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The Interlibrary Loan Task Force was appointed by State Librarian Richard Akeroyd in April 1988. Our charge was:

1. To define the philosophy, scope, and standards for interlibrary loan services;

2. To review the current structure and patterns of interlibrary loan services;

3. To evaluate how well current systems are working;

4. To identify solutions to current interlibrary loan problems;

5. To make recommendations for the future development of interlibrary loan services in the state.

We knew that carrying out this charge would not be easy. Interlibrary loan in Connecticut is a complicated issue surrounded by strong emotion. It was obvious at the outset that librarians felt that ILL was not working well, but there was no agreement about what was needed to improve it. In an attempt to focus on what Connecticut librarians wanted from an interlibrary loan service, we convened the Interlibrary Loan Forum on June 14, 1988. We invited individuals representing all types of libraries in the state to express their concerns about how interlibrary loan was operating in Connecticut. The library community input we received from the Forum shaped the subsequent work of the Task Force.

It was clear that librarians wanted a single, coordinated statewide ILL system which would provide equality of access to materials for all Connecticut citizens. Our report recommends the establishment of such a system; it presents the standards this system should achieve; it examines the components which go into providing this service and makes recommendations for their effective operation; and it suggests a method for the continuing evaluation of the system to insure its future effectiveness. Our focus was always on the purpose of ILL: to
provide patrons with access to materials not available to them at their local library. Each component of ILL was looked at in terms of how well it achieved this purpose.

At the heart of our report is the Interlibrary Loan Philosophy (Section IV) and the revised Interlibrary Loan Code for Libraries in the State of Connecticut (Appendix 1) which grew out of this philosophy. It is through the operation of the Code that the Philosophy will be implemented. The Advisory Council on Library Planning and Development formally endorsed these documents on December 13, 1989. We recommend that all Connecticut libraries adopt the ILL Philosophy and Code.

When we began to look at the current status of ILL, a major problem became apparent. There is no uniform method of collecting data about interlibrary loan activities upon which to base a study of current activity. Clearly, the first step in establishing a statewide ILL system is to design a uniform method of data collection and evaluation. We recommend that this be done jointly by the seven major ILL providers (the CLSUs and the Interlibrary Loan Center).

The Task Force has not made a recommendation about which available ILL system should be used statewide. When an interlibrary loan component, Impact, was added to Project reQuest in December, we felt that it should be seriously considered as a statewide ILL system, given the amount of time and money invested in this project. Since Impact is new, there is insufficient data to evaluate its potential at the current time. We recommend that it be evaluated as a statewide system for Connecticut after it has been in operation for one year.1 The other ILL system which seems to hold great potential as a statewide system is OCLC’s Group Access Capability (GAC). In order to fairly compare the two systems, we recommend that a pilot GAC project be run concurrently with the Impact project. The final choice of the statewide ILL system should be made by the State Library on the basis of the results of the pilot projects and the recommendations and guidelines set forth in this report.

Although we recommend that the choice of a statewide ILL system be postponed for a year, a number of our recommendations can be implemented before the pilot projects are completed. Some, such as uniform data collection and improvements in the operation of the Interlibrary Loan Center can be implemented immediately with little or no expenditure of funds. Others, such as the Connecticut enhancement, can be done as soon as funds are available. Many improvements in interlibrary loan could be realized prior to the choice of a statewide system.

While our Task force was conducting its work, there were a number of projects operating concurrently which had a direct bearing on interlibrary loan, e.g., reQuest, Connecticut Union List of Serials. With the wisdom of hindsight, we realize that we should have identified these projects and taken steps to include their representation at the start of the ILL Task Force’s work. For the future, we recommend better coordination between interrelated statewide library activities. This would maximize the benefits of each individual project and would advance the development of statewide resource sharing more rapidly.

1See Section VII, p. 15. Before the final draft of this report was completed, we learned that, after a brief field test, the reQuest Executive Committee decided that the Auto-Graphics ILL software was not ready for implementation at this time.
1. All Connecticut libraries should adopt the Interlibrary Loan Philosophy and the Interlibrary Loan Code for Libraries in the State of Connecticut.

2. The extent to which a library follows the Interlibrary Loan Philosophy and Code should be one of the factors considered when awarding ILL grants.

3. The seven major interlibrary loan providers should cooperate in the development of a uniform statistical reporting format to be adopted by all Connecticut libraries. The elements of effectiveness set forth in Appendix 3, “A Method for Measuring ILL Effectiveness,” should be included.

4. A uniform format for reporting budgeting data should be developed by the Interlibrary Loan Center (ILC) and the six CLSU's for all interlibrary loan service providers so that standard, comparable per unit costs can be determined.

5. Dial access to online systems should continue to be provided by the State to individual public libraries in those towns where there is no current direct access in order to enable libraries to participate directly in ILL. This should be a priority for library automation funding.

6. While the ILC is well situated to operate as a central, statewide clearinghouse to fill ILL requests for materials that libraries are unable to fill themselves, its future role should be determined by the results of the evaluation studies suggested in Recommendation #19.

7. The ILC should not maintain its own book collection. Its current collection should either be retained and integrated into other State Library collections or given to another Connecticut library where it will be available for ILL.

8. ILC should take steps to reduce the number of paper requests and expand its
9. ILC should be responsible for collecting, maintaining, and reporting uniform data on ILL use and cost from all participants in the state; it should be responsible for interpreting the data and recommending enhancements to statewide ILL.

