centers are on track to process 26,000 requests in FY12. Filled requests, projected at 21,000 for FY12, come from their own collections, through their local network (the Minuteman Library Network and the Old Colony Library Network), or through OCLC. This amount is consistent with the number of fills in FY11.

For the library user, the local library's participation in one of the resource sharing networks, the ability of users to be able to access discovery tools beyond the network catalog (libraries with First Search which permit direct user access), local staff willingness to navigate the Virtual Catalog, local financial support for coverage of interlibrary lending costs, and the promotion of interlibrary loan as an option by staff all factor into the provision of interlibrary loan as a core service to users. There are significant differences across the State in the levels of mediated interlibrary loan service offered through the local library, with some libraries paying all costs associated with an OCLC loan, and others requiring only free loans. Regardless of how MLS provides ILL services in the future, improved consistency in access to ILL for users is desirable.

The review of mediated interlibrary loan cannot be done in isolation. The nine automated resource-sharing networks, MassCat, the Virtual Catalog project, the Boston Library Consortium's WorldCat Local project, and other systems and historic relationships among libraries are all players in the broader interlibrary loan universe. The thread of "interlibrary loan" is shared by all of the above, but each holds a slice that is different from the other, although sometimes overlapping (e.g. Boston Library Consortium members which are also members of MLS) and often a service perspective that is different from the other as well.

The single most important factor in effective and efficient interlibrary loan is a simple and reliable discovery tool, supported by a simple requesting process. Requesting is at its most efficient when it is patron initiated and electronically managed. An ongoing commitment to achieve the following will provide for the best user experience at the lowest cost: unmediated requesting; maximized use of technology; and expanded reciprocity within and outside Massachusetts, supported by a timely, no-cost, and reliable delivery system.

Existing Discovery and Requesting Systems¹

The vast majority of discovery, requesting, and interlibrary lending occurs via the **automated resource sharing networks**. Within the State, the nine networks process the lion's share of "interlibrary loan" activity among member libraries through network transfers. Network transfers are patron-initiated transactions. Requests are made online by the patron, a "pull list" is system-generated, requests are sent automatically by the ILS system to libraries holding the desired item, and staff retrieve the requested title from the shelf. The item is then checked out to the requesting location and placed in the regional delivery system.

¹ Note: Information in this section does not reflect ILL activity between Massachusetts libraries that are full members of OCLC and are managing their ILL activity in-house.

In FY10, 6,520,329 items were lent as network transfers by a network member library to another library in the same network for local patron use.

The automated resource sharing networks are running on several different ILS systems, including Innovative Interfaces (III), Evergreen, and Sirsi/Dynix. An additional ILS system, Polaris, will be installed in near future for the MBLN network, replacing an older Sirsi/Dynix system.

Also facilitating patron initiated discovery and requesting is the Virtual Catalog. Since 2004, the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners' Massachusetts Statewide Virtual Catalog, running on Sirsi/Dynix' URSA, has been providing direct patron discovery and, to varying degrees due to system "incompatibilities," patron initiated borrowing access to the nine Massachusetts Library networks, the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and University of Massachusetts-Lowell, Bridgewater State University, and Westfield State College. The Virtual Catalog enables patrons to perform a single search across all of the catalogs simultaneously for an item, to view availability, and in most instances to request online to borrow the item. Requested items are processed for loan similarly to a network transfer, described above. An RFP is currently underway for a potential upgrade/replacement.

When the Virtual Catalog project was first launched, the Boston Library Consortium (BLC) libraries were active participants. As compatibility issues with URSA arose, the BLC moved to a WorldCat Local and Navigator solution for resource sharing among its member. It is hoped that the new Massachusetts Virtual Catalog will support participation by the BLC in the future.

In FY11, 81,975 items were lent as a result of a request made through the Virtual Catalog.

