

Out and About on the Circuit

ALA MIDWINTER MEETING, WASHINGTON

The Midwinter Meeting has a massive schedule of chapter and section meetings, including 50 just for serials, acquisitions, systems and collection development librarians. In addition, the exhibit hall takes a couple of days to go through properly. For this reason, there was not time to see much, but I did manage to go to a most interesting ALCTS SS session where Marilyn Geller, a well-known consultant, and Matt Price of ACS talked about e-journals. Marilyn's paper was on the real cost and price of e-journals.

The definition of cost was, "the outlay or expenditure of money, time, and labor to produce goods or services". She explained that the cost to publishers has two elements. The basic hardware software and staffing cost to mirror print (including file conversion, access rights and controls, web design, server network and marketing and technical support). Then there is the cost to deliver a more advanced service than print, (including ecommerce, third party integration, archiving, statistics, searching and DRM). There are two options for publishers to achieve this: in-house production, which can cost 40% more than print, or outsourcing, which can be six times more expensive and involve subscription rate increases.

The cost to librarians for the same advanced service, including negotiation and licensing, integration with library resources and third party services can be shown to be increasing with 1992

hardware and software expenditure being 18% of the operating costs and 1996 expenditure being 26.4% (ARL Report on investment in e-resources). 1992 e-resource expenditure was 3.6% of the total material budget and 8.16% in 1996. It is, therefore, clear that it really does cost more money to create electronic journals and it really does cost more money to provide access to electronic journals.

So how do those costs translate into price? 49% of e-journals were free or free with print in 2000, and 48% in 2001. Publishers are now offering an increasing variety of packages. This is mainly to achieve their goals of preserving print subscriptions, recouping their costs to meet current market demands and getting the buyer invested in electronic products for the future.

The publishers are using two concepts of economic pricing theory. The economic concepts of bundling and value-based pricing. There are three bundling choices: pure bundling (products only available as a complete package); pure unbundling (only available as separate components), and mixed bundling (available as either complete or separate). The buyers prefer bundling because it is an insurance against large bills, less hassle and an overestimate of use. Sellers like bundling because per usage prices tend to repress sales and it gives an established relationship with the buyer. The concept of value based pricing is to create differential pricing based on quality discrimination. Interestingly the

optimal number of quality “choices” is three. This is in part because of the theory of “extremeness aversion”, where there is always a middle choice. The current pricing models for individual titles are: free; free with print for unrestricted use; free with print for restricted use (usually experimental); or separately priced electronic version. The pricing models for bundles are: entire collection (bundling products); print and electronic combination (bundling types); and consortium sales (bundling buyers).

So, given the existing costs and prices, what might the future look like? Probably a lot less “free” stuff, publishers providing more value, different types of value bundles and different types of product bundles. The two knowns are that publishers will have to add more value, and librarians will have to pay for it.

The LITA Electronic Journals Interest Group featured a paper by Miriam Blake of the Los Alamos National Laboratory about their implementation of SFX. They have a network of knowledge systems and had been working with the University of Ghent who developed SFX since summer 1999. In 2000 ExLibris acquired SFX and invited LANL and others to participate in a bench test. None of these libraries was an ExLibris library. Their problem was how to interlink resources and the first solution was linking to the articles referred to in their database. Immediately, the appropriate copy problem reared its head. In order to go to a location other than the default link (usually the publisher website) you have to tell the link who you are. The link then checks the service component for LANL (SFX) and sends to the appropriate copy. The Open URL is an important part of the linking. Open URL is a NISO protocol, which is used to create localisation based on the user’s incoming URL,