10. ILC should retain access to OCLC and RLIN. It should plan for the eventual elimination of dial access to online circulation systems to fill ILL requests.

11. There should be a statewide interlibrary loan system. It should not be chosen at the present time.

12. The Auto-Graphics Impact System should be evaluated after it has been operational for one year in order to determine its suitability as a statewide ILL system.

13. Concurrent with the Impact pilot project, a pilot GAC project should be run for one year in order to compare which system best meets the needs of Connecticut.

14. The Connecticar service should be expanded to serve more libraries. Its internal operation should be reorganized to achieve greater efficiency; its staff should be increased; and additional routes should be added.

15. Once a telefacsimile network is operational in the State, protocols governing its use should be adopted, based on those presented in this report.

16. A uniform, statewide interlibrary loan procedure should be adopted.

17. The statewide ILL procedure utilized should facilitate performing ILL transactions directly between borrowing and lending libraries. The choice of an intermediary, if required to complete the loan, should be stipulated by the uniform ILL procedure.

18. After uniform statistical reporting and cost analysis methods have been developed, the ILC and CLSU's should use these tools to analyze the effectiveness of their current ILL methods.

19. While the pilot Impact and proposed GAC projects are in operation, the ILC and the CLSU's should conduct a joint evaluation of their effect on their patterns of interlibrary loan use. The designation of an ILL intermediary should be based on data compiled by this evaluation.

20. Libraries should provide sufficient staff to perform ILL and should provide them with training to ensure effective performance.

21. The median turnaround time for an interlibrary loan transaction in Connecticut should be five to seven days. Whether this turnaround time is achieved should be a major criterion in evaluating grants for ILL.

22. Adequate funding for ILL should be provided by the State to allow participation by all publicly funded libraries. Libraries participating in ILL should be willing to bear a portion of the cost.

23. The State Library should oversee and evaluate the operation of a statewide ILL service.
In order to assist the ILL Task Force with its charge of defining the scope, philosophy, and standards for ILL in the state, the Task Force sought input from fifty representative libraries across the state. At a forum convened at the Wallingford Public Library on June 14, 1988, thirty individuals spoke of their two major concerns about ILL, which upon review added up to fifteen unique topics for discussion. These items were prioritized by the Forum and later were taken up and studied by the Task Force members. Over the ensuing months, those items falling within the jurisdiction of the Task Force were thoroughly researched and have been incorporated into their recommendations. These priorities were as follows:

1. The adoption of a philosophy of universal ILL access to all Connecticut library collections.

2. Improvement of statewide ILL delivery service.

3. Development of a statewide plan for ILL.

4. The establishment of an adequate funding structure.

5. Provision of statewide bibliographic/holdings information.

6. Current periodical holdings information, uniform lending policies, and simplified procedures for loaning periodicals.

7. The establishment of a FAX network.

8. The relationship between ILL and collection development.

9. Consideration of OCLC as the prime ILL resource.

10. Load-leveling needs.

11. Staff training for ILL services.

12. Consideration of the impact of ILL on staff and library operations.
SECTION IV

Interlibrary Loan Philosophy
1. Interlibrary loan is essential to good library service. Through this process a wide range of materials can be made available to users.

2. Interlibrary loan is a basic service which should be offered by every library. Libraries have an obligation to publicize interlibrary loan so that users are aware of this service.

3. It is the responsibility of all publicly supported libraries to participate in interlibrary loan. Privately supported libraries of all types should be encouraged to participate and should receive support to facilitate this participation.

4. Libraries have a responsibility to provide adequate resources to meet the recurring and routine needs of their users except where cooperative collection development agreements are in place. ILL is not a substitute for this responsibility. It is accepted that all libraries must maintain an appropriate balance between resource sharing and the needs of their primary clientele.

5. Because every interlibrary loan transaction involves a lending library as well as a borrowing library, and because interlibrary loan works best when all participating libraries receive equal benefit from their participation, every library that wants to borrow on interlibrary loan must lend. In each transaction, it is the lending library that decides whether the requested material will be provided.

6. Statewide ILL should be performed in the most efficient and cost effective manner. Whenever possible, ILL requests should be filled in-state.


8. While the equitable distribution of costs is essential to the success of interlibrary loan, it is the responsibility of local and state government to provide an adequate funding structure for an interlibrary loan system.

9. There should be a statewide delivery system which ensures prompt delivery and return of material in all areas of the state.

10. Libraries have a responsibility to maintain accurate records of their holdings and to make these records available on a statewide basis. The burden is on the requesting library to provide the proper bibliographic citations. Lending libraries have the right to reject requests which do not meet basic standards for verification.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. All Connecticut libraries should adopt the *Interlibrary Loan Philosophy* and the *Interlibrary Loan Code for Libraries in the State of Connecticut.* (see Appendix 1, p. 25).

2. The extent to which a library follows the *Interlibrary Loan Philosophy* and *Code* should be one of the factors considered when awarding ILL grants.
There are currently seven major ILL agencies in the state of Connecticut: the six CLSU's and the Interlibrary Loan Center. Each of the regional Cooperating Library Service Units provides some level of ILL services for their members. This varies from Region 2, where a CLSU-run automated library system is the primary vehicle for interlibrary loan resource sharing, to Region 5, which processes nearly 10,000 items annually through its ILL office.