MassCat, which formerly functioned as a project of five regions, is now a service of the MLS. MassCat is filling a niche for libraries that are interested in building an

online catalog, managing collections (online catalog, circulation control, reserves, etc), and participating in resource sharing, but find the cost of membership in one of the resource sharing networks prohibitive. MassCat is in essence the tenth ILS system in Massachusetts. MassCat is especially attractive to smaller public libraries, as well as school and special libraries. The current user interface to MassCat feels very similar to the Virtual Catalog, and provides information to the user in a similar manner. MassCat provides patron initiated discovery and requesting, but not all members permit direct user access.

MassCat is using Koha for its shared online catalog and circulation functions. Member fees cover system costs (\$25,000 for the system, \$2,500 in OCLC charges for cataloging, and some operating costs such as a portion of the administrator's salary). MLS currently has funds allocated for Koha development. These funds may be used to provide desired expansion of functionality being requested by participating libraries.

MassCat currently has 70 members using the shared ILS, with another 6 converting their collections at the present time. In FY11 MassCat facilitated just under 2,400 loans among its members. Resource sharing is limited to within the MassCat database, as MassCat is currently not included in the Virtual Catalog. Requests for items not in MassCat are sent to the appropriate Interlibrary Loan center (although for libraries in the C/W Mars area that still hold a C/W Mars library card, requests can be placed directly in the C/W Mars system). Participation by MassCat in the Virtual Catalog was seen as highly desirable.

Activity and Related Financial Context

To put the mediated interlibrary loan traffic in context, the Interlibrary Loan Service Centers in Wellesley and Quincy are projected to receive and process just under

27,000 transaction from libraries in their designated MLS service areas by the end of FY12. This number is similar to the volume of requesting in FY11.

This number does not include the nearly 60,000 OCLC borrowing requests received by the two processing centers from non-MLS OCLC members in Massachusetts and non-Massachusetts OCLC member libraries. FY12 projections indicate an expected 12,000 (20%) of these OCLC borrowing requests will be filled from the Minuteman Library Network (MLN) and the Old Colony Library Network (OCLN) member libraries' collections. In FY11 Wellesley filled 14% of the OCLC fills from its own collection; Minuteman (MLN) member libraries filled the remaining 84% of the OCLC requests received by Wellesley. The two networks acting as OCLC lenders are contributing significantly to the reciprocity of OCLC-based ILL.

Gross cost calculations put the "cost-value" of a network transfer at \$1.79; a mediated interlibrary loan at just over \$20.00 per transaction.² Clearly, the more traffic that can be handled as a network transfer, or a similar process, the more cost effective the service. The same "value" (based on operating, not capital costs) for non-mediated transactions is replicated with the "cost-value" of the Virtual Catalog fills at \$1.37 per transaction.

² Gross calculations are based on total operating costs for all networks divided by the total number of network transfers and the total operating costs for the two interlibrary loan processing centers divided by the total number of mediated interlibrary loan requests received from members of MLS.

Factors Potentially Influencing Mediated Interlibrary Loan Traffic

There are a number of factors that have the potential in the near term to reduce mediated interlibrary loan traffic. These include:

More significant

- ◆ Virtual Catalog upgrade with improved functionality and expanded participation (addition of MassCat; potential for participation by Boston Library Consortium members)
- ◆ Additional libraries joining one of existing automated resource-sharing networks

Less significant

- ◆ Retrospective Conversion of Boston Public Library research collection holdings and policy change by Boston Public Library to permit some items held in the research collection to circulate
- ◆ Continuing digitization of collections permitting online access to titles

The potential Virtual Catalog upgrade and expanded participation holds much promise for enhancing discovery and direct requesting by patrons, and thus reducing the need for mediated interlibrary loan service. With the decision on the new product coming late in FY12/early in FY13, followed by implementation in phases, the full impact of the new system may not be felt until sometime in the FY15 to FY16 timeframe. What is also unknown at this time is the scope of functionality for the new product.