and points back to the user’s institutional service component (ISC). This has become the standard and is used by CrossRef and the DOI system for example. This is a basic component of the SFX software used at LANL, but not limited to SFX. The OpenURL works by having information pushed into it, consisting of the BaseURL (service component address) and content (elements of metadata). So an OpenURL is constructed for each object (citation etc) and contains ISC location and identifying metadata from the source. In setting up SFX it is necessary to decide which services your library wants. Targets are external and decisions are made on syntax and URLs for requests, content to be retrieved and existence, or not, of a partner. Sources can be external (is the vendor OpenURL aware?), internal (OPAC, A&I etc.), what metadata will be available and is there an existing partner. You also have to decide which services will show to the user. LANL has these locally controlled and maintained with a database manager of MySQL. At LANL the Sources are local A&I databases, the OPAC, Science Server (the local journal repository). The Services (which link to Targets are (Article full text, document request/ILL, author search in local databases, PubMed, PubList, local holdings and “ask a librarian”). A key issue is maintenance of SFX, with the library loading all the journal titles and parameters in batch from an Excel file. The main problems are with too many services; dynamic linking presenting “dead links”, screen navigation requiring user training and just what does SFX mean? In fact it comes from the movies – meaning Special Effects, but LANL have renamed it Link Seeker. There is a full PowerPoint of Miriam’s paper at <http://lib-www.lanl.gov/lww/add.htm>.

Helen Henderson

A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A JOURNAL PUBLISHER: JOHN WILEY & SONS LTD, CHICHESTER

Report of a UKSG seminar, 24 November 2000

Forty people gathered in the attractive Sussex Cathedral City of Chichester, to hear about ‘A Day in the Life Of a Publisher’, part of the continuing series of such seminars organised by the UKSG. The hosts were John Wiley and Sons who have their UK main office in Chichester. We visitors were met by the bizarre sight of the local river

being ducted around the city in dozens of large pipes, as part of the flood relief operations after the exceptionally high autumn rainfall. Fortunately, Wiley’s offices seemed to have escaped the worst, so the meeting was able to go ahead.

The subheading of the day’s programme was: ‘Would you like to know more about journal

publishing in the electronic world?' Thanks to some excellent presentations and some lively questions and discussion, all the delegates must have left knowing more about how publishers work than when they arrived. I know I did! Ian Middleton of EBSCO chaired the sessions.

(All speakers were from Wiley, unless otherwise indicated)

Publishing scholarly journals in the electronic age

Deborah Reece

Deborah is responsible for 25 life science journals and for an associated book programme. She explained the reasons why Wiley has developed electronic journals. These included demand from users (users = authors and readers), added value compared to print, and one that is often not realised by those of us who use these products; the advantages that an electronic office management system brings to the editorial process.

The Wiley strategy has been to bring all their 300+ titles into the Wiley Interscience (WIS) programme. That has almost been achieved. Initially, articles were delivered in PDF file format, but now these are being supplemented by the inclusion of HTML files, for the extra functionality these offer. 'Early View' is Wiley's name for the articles that are available on the web before the paper copy is printed. Wiley was one of the prime movers of CrossRef, and is enthusiastically promoting its development. (CrossRef allows x-publisher reference linking). Usage statistics are now being delivered to Enhanced Access Licence subscribers to WIS. WIS has 200,000 registered users, and in the previous week the system logged 3m uses.

How have the production process and costs changed?

Miles Hutchinson

Whatever methods and processes might have changed, the key objectives in this operation are still quality and speed.

First some impressive facts and figures. Wiley publishes 133 journal titles from the Chichester office. This generates 1,100 issues, 10,000 articles and 112,000 pages per year. 22 production editors have responsibility for about 6 titles each.

'Adding value to the content' is what publishers say they do. But what does that

comprise? These are the activities that largely go unnoticed by users, unless someone makes a mistake! Much of this work is outsourced.

Copy editing. Papers are checked and edited for house and title style. Many authors' first language is not English. Citations and references are checked (Note for librarians; it must be other publishers that do not!)

Page lay-out and illustration enhancement. Aim is for consistent style and arrangement according to the house rules. Many graphs and tables are not up to publishing standards and have to be redrawn and re-labelled.

Proof reading. Checking for accuracy and quality. This is repeated at many stages of the production cycle for each paper.