The Connecticut State Library's Interlibrary Loan Center in Rocky Hill handles 49% of the total ILL requests received by the seven main providers. ILC primarily uses OCLC and access to automated circulation systems to fill requests.

In April of 1988, when the Interlibrary Loan Task Force first started its work, State Library staff produced a "quick and dirty" compilation of statewide interlibrary loan statistics (see Table #1, p. 9). Actual figures were collected from the six regional Cooperating Library Service Units and the State Library Interlibrary Loan Center showing that 62,780 ILL requests went through those seven service providers in the previous year. Information from automated systems, OCLC, and some plain and simple guesswork showed that there was a minimum of 150,000 requests annually made through Connecticut libraries. This does not include an unknown number of requests which do not pass through any system.

While the ILC and the CLSU's are the main avenues for libraries to fill requests which they have not been able to fill from their own resources, there is a high level of library-to-library ILL activity in Connecticut. It is estimated that 59% of all ILL requests generated are handled by libraries using their own resources. The remainder are sent on to either a regional or statewide agency to be searched.

Table #2, p. 9, shows the levels of ILL activity in each region and their primary source of fills. The statistics for Region 2 show only their OCLC ILL service. These statistics are an attempt to
TABLE #1: ILL STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests Filled:</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>ILC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*access to circ. system</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>7,291</td>
<td>14,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*access to OCLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,523</td>
<td>19,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*union card catalog</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>5,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*other</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8,813</td>
<td>9,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Filled</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>24,482</td>
<td>48,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill Rate</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>88.55</td>
<td>84.40</td>
<td>53.52</td>
<td>79.04</td>
<td>77.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLSUs/ILC: 62,780
LEAP: 6,599
CIRCCESS: 14,000
LION: 9,000
BIBLIOMATION: 15,000
NEW CANAAN (LINK): 585
GROTON/WATERFORD: 1,226
OCLC (CONNECTICUT): 42,203
TOTAL: 150,908

---

TABLE #2: MAJOR INTERLIBRARY LOAN SUPPLIERS IN CONNECTICUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Total Fills</th>
<th>Fills for ILC</th>
<th>Fills for Region 3</th>
<th>Fills for Region 4</th>
<th>Fills for Region 6</th>
<th>Fills for 3/89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UConn Stores</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middletown Rs.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New L. Otis</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ledyard P.L.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>East Lyme P.L.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meriden P.L.</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Greenwich P.L.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Old Lyme P.G.N.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>East Ct. U.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fairfield Univ.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Central Ct. U.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>West Ct. U.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Killingly Libs.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New London</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>W. Hartford</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mansfield P.L.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Univ. of Hartford</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hartford P.L.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>South Ct. U.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Guilford P.L.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Norwalk P.L.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Danbury P.L.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UConn Health</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Brookfield Bkst.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>West Hartford</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by CSL/ILC

Data from CSLU
Regions 1, 2, and 5 not available.

Given those qualifications, this information is still of interest. One obvious point is that the CSLU Regions without OCLC access have the lowest fill rates (53% and 66%); these two regions are both in the process of acquiring OCLC terminals, and those fill rates should increase to the 80% level within the next year.

Even with the high level of automation activity in Connecticut, it is interesting to note that nearly 10% of the requests going to the ILC and CSLUs are filled through various paper union catalogs. OCLC libraries in Connecticut filled 28,905 requests for other Connecticut OCLC libraries in 1987. Of those, 19,575 were handled through the CSLUs or ILC.
ILL providers in Connecticut include the CLSU Regions, the State Library Interlibrary Loan Center and the Service Centers, automated systems and OCLC libraries. These providers handle 117,480 ILL requests annually, given this estimate. Add to that amount an unknown level of other ILL activity generated at individual libraries and out-of-state OCLC transactions, and an educated guess could put the total activity at 150,000 transactions.

This number has some impact on the delivery of ILL materials. Since, unlike Connecticut transactions, ILL transactions ride a delivery system both ways, the above figure implies 300,000 deliveries. There is some random data from libraries which indicates that U.S. Mail and UPS are both being increasingly used to deliver ILL materials. A survey of C-Car use is presently being compiled and will provide additional information on the use of that delivery mechanism in relation to ILL.

It was the intent of the Task Force to collect further data on the interlibrary loan picture in the state. As we pursued the topic, it became readily apparent that there existed no uniform statistical reporting of ILLs. One area of interest was the question of which libraries were the major providers of ILL fills in the state. Of the six CLSU s and ILC, only three regions and ILC kept their statistics in such a form as to answer this question. The information gathered in Table #2 is interesting but not complete. It shows that for those four ILL service providers, the University of Connecticut Library at Storrs was the top provider for the period July–December 1988 with 296 fills. UConn was followed by eight public libraries, seven of which are members of the Libraries Online (LION) automated circulation system. This is of import in that LION is now represented in the Project reQuest CD-ROM database, and these records will be available directly to libraries with CD-ROM workstations. The importance of this cannot be correctly determined without a complete reporting from all ILL service providers, which is not possible at this time.