Enhanced statewide systems are continuing to be deployed across the country. In 2008 RMG Consultants, Inc. worked with the Florida Division of Library and Information Services to develop the “Strategic Goals for the Florida Electronic

Library (FEL).” Through FEL, the Florida Electronic Library has launched statewide support for online resource sharing, which utilizes OCLC’s “Navigator Lite” and permits Florida residents to search for and request items found in WorldCat or FloridaCat, the Florida union catalog, online.

Texas, which has had nine interlibrary loan centers located in public libraries, is moving to a virtual catalog for discovery and direct patron requesting, permitting unmediated interlibrary loan. The change from ILL center to unmediated requesting is a follow-up to a 2008 study by the Bibliographical Center for Research (BCR). In its transition phase BCR recommended moving from nine interlibrary loan centers to one, as the new statewide system is being implemented. The transition process and implementation are currently underway.

The Texas State Library anticipates both significant improvements in the library customer experience, especially in terms of turn-around time from request to delivery, and reductions in cost for resource sharing as a result of unmediated activity.

Another factor that will continue to reduce mediated interlibrary loan traffic is the addition of libraries to existing networks and the expansion of MassCat membership. Although there are not a significant number of libraries that are candidates for network membership, there are enough that continued efforts to encourage membership is beneficial. Both MLS and MBLC are considering efforts to encourage such membership, which will allow for the most cost effective type of loan, i.e., non-mediated self-service.

As an example of the potential for reduction in mediated interlibrary loan traffic, the Sherborn Public Library, which has indicated its intentions to join the MLN network, has been a steady user of MLS’s mediated interlibrary loan service through the Wellesley Free Library. For the period July-December 2011, 282 requests were filled for Sherborn through mediated interlibrary loan. Sherborn’s traffic accounted

for 5% of all of the ILL center's member library traffic during that time period, at a "cost-value" at \$5,600 (based on the \$20.00 per request). That same amount of traffic as network transfers would have a "cost-value" of just over \$500.00 (see footnote 2).

Another intriguing avenue towards improved statewide discovery and resource sharing lies in the multi-million-volume research collection of the Boston Public Library (BPL). In a small sample of 120 titles for which the Interlibrary Loan Center at the Wellesley Free Library procured the item with a lending fee from an OCLC lender, 28 of the titles, or 23% of the requests are held in the BPL's collection. Of those 28 titles, 17 are in the research collection and are currently limited to "in library use".

For some time now, BPL has been in the process of preparing to make a portion of the titles held in the research collection circulating; however, the implementation is not as simple as a blanket change in policy. Large numbers of rare and fragile materials, which are not candidates for lending, are inter-shelved with more recent additions to the research collection. Separating the validly lendable items from those titles that cannot be lent due to condition or value requires a significant staff effort. Recent additions are currently being prepared to be available for lending in the near future.

Of the rare and fragile volumes in the research collection, many are pre-1923 and are thus candidates for digitization. As requests are received for these titles via interlibrary loan, digital copies are offered to the requestor. This process responds to specific requests in a timely manner, and gradually builds the digital collections at BPL, with a cumulative statewide benefit. Facilitating this process for end users will be both a service and a cost benefit.

In addition the BPL participates in the Internet Archive's Open Library project at <http://openlibrary.org>, where in-copyright titles are being digitized and made

available to users on a “one loan at a time per digitized copy” model. The BPL started with post-1923, much-used genealogy titles for this project, making them available digitally through the Open Library, and plans to add additional titles to the collection.

The large number of titles in the research collection that have yet to be retrospectively converted further hampers the discovery facet of the BPL collection. Although BPL has been working steadily for the past decade to convert large numbers of these titles, due to limited resources, much remains to be done. A portion of the funding received through the Library for the Commonwealth program is used to make more volumes accessible through retrospective conversion. The research holdings are estimated at 8-10 million; currently the total MBLN database, which includes BPL’s research holdings, as well as its circulating collection and the holdings of other MBLN member libraries, shows holdings just over 3 million titles.