Web publishing. Standard Generalised Markup Language (SGML) enables papers to be easily tagged and then capable of conversion to the HTML version for web publication, and to typesetting for the print copy. This ensures that both print and online are of consistent quality.

Miles then gave a few examples of current developments at Wiley that are having a further major impact on the production of journals. Over half the Chichester journals will have Early View articles in the next six months. Soon they will be sending PDF files to authors for proofing, rather than print proofs.

In closing, Miles added a third keyword to add to quality and speed— change. We all empathised with that!

Copyright issues

Cliff Morgan

Cliff walked us through the basics of copyright, and highlighted some of the challenges still facing publishers. £20m was paid to copyright holders by the Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA) in the UK last year, from collected fees and licences.

Wiley received 300-400 requests per month to use copyrighted material. Two thirds of these requests are granted free of charge. Publishers grant reciprocal rights to each other in many cases. They ask their authors to assign copyright to them, so that they can administer the rights on their behalf. Authors are granted rights to distribute preprints, distribute electronic copies to their colleagues, and use in teaching and also to load on to their employing company's website.

In the digital world, however, the picture is complex. The right to copy print does not imply the right to distribute electronically. There are no industry standards, and there is an increasingly vocal author and university lobby for authors to retain copyright. Licensing attempts to clarify and regularise such rights, but inevitably involves tedious negotiations to achieve a result. Legal Deposit is an issue. There is no obligation on any content producer to deposit anything that is produced online. This is a potential threat to the long-term security of that information.

What we need, and what is being worked towards by Cliff and other industry experts, is a set of fair rules for the e-environment that will protect authors and rights owners, whilst giving users and licencees the access and permissions they require.

Marketing journals online – print and e-journals

Caroline Sims

Caroline Sims covered the marketing operation that supports journals once they are published, and how that is changing with electronic journals.

Marketing's aims are:

1. to build new subscriptions;
 2. to improve journal impact factors and encourage manuscript submissions;
 3. to promote usage.
- 1) *New subscriptions*. Before online, the traditional methods used included fliers, free copies, chasing renewals, exhibitions, and services to editors and authors but online is bringing many new marketing opportunities.
- Mail shots are still used but are more targeted, using the web addresses as a location for more information. Free, trial access to the online version is easy to administer and to follow-up. An example was given that showed the expected take-up of a typical marketing exercise. 7,000 mainly US users were targeted in a specific subject area. They were all offered free access to a product for a 6-month period. 500 registered for the trial, and it is hoped that 50 firm subscriptions will be the result.
 - Virtual sample copies. Now possible to create an e-only sample issue containing key papers for use in promotion.
 - It is now possible to identify 'hot' articles for promotion campaigns.
 - Editorial boards are encouraged to promote

their journals through their own personal contacts networks.

- E-mail alerting on news, developments, Early View, CrossRef, TOC from a tailored list.
- 'Viral marketing', or word of mouth marketing. For example, 300 contributors to the Encyclopaedia of Analytical Sciences were sent a promotional tag with a web link, for them to put at the foot of their e-mails to colleagues. This produced a dramatic increase in activity on the site

2) *Using and improving impact factors*. Wiley regard this as crucial for two reasons. Many librarians use impact factors as a key selection tool for journal subscriptions. It is also important for a publisher to show to prospective authors that their journals are highly regarded and cited., which, it is hoped leads, to more and better manuscript submissions

3) *Promoting usage*. A crucial activity to build the reputation of a title. Increased use means more revenue, more submissions and better impact rating. Wiley run end-user awareness campaigns, provide customised alerting services and encourage subscribers to register for online version.

The usage data being collected through Wiley Interscience is extensive and Caroline admitted that Wiley were still working out how best to use this new data.

Supplying the electronic library – the agent's role

Ian Middleton, General Manager, EBSCO Information Services

There are 55 thousand publishers and 265 thousand serial titles for librarians to choose from. Subscription agents (of which EBSCO is one of the largest) exist to simplify the supply chain and to add value to both publishers and libraries.