Another statistical avenue of approach is to look at ILL providers who claimed reimbursement for their ILLs. Statistics collected by ILC for 1987–88 show 68,794 reimbursable transactions from 124 libraries (see Table #3, p. 11). This is not a complete listing of all statewide ILL transactions, given that many libraries do not claim reimbursement. The figure of 68,794 does not come close to the total figure in Table #1, and the rank order of ILL providers is not the same as in Table #2. Of the top twenty-seven providers (all reporting over 1,000 fills annually), fifteen now have records in the Project reQuest database, twenty-three have holdings in the Connecticut Union List of Serials, and twelve are OCLC members.

Another important element in the statewide ILL picture is how many public libraries have access to online systems. Either through membership in an online system or through dial access, ninety of the 169 towns in Connecticut provide online access to other library holdings to their patrons. While it is generally recognized that the number of public libraries for which it would be appropriate to join automated systems is declining, there is a growing need to provide dial access to smaller libraries. This is particularly true in the northeastern part of the state, where there are many small libraries. Only a few towns, none of which border on each other, are members of an online circulation system. Dial access could provide an important service in linking these rural towns with their larger neighbors and the rest of the state.

Another area in which there is no standardization of information is cost. In an attempt to determine a per unit cost for ILL service provision, costs for each CLSU Region were taken from their July 1988 grant application, and compared with 1987–88 statistics from each region. ILC costs for the 1987–88 fiscal year were compared with 1987–88 ILL statistics (Table #4, p. 12).

Each CLSU Region reports its costs in its own manner. There has been no consistency required as to the percentage of certain costs
### Table #3: Reimbursable ILL Transactions Reported 1987/88 • Connecticut State Library ILC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Number of Transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>3,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UConn Storrs</td>
<td>2,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>East. CT State U.</td>
<td>2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fairfield Univ.</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New Britain</td>
<td>1,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>West Hartford</td>
<td>1,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Greenwich Libr.</td>
<td>1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>1,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>1,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>1,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Simsbury</td>
<td>1,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Groton Public</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wesleyan Univ.</td>
<td>1,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Norwalk Public</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>West. CT St. U.</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Plainville</td>
<td>1,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fairfield Public</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>South. CT St. U.</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Westport</td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wethersfield</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Waterbury Bronson</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>New London</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>U. of Hartford</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Conn. College</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>St. Joseph College</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Southington</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Branford Bkstone</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>East Lyme</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>UConn Storrs</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Danbury Public</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Suffield</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ledyard</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Killingly Buggbee</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Berlin Peck</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vernon Rockville</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>New Milford</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Old Lyme</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sacred Heart U.</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>UConn Health</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>New Canaan</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Greenwich Perrot</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Thomaston</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>UConn W. Htfd</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Southbury</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Quinebaug V. C.C.</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Middlesex C.C.</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Htfd. Grad. Center</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>U. of Bridgeport</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tunxis C.C.</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Newtow</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Asantuck C.C.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Woodstock Breckin</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Htfd. Coll. Women</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Htfd. Seminary</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ashford Babcock</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard A.</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Manchester C.C.</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mohegan C.C.</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Naugatuck</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>UConn Law</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Norwalk C.C.</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Bloomfield Prsgr</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Northwestern C.C.</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Pomfret Public</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>East Lyme H.S.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Greater Htfd C.C.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>U. of New Haven</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Coventry B. Dimock</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Woodstock North</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Pomfret Abington</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Mattatuck C.C.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Tolland</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Wolcott</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Ellington</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Glastonbury W. Turn.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>East Hartford</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Wdnhm Willimans</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>UConn Waterbury</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>UConn Avery Point</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Killingly Jr. H.S.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Eastford</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Holy Apostles Coll.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Waterbury St. Tech.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>South Central C.C.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>East Hampton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Middlefield</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Plainfield H.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Durham Public</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Yale Univ.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,794</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocated against the ILL program (rent, utilities, administration, etc.). Costs in each region cannot be compared to each other with any surety. The ILC costs are presented in two forms. The first is the full budget for the total ILC operation. This includes activities other than interlibrary loan transactions, such as Connecticut, collection maintenance, reimbursement, and related staff. The second figure relates to interlibrary loan operations only, in order to have a more realistic comparison with interlibrary loan functions in the CLSU Regions.
TABLE #4: PER UNIT COST OF ILL TRANSACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>REQUESTS</th>
<th>PER UNIT COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>$54,054</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>$7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>$33,311</td>
<td>6,784</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>$33,723</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>$47,903</td>
<td>9,841</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>$35,035</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC (total)</td>
<td>($455,007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC (ILL operations)</td>
<td>$286,023</td>
<td>30,975</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$490,049</td>
<td>62,850</td>
<td>$7.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATIONS

3. The seven major interlibrary loan providers should cooperate in the development of a uniform statistical reporting format to be adopted by all Connecticut libraries. The elements of effectiveness set forth in Appendix 3, "A Method For Measuring ILL Effectiveness," should be included.

4. A uniform format for reporting budgeting data should be developed by the Interlibrary Loan Center and the six CLSU's for all ILL service providers so that standard, comparable per unit costs can be determined.

5. Dial access to online systems should continue to be provided by the State to individual public libraries in those towns where there is no current direct access in order to enable libraries to participate directly in ILL. This should be a priority for library automation funding.

It should be noted that halfway through the 1988-89 statistical year, requests to ILC were down 33% from the levels reported below. There was no concurrent reported rise in CLSU requests. The reason for this is not known.