In the interim, much of this resource, which has the potential to significantly expand its statewide benefit in the future, continues to remain hidden from online discovery tools, and use is limited to those who can make the trip to Copley Square.

Not all state library agencies and library systems are in the business of providing mediated interlibrary loan service. In Connecticut, the Connecticut Library Consortium had been providing mediated interlibrary loan service through a contract with the Donahue Group. That contract has since ceased, and there is no provision of mediated interlibrary loan service being offered in the state. No state support for mediated ILL is anticipated in the near future. Individual libraries not belonging to OCLC use WorldCat as though they are a member of the public, and upon finding an item, will approach a potential lender directly (not through OCLC) to obtain an item. Connecticut has an online statewide union catalog, reQuest, with the holdings of 200 libraries, running on Autographics. In FY11 134,000 requests were filled through reQuest.

Library systems have also begun to set limits on eligibility for mediated interlibrary loan. As an example, the Mid-Hudson Library System in Poughkeepsie, New York no longer accepts requests for “any item readily available for under \$25” and for “...popular, readily available DVDs and music CDs.” This change in service has resulted in a noticeable reduction in mediated ILL traffic.

Option Review

Status Quo (Contracts with Wellesley Free Library and Thomas Crane Public Library)

The MLS requested that the consultant review a variety of possible options for the provision of mediated interlibrary loan services. The current arrangement, with a contract with the Wellesley Free Library and the Thomas Crane Public Library in Quincy, for the provision of the service has continued a long-standing, stable, “well-oiled” machine approach to interlibrary loan. Each ILL center operates with a fair amount of autonomy in the host library, with the ILL staff focusing their efforts on the MLS members they are responsible for. There is a high satisfaction rate with the service by MLS member libraries.

Although the bulk of mediated interlibrary is done via OCLC, the interlibrary loan centers rely on “point-to-point” to request materials that are listed in OCLC in one of the OCLC non-lender ILS networks in Massachusetts. Quincy, for example, has an email template it uses to make these requests on behalf of the requesting library. Materials are delivered to Quincy, and then put back in the regional delivery to the requesting library. On average 60 requests a month are handled as point-to-point transactions by Quincy.

Both ILL centers indicated that they are able to obtain 90-95% of the items they request via OCLC for free, but that they have to cancel more requests because the requesting libraries can't or won't pay for postage and/or borrowing fees. Quincy reported that approximately 25% of the requests they receive have to be cancelled because a free loan is not available anywhere and the requesting library is unable or unwilling to pay postage/borrowing charges. Wellesley's cancel rate is slightly lower, which may be related to the willingness to pay by the communities represented in their service area.

The staff at both of the contracting libraries are experienced, service-oriented, and go the extra mile to provide good service delivery. They are very cognizant of the value of access to OCLC, and the importance of reciprocity as a borrower and a lender. Service is still a pretty traditional interlibrary loan center model, although requests mostly arrive electronically and member libraries have had to pick up activities such as reporting the status of an item to the ILL center and the packing and shipping of returns to libraries not on statewide delivery system. Both centers have elected to use CLIO, rather than ILLiad, as their ILL management tool. CLIO costs less (\$2,200 per year for each center) than ILLiad, has a reputation for being easier to keep up and running, and handles multiple shipping addresses with more ease.

Each center currently has a flat-rate contract for \$270,000 with MLS, at a cost of \$540,000 annually in the MLS budget. Personnel (salaries and benefits) constitute the lion's share of the cost attributed to the program. Each center is staffed with a department head librarian, 2 full-time support staff, and approximately a half-time position. Staff salary and benefits costs represent 78%-82% of the budget for the centers. The percentage of the budget allocated to staffing costs is consistent with mediated ILL program costs reported in the library literature.