Ian highlighted some current developments and issues in this industry; declining budgets, price increases, new technologies, distance learning, e-journals and linking, access vs holdings, outsourcing, margins vs investment, EDI and Z39.50, consortia – leading to a 'more for less' expectation.

Agents' initiatives in some of these areas have been:

Aggregation services – 'Simple uncluttered access through a single entry point'

Identification – ability to search agents' system by title, author, keyword

Access – providing users with quick simple access by IP/Athens

Management – usage statistics across range of different publishers

Linking – agent will provide stable URL to a journal web site, even if the publisher changes it.

Licences – Subscription agents funded the 'John Cox' licences (www.licensingmodels.com) in an attempt to set standards in this area.

Negotiations – agents have the experience e.g. NESLI, and can offer assistance if required.

Knowledge and experience – Long history of publisher and library relationships. Have access to a vast database of publisher and title information. Can offer technical support 'How can I?' 'Why can't I?'

Ian ended with this quote: "The value the agent brings will multiply as the complexity of the information chain grows."

Journal fulfilment/distribution and EJ support

Beverly Richardson and Matthew Collins

Beverly covered the print fulfilment processes.

The cycle begins in July with the setting of subscription rates for the following year. Renewal invitations are sent in September. There then follow a regular series of reminders for subscriptions believed not to have been renewed. Libraries using agents' consolidation services can cause problems to publishers trying to reconcile subscription records.

Wiley use journal expeditors in UK and US who send out journals using labels provided by Wiley. Surplus stock is returned to Wiley warehouses for future late renewals, claims, marketing etc. The January issues are sent to previous subscribers regardless of the subscription status to give time for the subscription record to be updated.

An astonishing 26,300 claims were received by Wiley in 2000. Most claims are met with a response that states that the issue was despatched on x date, or that the issue is not yet published. Automated library check-in systems are blamed for much of this 'false' claiming.

Matthew then talked about his role in the Wiley support mechanism for their electronic journals.

A major activity has been to clean-up the customer database, since this is the starting point for any licence negotiations.

There are two licences for Wiley e-journals: the basic access and enhanced access licence. 'Basic' gives access to WIS. WIS has 200,000 registered users, and in the previous week the system logged 3m uses. 'Enhanced' has no such limitations on users or sites. Much time is also spent on consortia deals. Access can be negotiated to all Wiley titles, with a flat fee for any non-holding members.

Ian thanked Wiley for hosting the day and for giving so generously of their staff's time, not to mention the lunch! A sentiment echoed by all of us.

Roger Brown, GlaxoSmithKline Pharmaceuticals
roger_d_brown@sbphrd.com

SERIALS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SEMINAR

FOR THE 21ST CENTURY Report of a UKSG seminar, 7 February 2001

The UKSG Serials Resource Management Seminar aimed to provide an introduction for those, like myself, who are relatively new to serials provision and a refresher for those with more experience. Delegates were greeted at the door by the news that the delegate packs had gone astray. Bad news for those of us who, over coffee, like to read through the list of those attending.

The backgrounds of the three speakers demonstrated the link between publisher, subscription agent and library in serials management.

Nancy Gerry, from Blackwell Science, gave a comprehensive paper on the processes involved in the publishing world from author's submission to publication in print/electronic form. She outlined how Blackwell Science publish journal titles on behalf of learned societies, including the production process, pricing structure and economics of journal production. It would be interesting to see how other publishers that were not so tied-in to learned societies justified their pricing structure. Nancy also gave a brief overview of Synergy, Blackwell Science's

contribution to the ever increasing number of ways of accessing electronic journals.

Des Le Roy of RoweCom UK followed with a paper discussing the changing role of the subscription agent as intermediary between the publisher and library, which could have been retitled 'its a dirty job but someone's got to do it'. He described the services and benefits to both publishers and libraries that a subscription agent brings, facilitating the whole process including new subscriptions, renewals, claims and cancellations. Des went on to talk about the role automation will play in the work of the subscription agent in both content access and management information.