It is too early to judge the impact of the Project reQuest CD-ROM database on current ILL patterns, but we can make a projection based on certain assumptions. If the reQuest database grows to approximate the Connecticut OCLC database and records in automated systems (1.5-2 million titles) and CD-ROM workstations are located at those libraries which are the heaviest ILL borrowers and lenders, from 30% to 50% of the above 62,850 requests could be done directly at the level of the requesting library. The key problem in assessing the impact of reQuest is that the database is new to the Connecticut library scene as of this date. It probably will take a minimum of a year to properly assess where this new tool will take statewide ILL.
The best available data on current interlibrary loan activity in the state indicate that ILL service providers (ILC and the CLSU) now process about 83,000 requests annually. Growth projections for the reQuest database and CD-ROM workstations in Connecticut libraries suggest that from 30% to 50% of those requests might eventually be made directly from library to library without the need for an intermediary, leaving between 30,000 and 45,000 requests requiring next level searching and referral.

The Interlibrary Loan Center could operate as a central statewide ILL clearinghouse that can verify, find, and fill requests for materials that Connecticut libraries are unable to fill themselves, regardless of what interlibrary loan system is developed in Connecticut. It could directly serve those libraries that lack access to any ILL resources by providing first level ILL verification, location, and referral services. If Connecticut chooses to become an OCLC GAC, ILC could easily become the OCLC broker.

ILC should no longer maintain its own book collection. We recommend that this collection either be retained and integrated into existing State Library collections or be given to another library within Connecticut where it will be made available for ILL. These materials should be added to the OCLC and reQuest databases.

The Interlibrary Loan Center should have the ability to search the holdings records of every automated library in the state and to make loan referrals both to Connecticut and to out-of-state libraries quickly, efficiently, and cost effectively. A significant ingredient in this formula is the reduction in the number of requests that must be sent on paper forms by mail or by Connecticut. It is recommended that the Interlibrary Loan Center expand its ability to receive and send ILL requests electronically. ILC could be the last stop for ILL requests within Connecticut. It would automatically refer any request not filled within the state to out-of-state libraries.

It is recommended that the Interlibrary Loan
Center have ongoing responsibility for collecting, maintaining, and reporting uniform ILL use and cost data from all ILL users and providers in the state and that ILC should evaluate this data and make recommendations to enhance the statewide interlibrary loan system.

The Interlibrary Loan Center should retain dial access to the RLIN database and dedicated access to the OCLC database for identification, verification, and location of materials, and to the OCLC ILL system and any other electronic ILL systems that are developed in the state, including FAX, to send and receive ILL requests. Adequate hardware to support that access is essential.

With the development of a statewide database, whether it be on OCLC or reQuest, the ILC should plan for the elimination of dial access to online circulation systems to locate ILL materials, with a goal of reducing both costs and steps in the interlibrary loan search process.

Many factors will affect the number and level of staffing that the Interlibrary Loan Center will need to operate effectively in a new statewide ILL environment: the type of statewide ILL system that is elected; when it is to be initiated and how long it will take to implement it in all libraries; and how the introduction of a more efficient ILL system affects the demand for ILC services. Those variables cannot be predicted as this report is being written.

The suggested staffing that follows is based on the Task Force's best estimate of ILL activity in the state at this time. It assumes that the Interlibrary Loan Center would not have responsibility for maintaining a book collection or for circulation activity from another collection, that ILC staff would search and refer between 30,000 and 45,000 requests from libraries annually, and that less than 10% of those requests would require the receipt and handling of paper ILL forms.

In that scenario, the position count at ILC might be reduced by up to one-third without a serious deterioration in ILC service. The positions assigned to ILC would be a Unit Head, a Librarian, four Library Technical Assistants, and two clerical positions.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

6. While the ILC is well situated to operate as a central, statewide clearinghouse to fill ILL requests for materials that libraries are unable to fill themselves, its future role should be determined by the results of the evaluation studies suggested in Recommendation #19.

7. The ILC should not maintain its own book collection. Its current collection should either be retained and integrated into other State Library collections or given to another Connecticut library where it will be available for ILL.

8. ILC should take steps to reduce the number of paper requests and expand its ability to receive and send ILL requests electronically.

9. ILC should be responsible for collecting, maintaining, and reporting uniform data on ILL use and cost from all participants in the state; it should be responsible for interpreting the data and recommending enhancements to statewide ILL.

10. ILC should retain access to OCLC and RLIN. It should plan for the eventual elimination of dial access to online circulation systems to fill ILL requests.
The Task Force chose to study, at length, the two database systems that were currently, or shortly to be, in partial use in Connecticut. These were Impact by Auto-Graphics, a CD-ROM bibliographic database, and the OCLC online ILL subsystem called a GAC, or Group Access Capability. A GAC is a group of selective users of the OCLC system which has access to Connecticut records and can transmit ILL requests on OCLC at reduced rates.

The comparison of Impact and GAC was planned as a two-part report. The first was a comparison of costs and vendor claims; the second, a series of interviews with users in other states to compare the claims with the reality. The Impact system was just beginning implementation in New Jersey and, through reQuest, in Connecticut, so only the interviews concerning GACs were completed. It is hoped that interviews with Impact users can be added at a later date. The comparison of the Auto-Graphics and OCLC Interlibrary Loan subsystems and a summary of the interview with GAC members appear in Appendix 2, Part I, pp. 27–34. The most significant difference between the two systems, in addition to cost, and the one that makes comparison difficult, is that the OCLC system is an online system and the Impact system is an off-line system. Although both are interlibrary loan systems, they are very different from one another in the way they are used.