Each center pays its local network for the ports used for ILL (Wellesley has 4; Quincy has 3) and for the OCLC resource sharing costs for the network. Quincy's OCLC costs are just under \$1,000 per month, \$12,000 annually; Wellesley currently budgets \$35,000 for OCLC, which includes \$20,000 for FirstSearch for members of the former MetroWest and some of the Northeast regions that had First Search at the time of the regional consolidation. Other operating costs such as web maintenance, phone, postage, travel, audit (Quincy), and equipment are attributed to the remainder of the budget. Quincy has been able to continue to purchase some titles to fill requests; Wellesley has had to eliminate acquisitions for budgetary reasons. For FY13 Wellesley has included a cost for space rental at \$27,000.

Both Wellesley and Quincy expressed concerns over the fixed amount of the contract and appear to be reluctant to commit to multi-year contracts due to fluctuating costs they are unable to control. Although each is aware of, and it appears even anticipating, future change, any impact on long-term staff that have diligently and expertly provided this service will need to be facilitated.

Single Contract for service

Having two interlibrary loan centers inherently means duplication of some costs: management, CLIO, postage machines/service, network/OCLC resource sharing costs, and web/technology support-all costs that could be reduced with a single center. Mediated interlibrary loan continues to be a labor-intensive service, and combining service into a single contract could result in some reduction in management and personnel costs, as well as a reduction in other operating costs. If MLS decides to issue an RFP for a single center it needs to be prepared in the event no candidates come forward and/or meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The bottom line: a fair amount of work for not much of a financial savings, coupled with the potential for a new, and possibly inexperienced, service provider with the risk of some disruption of service.

Should MLS decide to move to a new in-house model of service delivery, it may make sense, however, for MLS to move to a single contract with one of the existing providers as part of a transition plan. Another approach would be to reduce the amount of the contracts with the two existing centers, with an appropriate reduction in service area, at the same time MLS was developing and beginning to implement its internal resource sharing staff and service program.

Formula-Based Contract

While a formula-based contract could offer MLS the opportunity to fully control costs moving forward, it is in reality unlikely to result in noticeable cost savings now or in the future. With the current ILS centers experiencing a 90-95% no-cost fulfillment rate there isn't much likelihood of a decrease in results (thus reducing the formula-based payment for service) nor is there the opportunity to increase results given that fees are assessed to the borrowing library. The market of supply and demand is fairly balanced.

As an established service, with costs that are known and not subject to much change, the formula approach offers little in terms of a longer-term solution. It could, however, be used as a mechanism to allocate funds transitionally in the event MLS made the decision to move the mediated interlibrary loan program in-house.

Administrative Function of MLS

Offering mediated interlibrary loan service as an administrative function of MLS should be considered. Library systems have successfully offered this service out of administrative headquarters for many years. In considering this option, MLS will need to determine if it makes sense operationally and fiscally. What is the impact of additional staffing on the MLS operation? Is space for the ILL operation readily available? Are there operating costs, such as administrative costs associated with accounting, expanded tel/data, and similar overhead costs that need to be factored into the plan? What will be the impact on management staff? What will be required to establish service relationships with OCLC and with a network or networks to serve as OCLC lenders?

If MLS brings interlibrary loan in-house the decision will need to be made regarding OCLC lender status. MLS could elect to be a non-lender processing center. There is no penalty financially from OCLC for being a non-lender. The issue of lender vs. non-lender comes into play with regards to reciprocity and the ability to borrow for free because you lend for free. It is probable that the assessment of borrowing costs will occur more often if MLS is a non-lender. As noted earlier, a high percentage of OCLC lending is currently from the collections of the members belonging to the MLN and OCLN networks. MLS will need to consider carefully the benefits, both financially and reputation-wise among the larger library community, of OCLC reciprocity. In addition to OCLC's ILLiad license, MLS would need to have access to WorldCat Resource Sharing for ILL transactions in-house or through a network or a library. WorldCat Resource Sharing is a cost currently being carried by the two ILL centers through their respective networks.