The third paper, presented by Kate Brunskill from King's College London, was from the perspective of the library. Kate discussed the rate of change from print to electronic format, the very real problem of deciding what to buy or what not to buy and liaison between the library and the academic community when considering cancellations. 'Trying to keep up' was the main message of the paper, which raised a number of important issues including the lack of synchronisation between print and e-journal renewals, claims for e-journals, merging of Inter-Library Loans and serials departments and the need for balance between the different formats.

After lunch the speakers outlined in turn the core issues in serials resource management as they saw them. This was followed by a discussion of these points in an open forum. Predictably the main points raised were on the subject of e-journals such as standards on usage data (perhaps a role for UKSG?); print verses e-access; direct negotiations with publishers for e-journals verses the subscription agent route; the timing of renewals and the difficulty in budgeting in advance; pay per view and electronic archiving. The debate was both stimulating and in depth and rounded off a very informative and productive day. The speakers presentations will be available on the UKSG Web Site shortly, no sign of those delegate packs though!

**Graham Stone, Electronic Resources Librarian/
Technology Team Leader, Eagle Learning Support
Centre, Bolton Institute, Deane Road
Bolton BL3 5AB
email: g.stone@bolton.ac.uk
Tel. 01204 903099 Fax. 01204 903594**

[Footnote to the Business Post saga: The packs were delivered on the Monday before the seminar and, from what we can piece together, were taken away again on the Tuesday. They have not been seen since. It is very frustrating and disappointing but Alison Whitehorn is on the case and apologises for the lack of coffee-time reading.]

BUILDING E-COLLECTIONS IN EUROPE: THE EUROPEAN CHAPTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL COALITION OF LIBRARY CONSORTIA FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

The second meeting of the European branch of the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) met in Berlin from 1-3 December 2000 and was attended by delegates from 21 countries. This meeting followed the successful ICOLC formula – a mix of publisher 'grille' sessions and business sessions on strategic issues, such as licensing principles – with added spice in the form of reports from consortia on current activities.

Consortial updates

In **Estonia**, the Estonian Libraries Network Consortium was founded in 1996 as a non-profit

non-governmental organisation. Its first objective was implementation of an integrated library system across academic universities which was launched in 1998. Their next task was co-ordination of electronic purchases in collaboration with the Open Society Institute, and in 2000 they launched a digital national archive project under UNESCO's digital memory programme.

The COUPERIN Consortium in **France** was set up specifically for e-journal negotiations in 1999. This was a direct result of universities wanting to work together, and no new national funding drove this. Their first negotiations have been successful both in securing publisher agreements,

and in attracting new members to the consortium. They now involve about 2/3rds of all French universities and are also working with some public research institutes.

Germany has 94 state-funded universities, with a plethora of state-level consortia engaging in co-operative cataloguing initiatives. Federation-wide activity is beginning to take place, and there is also a new German-Austrian-Swiss Consortia Organisation (GASCO), which is an ICOLC-like co-operative and information sharing body.

The HEAL-Link Consortium in **Greece** is a real success story. They tackled 7 large consortial agreements in 1999, and expected the year 2000 to be an easier one of evaluation and renewal. Unfortunately, the government shifted their funding back to the next financial year. In the end the government worked with the consortia to secure renewals, but HEAL-Link does not wish to be so vulnerable again. Sustainability is recognised as a key success factor for this, and other, consortia.

There are 40 or 50 consortia in **Hungary**, which is remarkable given the size of the country. Many of these are organised around user groups of individual databases but they have also worked together to collaborate with the Open Society Institute on licensing electronic resources.

In **the Netherlands** the strategic importance of seeing electronic licensing in the context of the whole university, and not the library alone, is recognised. Senior institutional managers are represented at the negotiating table, and the construction of e-collections is seen strategically in terms of distance and lifelong learning and accessing cultural heritage.