Once an ILL request is initiated in the OCLC ILL system, the system moves the request automatically through a five-library lender string until the request is filled or has been searched by each potential lender. Lenders are required by the system to respond within four working days or the request moves on along the string; an online message file of all requests currently in the system with their statuses is accessible to both borrower and lending library at all times.

The Impact system depends on local protocols and the cooperation of group participants to keep response time at acceptable levels. It
requires that a borrowing library re-initiate a request if the first lender cannot supply the material. An off-line system has the major advantage of cost over an online system, however, since there are no unit charges or telecommunications costs for database searching or for looking at holdings information; costs to send a request to another library are considerably lower since all requests and replies can be saved locally as they are built, then batched and sent all at one time.

Research of another thirty interlibrary loan programs in the United States, England and Canada brought the Library Services Center Interloan System of Ontario to our attention. They have developed a cost-effective, centralized interlibrary loan system that does not require building a database of bibliographic holdings. As the system doesn’t use a database it was not directly comparable to Impact and GACs, and the report was written as a separate unit. It appears in Appendix 2, Part II, pp. 34–37.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

11. There should be a statewide interlibrary loan system. It should not be chosen at the present time.

12. The Auto-Graphics Impact System should be evaluated after it has been operational for one year in order to determine its suitability as a statewide ILL system.

13. Concurrent with the Impact pilot project, a pilot GAC project should be run for one year, in order to compare which system best meets the needs of Connecticut.

**UPDATE**

Shortly before this report was to be printed, the Task Force learned that the Auto-Graphics ILL subsystem was dropped from reQuest. The following report was prepared by Jim Benn, member of both the ILL Task Force and the reQuest Executive Committee.

The Auto-Graphics Impact Public Access Catalog currently offers two methods of providing interlibrary loan software. One is through screen printing of ILL forms; the other is electronic communication of ILL requests via a telecommunications vendor.

The electronic communication method was field tested by the reQuest Executive Committee this spring. It requires special software, a modem, and phone line to allow communication between Impact workstations. The evaluation of this method was essentially negative. We also learned that we had been provided with software that was still in the beta test stage. Auto-Graphics is currently revising this software, including a switch from using a telecommunications vendor (Compuserve) to providing centralized file servers for each system.

The reQuest Executive Committee decided that the ILL telecommunications software was not ready for implementation at this point and that the state would be better served by the screen printing of ILL forms. Using this method, an ILL request is made based on an existing database record, the author, title, edition and imprint data, along with five holding library codes; these will be transmitted to an ILL work form. A referral string will be constructed automatically from the holdings codes selected, based on a priority listing preset by the individual library. Libraries acting as ILL brokers can also be reflected in the listing. Blank forms can also be filled in for requests not in the database. Defaults can be preset for “need by” dates, photocopy, and substitute policies.
Part I: Connecticar

At the Interlibrary Loan Forum held by the ILL Task Force, participants identified over fifty issues relating to the improvement of ILL in Connecticut. The number one priority for the Task Force to deal with was delivery. The mechanisms for identifying and locating bibliographic materials have increased in quantity and quality over the last ten years. Millions of dollars from state, local and federal funds have improved the quality of library automation and resource sharing. We have reduced the number of Connecticut residents unserved by library automation in their own towns to 18%, and there are considerable resources in place at the state and regional CLSU levels to serve those citizens. The latest advance in providing information services through automation is the pilot project for a CD-ROM public access catalog holding over 838,000 titles and 2.3 million holdings. The value of this first database is considerable, given that 50% of the titles are unique and held at only one location. Another 16% are held at only two locations.

While these advances in locating materials held in other libraries have been great, our ability to deliver those identified materials to and from the requesting library has not improved in a like manner. As the participants in the ILL Forum correctly noted, the greatest service impact for the public we could make would be to increase the speed and efficiency of our statewide delivery operations.

The Connecticar interlibrary delivery system currently serves 234 libraries, providing nearly 600 stops weekly to facilitate the delivery of library materials among all types of libraries. Connecticar is currently operated with a staff of eleven, shipping an estimated 1.2 to 1.5 million items annually. More than 30% of these items are interlibrary loan materials. Two-thirds of the materials moved through Connecticar are return materials borrowed through the state's Connecticard program of reciprocal borrowing through public libraries.
Our ability to locate needed materials has increased incredibly over the past several years, but there has been no concurrent increase in delivery capabilities. The Connecticut delivery system has been operating under increased demands without any increased capability. This proposal is aimed at providing an additional, yet cost-effective, capability for the timely delivery of library resource-sharing services to the citizens of Connecticut.

As well as instituting this proposal, the State Library should adopt a Connecticut mission statement designed to reflect a concentration of effort towards the effective delivery of services. The Connecticut mission statement is in support of the following element of the Connecticut State Library Statement of Mission and Responsibility:

The mission of the Connecticut State Library is to plan for the development and implementation of statewide systems for information and resource sharing among all libraries in the state.