Mediated interlibrary loan as an administrative function has the potential for meaningful cost reductions, as much as \$100,000-\$140,000 annually (See **Appendix C-Model MLS Mediated Interlibrary Loan Budget**). Costs savings will be greater if MLS has existing space that could be repurposed at no additional cost. The cost per interlibrary loan request would be reduced by about 25%, to \$15.00 per request. Perhaps even more importantly, bringing ILL in-house would position MLS to move quickly to respond to changes in the library resource sharing service delivery arena. As an administrative function, MLS would be able to fully integrate mediated interlibrary loan into the broader resource-sharing universe, both within Massachusetts and beyond.

By bringing together MLS staff who have complimentary responsibilities for program and service development (for example, staff development, delivery, reference and information services, e-resources) MLS would be better positioned to "think big" about next generation library system services, and the coordinated planning and execution of those services, particularly as the volume of physical lending is supplanted by electronic transactions.

Historically interlibrary loan service centers were tied to strong library collections, the theory being that many of the requests could be filled out of that collection. ILL has evolved into a service that is not bound to a particular library's collection, and it has become a service that is integrally intertwined with discovery services, with digital and e-resources, with reference and information services, and with physical delivery. The physical relationship with a library collection is no longer needed.

Conclusion and Steps for Implementation

By moving the mediated interlibrary loan activity in-house, MLS will be in a position of agility, with direct control over budgetary and service decisions. Further, MLS will be able to move towards implementation of statewide consistency of service. MLS needs to be positioned to move quickly as factors outside of their direct control, e.g. the virtual catalog implementation, move ahead.

1. MLS must first determine if it is desirable and feasible to move mediated interlibrary into MLS as an additional administrative function.
2. If the decision is made to move it in-house, a transition plan needs to be drafted for FY14 and FY15. A work plan based on the current level of interlibrary loan request traffic, including the staffing plan and job descriptions for MLS resource sharing staff, and a member library staff-training program, needs to be developed.
3. Consider consolidating to a single service center on an interim basis, or to reduce the contracts, and service area, with both of the existing centers; enter into short-term (one year) contract with the provider library/ies in FY14. Begin to operate a limited MLS mediated ILL center during FY14, serving a portion of the MLS members.
4. Monitor progress of the virtual catalog project to see how that might impact mediated interlibrary loan activity. Be prepared to make

adjustments to staffing levels/service approach in response to the service impact of Virtual Catalog. Consider holding off transition until final procurement decisions on the new virtual catalog are finalized in order to build in the highest level of efficiencies.

5. Monitor use of mediated interlibrary loan service to identify heavy users. Determine if options such as network or MassCat membership could reduce reliance on mediated interlibrary loan.
6. Initiate discussions with automated networks to expand the pool of potential lenders to enhance the level of member library reciprocity that will lead to no-fee OCLC lending and a high level of customer service from out-of-state lenders.

The Wellesley Free Library and the Thomas Crane Public Library have served the Massachusetts Library System and its predecessor systems long and well, responding to the needs of member libraries with care and high quality service. However, changes in technology and in society have resulted in library users who expect a service model that is more like the Internet: self-service with speed. The role that contemporary discovery systems play in the identifying and the requesting of items sought by library users has made it even more appropriate for the MLS's mediated interlibrary loan operation to be delivered as an administrative function. Interlibrary loan no longer needs to be directly linked to a library collection; what is needed is online access to holdings information and the ability to request an item electronically. Of the over 6.5M interlibrary loan transactions (network transfers, virtual catalog and MassCat facilitated loans) mediated interlibrary loan represents .004% of the interlibrary loan activity in Massachusetts. Transitioning the service to an administrative function of MLS will result in meaningful cost reduction, but more importantly will position MLS to have immediate and direct control over program development and dissemination. The end result will be consistent, relevant, timely, and cost-effective delivery of service.