Scandinavian countries are collaborating closely. Central funding has made an electronic library initiative possible in **Denmark**. In **Norway** there is no central money, but a new project is underway to create an Electronic Research Library funded directly by universities. In **Sweden** the Royal Library is leading consortial licensing for 70 academic institutions, research libraries, and at least one museum. The National Library in **Finland** also leads on national digital library development including archiving, access, and licensing.

Consortial activities in **Turkey** are at an early stage but have been gaining momentum over the

last 18 months. This is against a rather challenging technical background. Current challenges include the lack of agreed terms of reference among Turkey's different consortia and institutions.

In the **United Kingdom**, the JISC undertakes a variety of national licensing initiatives for electronic information and colleges/universities choose which of these agreements they wish to participate in. The UK currently has a large collection of electronic content, but it is distributed and in a sense 'fractured' and difficult to access and manage. To counteract this, development funding is going toward shared authentication tools, services that 'fuse' content from a variety of resources, and presentation services that serve the collections in a way tailored for specific disciplines (e.g. a portal for social scientists, and a different portal for biomedical staff and students).

Strategic issues for collaboration between libraries and publishers

In the course of the ICOLC business, grille, and report sessions a variety of strategic issues emerged again and again. Three of these – digital preservation, usage statistics, and VAT – were recognised as being of importance to both libraries and publishers.

VAT: a dreaded acronym for European electronic collection managers and publishers. VAT is not currently added to printed information in Europe but is added to electronic versions of that same information. This presents a considerable barrier to encouraging the shift from print to online access. There is growing conviction that the best way forward might be joint lobbying of the EU about this problem, although some consternation is felt at the prospect that an apparent solution might be to add VAT to print resources. This would clearly act as a barrier to educational institutions' ability to provide high-quality materials for learning, teaching, and research. EBLIDA and the Publishers Association appear poised to take the lead on this sensitive issue.

Both publishers and libraries felt that usage statistics for online services were collected, transmitted, and digested in different ways and were generally not comparable or of sufficient

quality. Collaborative endeavours to tackle this problem, for example a new working group set up by ALPS, the JISC, and the Publishers Association, were welcomed.

Digital preservation was recognised as a problem for both libraries and publishers, although there are perhaps still too few examples of collaborative working to address these issues. Organisations leading in this area include the British Library, CEDARS, JSTOR, and OCLC.

Publisher grille

Though no one was physically damaged during the publisher grille sessions, it is fair to say that these are not always easy and relaxed exchanges. A few senior managers invited from a hand-selected range of publishers were invited to present their latest strategic plans and pricing models. This is followed by probing, sometimes searing, questions from conference participants.

Grille sessions began with representatives from BioOne and Boline – two collaborative publishing activities based both in the library sector and the publishing community.

The goal of **BioOne** is to build a new co-operative publishing model for the non-commercial academic publishing community and the library community. It was founded by AIBS, SPARC, Big Twelve Plus library consortium, Kansas University, and Allen Press with the aim of giving small publishers, 'trapped' in print, some options for moving into electronic distribution. Right now options are generally to remain only in print or license content to a larger publisher (and generally lose control over content and pricing). The BioOne license agreement is librarian-crafted and enables ILL, electronic reserves, distance education, printing, fair use, non-commercial teaching & research purposes, and personal use. BioOne is scheduled to launch in the first quarter of 2001 with 30-40 journals all described as peer-reviewed and high impact. Titles are in ecology, environmental biology, and integrative biology.

Boline International aims to make journals published in developing countries more widely available. These publishers send Word documents to the University of Toronto library, where the text is transformed into HTML and then mounted on a web server in Brazil. The

library raises awareness about the journals in the hope of attracting new subscriptions to offset costs, and to decrease the danger that scientific knowledge will be lost because it is produced in developing countries and, although good, is simply not widely known or available. Boline International publishing partners come from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The library is currently investigating the definition of peer-review' across this collection, and are also exploring how these journals are included (or not) in major scientific indexing and abstracting tools. Abstracts and summaries of all documents are available free of charge.