The mission statement for the Connecticut program should be:

The mission of the Connecticut delivery program shall be to support the technical, political and organizational resource-sharing mechanisms currently in place among Connecticut libraries with a delivery service which keeps pace with the demand for materials created by those resource-sharing mechanisms. This will be accomplished by adopting the following goals:

**PRIMARY GOALS**

1. To support the return delivery of materials borrowed through the state-funded Connecticut reciprocal borrowing program.
2. To support statewide interlibrary loan mechanisms through the timely delivery and return of materials identified, located, and requested through all components of that program.

**SECONDARY GOAL**

To support the delivery of Connecticut State Library materials as appropriate.

The nearly half a million interlibrary loan materials shipped annually through Connecticut are highly valued by library users. (Unlike Connecticut materials, interlibrary loan materials are shipped both ways, creating an impact of twice their number.) These represent information for which both library users and librarians have gone through considerable effort and time to locate. We propose to reduce that time to a minimum through the adoption of a delivery model as practiced widely in the private sector. The sorting and delivery functions shall be separated so that drivers spend their entire shift en route, and the sorting and packing of vans occurs during a second shift. This will allow for the addition of 230–270 stops per week, greatly increasing the frequency of delivery and decreasing turnaround time. The turnaround time goal will be an average of three days.

The adoption of the second shift sorting operation requires the addition of only two positions. A third position should be added to expand the number of routes from seven to eight. Two sorters currently working the day shift would be transferred to second shift operations with the two new sorter positions.

Implementation of this plan will result in a measurable increase in service to the citizens of the state. While the delivery of library materials is a major component of the comprehensive statewide services available to citizens through local funding of their own libraries and state funding of resource-sharing technology, quality delivery service can be implemented for only a very small fraction of those costs.

The $85,000 required would come from federal LSCA funds. LSCA budget priorities would be reviewed to determine where funds could be allocated from to meet this crucial need.
Part II: Telefacsimile

Installation and Operation

Libraries installing FAX machines should make every attempt to connect the equipment to a dedicated phone line. The telefacsimile equipment should not be turned off at night or on weekends. It should be left on at all times in order to be ready to receive requests or documents from libraries that wish to take advantage of lower off-peak hours telephone rates. If it is not possible for the equipment to remain "on" at all times, the library should establish definite hours that the machine will be available for FAX activity.

FAX Directory

Libraries should make their FAX numbers known to other libraries. While it is necessary to include your FAX number on requests (ALA forms, OCLC, electronic mail, or FAX), a directory should be created that would include library name, address, telephone number, FAX number, FAX location, contact person, lending policies, levels of FAX service available from your library, and charges for the different levels of service. If the FAX machine is not on a dedicated telephone line or is not left on at all times, the hours of operation should be included in the policy statement. All policy statements should be kept up-to-date.

FAX Protocols

Philosophy

Telefacsimile technology should be used to speed the delivery of time-sensitive information, thereby supplementing current delivery methods and in some cases relieving the burden on the state delivery service. This section sets forth recommended protocols for the use of telefacsimile. Libraries participating in Connecticut's telefacsimile network should follow the Connecticut Interlibrary Loan Code as well as the FAX protocols. They should establish reciprocal FAX agreements wherever possible. The strength and success of the FAX network will depend on the willingness of the members to share resources and to exercise good judgement in the placement of requests for FAX service.

Costs, Charges and Fees

FAX libraries are responsible for the phone charges, paper, supplies, and maintenance of their machines. Libraries are encouraged to provide free FAX service to requesting libraries, but individual libraries may set their own charges. The fee structure at a FAX library should be reasonable and should reflect the levels of FAX service the library is capable of providing.

Libraries that bill should send an invoice at the end of the FAX transmission (if possible). The invoice should include the library's Federal
Employer Identification Number (FEIN). Libraries should anticipate community interest in FAX and should develop their own protocols for public service and fees.

Placement of Requests

Libraries should transmit their requests in the most efficient and cost effective manner possible. If a request is FAXed, indicate your FAX number, telephone number, address (for billing purposes); include the deadline for the requested information; indicate your willingness to accept charges; type your request in the standard bibliographic format—following the outline of an ALA interlibrary loan request form; and state any other conditions that could possibly affect the filling of the request.

It is preferable, given the present technology, to place a request using the OCLC ILL Subsystem, and within the workflow indicate your desire to have the article FAXed. (FAX # needed along with “max cost” information.)

Servicing of Requests and Messages

Libraries should make every attempt to deliver FAX messages and respond to requests for service within twenty-four hours. Requests for FAX service should be rejected if the information is not typed or other information is lacking.

Libraries receiving articles via FAX should check for completeness and resolution as quickly as possible.

Libraries sending articles via FAX should assume that the original photocopies can be discarded after forty-eight hours if the receiving library has not called.

Libraries should not resort to sending standard photocopies as a follow-up to the FAX transmission.

Evaluation

Do communicate your FAX experiences—both positive and negative—to your CLSUs.

Plan to keep track of your FAX activity.

Plan to discuss FAX at regional and state meetings.

RECOMMENDATIONS

14. The Connecticut service should be expanded to serve more libraries. Its internal operation should be reorganized to achieve greater efficiency; its staff should be increased; and additional routes should be added.

15. Once a telefacsimile network is operational in the State, protocols governing its use should be adopted, based on those presented in this report.
The purpose of Interlibrary loan service is to provide library patrons with materials and information which are not available to them locally, in a fast, efficient and cost effective manner. When we evaluate the elements that contribute to a successful service, we must not lose sight of the fact that the ultimate measure of success of the service is how well it fulfills this purpose. We have kept this in mind in our consideration of the components of an interlibrary loan service.