Appendix A-Interview List

Massachusetts Library System

Greg Pronvevitz, Executive Director
Carolyn Noah, Assistant Director
Norah Blake, MassCat Manager

Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners

Cynthia (Cindy) Roach, Head of Library Advisory and Development and (former
Southeastern MA Library System (SEMLS) Executive Director)
Paul Kissman, Library Information System Specialist

Interlibrary Loan Service Centers

Wellesley Free Library
Janice Coduri, Director,
Sue Kalor, Interlibrary Loan Supervisor

Thomas Crane Library, Quincy, MA
Harry Williams, Director,
Megan Allen, Assistant Director
Jim Jaquette, Interlibrary Loan Librarian

Boston Library Consortium

Melissa Trevvett, Executive Director

Boston Public Library

Michael Colford, Director of Library Services

Agencies and Systems Outside of Massachusetts

Sue Bennett, Library Resource Sharing Division, Texas State Library and Archives
Commission

Steve Cauffman, reQuest ILL Coordinator iCONN - Connecticut's re-search engine
Connecticut State Library

Judy Fischetti, Interlibrary Loan, Southeastern New York Library Resources Council

Kelly Lima, Interlibrary Loan, RI Office of Library and Information Services

Tara Stohr, Interlibrary Loan, Mid-Hudson Library System, Poughkeepsie, NY

Appendix B

Links to Selected Related Documents

Texas State Library "Texas Resource Sharing: Examining the Present, Envisioning a Vibrant Future" January 2008, Bibliographical Center for Research (BCR)

<https://www.tsl.state.tx.us/texshare/illstudy2008/index.html>

Florida Division of Library and Information Services "Strategic Goals for the Florida Electronic Library (FEL)" 2008, RMG Consultants, Inc.

<http://www.flelibrary.org/about/FEL-Stratetic-Goals2008-09-FINAL.pdf>

IDS (Information Delivery Services) Project, New York

<http://idsproject.org/about/aboutus.aspx>

Rethinking Resource Sharing group: Rethinking resource sharing for the 21st century. Site provides links to a number of presentations on resource sharing.

<http://www.rethinkingresourcesharing.org>

Jefferson County Library System, Lakewood, Colorado "Jefferson Country Public Library Interlibrary Loan and Resource Sharing Cost Study" 2004

jefferson.lib.co.us/pdf/ILL_cost2004.pdf

Iowa State University Library "Interlibrary Loan Cost and Performance Studies" 2006

<http://www.lib.iastate.edu/narrative-main/3038/11075>

Appendix C-Model MLS Mediated Interlibrary Loan Budget

| | Year 1- Contract | Year 1-MLS | Year 1- Total | Year 2-MLS | Year 3-MLS |
|--------------------------|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Personnel | | | | | |
| Resource Sharing Manager | \$65,000 | \$70,000 | \$135,000 | \$70,000 | |
| Assistant ILL Librarian | | | | \$45,000 | |
| Support Staff | \$42,000 | \$42,000 | \$84,000 | \$42,000 | |
| Support Staff | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$70,000 | \$35,000 | |
| Support Staff | \$35,000 | | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | |
| Support Staff | | | | \$35,000 | |
| Subtotal | \$177,000 | \$147,000 | \$324,000 | \$262,000 | \$267,240 (2% salary pool) |
| Benefits | \$30,000 | \$25,000 | \$55,000 | \$64,000 | \$67,000 |
| ILLiad/CLIO | \$2,200 | \$15,000 | \$17,200 | \$15,000 | \$17,000 |
| Equipment-PCs | | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | \$3,000 | \$1,000 |
| Printers | | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$500 |
| Supplies | \$2,000 | \$3,000 | \$4,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| Postage | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| Travel | \$1,000 | \$2,500 | \$3,500 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| Facility costs | | \$32,000* | \$32,000 | \$32,000 | \$32,000 |
| Network Fees | \$10,000 (assumes no coverage of First Search costs) | \$18,000 | \$28,000 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| Total | \$235,200 | \$260,500 | \$495,700 | \$427,000 | \$438,740 |
| Contingency | | | \$43,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |

*Space rental (200 sq. feet) at \$16.00 per square foot per year.