The rest of the grille sessions at EuroICOLC-2 were from relatively large commercial publishers, society publishers, or aggregators including Springer Verlag, Blackwell Science/Munksgaard/Blackwell Publishers, Kluwer, American Chemical Society, Dialog, Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, Academic Press and Elsevier. These sessions involve the candid sharing of commercial-in-confidence information, so there is a limit to what can be written here. Instead what seems useful is to draw out some of the patterns (or lack of pattern) that emerged in the course of presentations.

The changing commercial landscape was one clear pattern. News to many attendees, now familiar to UKSG readers, about the merger of Blackwell Science, Blackwell Publishers, and Munksgaard paralleled the possible new relationship between two other participants: Academic Press and Elsevier.

Another clear pattern was the struggle to find new pricing models that would better meet the needs of libraries. There is, unfortunately, no miraculous break-through to report here. Several publishers were happy to discuss subscription prices for core electronic journals (unfortunately too often defined as those held in print) with pay-per-view/article/usage for less-used titles. This flexibility, along with a willingness to craft different kinds of deals for different types of consortia, is welcome but does appear to be increasing the complexity of journal deals – a serious challenge for libraries in managing e-journals. Cross-access fees of 1-10% seemed the norm to enable a library to access electronic versions of non-subscribed titles to which another consortium member subscribed.

Many publishers stated they had no customers that wanted to go electronic only. Perceived reasons for a reluctance to move to electronic only included archival access, and different content in online and printed versions. The strong message from consortia present at EuroICOLC-2 is that many *do* want electronic only access, and they expect this at a discounted price to print-only subscriptions. At least 10% discount from the print subscription price seems to be the norm among those publishers who have listened to and accepted this position from their customers.

Another pattern was the increasing number of journal publishers who are developing web portals containing databases and other finding aids. Some publishers appear to see these new business models, fueled by cross-linking opportunities offered by CrossRef, as golden eggs. Though no doubt some libraries will find the convenience of an all-integrated publisher portal desirable, one wonders if eating these golden eggs will be nutritious, easy on the teeth, or good for stimulating development of other foodstuffs and pantries in the long run.

Usage-based pricing may become more important in the future, and some libraries and publishers are in the early stages of experimenting on this. A key starting position appears to be the joint sharing and interpretation of detailed usage statistics. Parties on both sides expressed feeling a little nervous about this, but felt it important to explore options fully.

The wish of libraries and consortia to choose whether to subscribe to individual titles or to complete baskets of titles had been received by some (not all!) publishers, but appropriate responses were perhaps not so easily articulated. Some publishers offered a choice of titles with deeper discounts for retention of increasing percentages of existing subscriptions. Other publishers offered choice of titles only with

guarantees about maintenance of current print spend for a year or two and then mutual revision of this sum based on usage data. Others were willing to offer choice of titles on the basis of purchasing based on number of concurrent user.

When asked, some society publishers expressed willingness to work with universities to offer a discount for titles that academics from the institution publish in. This was welcomed, but participants noted that this is likely to significantly increase the complexity of deals.

There appeared to be a new willingness from both consortia and publishers to consider multi-year deals.

Another clear pattern was concern over U.S.-centric licences offered by North American publishers. Consortia in Europe seemed to prefer to sign agreements under the laws of their own countries, and in some cases are required to do so.

Conclusion

Both ICOLC and EuroICOLC have developed into informative and empowering fora for discussion of electronic licensing activities. It offers publishers a chance to meet with senior representatives of varied consortia to have an undiluted opportunity to 'listen to the marketplace'. The next ICOLC Europe meeting will be in Helsinki 29 November – 1 December 2001, and it would be very nice to see colleagues from even more parts of Europe (and further afield) and from public (and other) libraries.

Dr. Alicia Wise
Assistant DNER Director
Joint Information Systems Committee
Strand Bridge House
138-142 Strand
London WC2R 1HH
+44 (020) 7848 2556
alicia.wise@kcl.ac.uk