**Interlibrary Loan Tools**

The statewide interlibrary loan system chosen, whether it be GAC, Impact or another, is a basic tool used in the delivery of service. It determines the method and speed of transmitting of the request, the forwarding of the request, and the response back to the requesting library. In evaluating a system, speed of transmission, ease of use and efficiency of operation should be paramount considerations.

The database utilized for interlibrary loan is another important tool. Its size, inclusiveness and the availability of the materials are critical factors in any total system, determining the percentage of successful fills. Once a statewide system is chosen, all libraries in the state should be encouraged to contribute their holdings to the database utilized by the system. This would facilitate in-state borrowing, promote load-leveling, and go a long way toward insuring the success of the service.

Another determining factor of successful ILL service is the number of staff available for ILL at each library and their efficiency. We recommend libraries provide sufficient staff to perform ILL functions and provide them with training to ensure effective performance.

**Efficiency and Productivity**

Efficiency and productivity of the statewide interlibrary service must also be considered. Duplication of effort should be avoided. We
recommend that a uniform, statewide interlibrary loan procedure be adopted.

The most efficient method of interlibrary loan is a direct transaction between the borrowing and lending libraries. We recommend choosing a statewide interlibrary loan system which facilitates this. If an intermediary is required to assist in completing the loan, that intermediary should be designated in our statewide interlibrary loan procedure. In Section V, we have recommended developing uniform formats for statistical reporting and cost analysis. These tools should be used by ILC and the CLSUs to analyze the effectiveness of their current ILL methods. We also recommend that while the pilot Impact and proposed pilot GAC projects are ongoing, the CLSUs and the Interlibrary Loan Center conduct a joint evaluation of their effect on the patterns of CLSU and ILC interlibrary loan use. The data compiled from the evaluation should be used as the basis for choosing the ILL intermediary.

Turnaround Time

One of the most effective measures of an ILL service is its response or turnaround time. We define turnaround time as the time between receiving the ILL request from the patron, and notifying the patron that the material has been received. Using this measure focuses our attention on the purpose of the service rather than the elements which go into its performance.

Turnaround time is a function of many of the elements discussed in this chapter: staff, equipment, database availability, and delivery system effectiveness. However, none of these elements is of concern to the patron, whose only interest is how soon he can obtain the material requested. An effective interlibrary loan service will be one with a fast turnaround time.

We recommend that the median turnaround time for an interlibrary loan transaction in Connecticut be five to eight days. Breaking turnaround time into its components, we recommend that the borrowing library send the patron request out within two days of receiving it; lending libraries should act on the request within two days, either getting the material into the delivery system or acknowledging that they cannot fill; delivery should be completed within three days. The library should notify the patron within twenty-four hours of the completion of the ILL transaction.

In order to facilitate achieving a statewide median turnaround time of five to eight days, we recommend that this be a major criterion in evaluating both state and federal grants for interlibrary loan.

Delivery

A key element in interlibrary loan success is the speed and efficiency of the delivery system. It is the most important link between the borrower and the lender, since at the heart of all interlibrary loan transactions is the movement of materials between the parties in the transaction. The importance of the delivery system utilized cannot be overemphasized. In Section VIII, we recommend specific enhancements of Connecticar and make suggestions on developing protocols for telefacsimile.

Cost and Funding

Cost factors are another important consideration. Cost includes staff time, telecommunications, hardware costs, access and other fees, supervision and administration, and reimbursement payments. Cost actually begins with the patron request and ends only after the material is returned to the lending library (or given to the patron, in the case of a photocopy). Costs, therefore, cut across all lines of borrower, provider and lender.

It should be recognized that the State Library currently provides financial support for interlibrary loan in a number of ways. In FY 88–89, $643,775 was spent to support
interlibrary loan through the funding of: CLSU
interlibrary loan activities ($142,194), Connnex
grants ($274,450), Connecticut ($81,064), the
Interlibrary Loan Center ($120,367), and
interlibrary loan reimbursement ($25,700).

Participation in a statewide interlibrary loan
system should be affordable for all libraries in
the State. We recommend that adequate
funding be provided by the State to allow
participation by all libraries. We do not mean
that the entire cost of a statewide interlibrary
loan system should be borne by the State. This
is unrealistic in light of federal and state fiscal
realities. Libraries participating in interlibrary
loan should be willing to bear some portion of
the cost. The factor of overall cost to individual
participants must be a consideration in choosing
a system. Specific funding recommendations
cannot be made until a statewide interlibrary
loan system is chosen.

**Oversight Authority**

A final consideration for an effective statewide
interlibrary loan service is that there be a
central authority responsible for overseeing and
evaluating its operation. This is necessary if we
are to achieve our goal of a rapid, efficient and
cost-effective statewide interlibrary loan
service. We recommend that the State Library
assume this responsibility. It is in the best
position to establish and coordinate a statewide
operation, encourage participation by libraries
throughout the state, develop uniform methods
for gathering statistics and determining cost
factors, improve statewide delivery, and monitor
productivity and effectiveness. The choice of a
statewide interlibrary loan system should be
made by the State Library, based on an
evaluation of the success of the recommended
pilot projects and the criteria set forth in this
report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

16. A uniform, statewide interlibrary
loan procedure should be adopted.

17. The statewide ILL procedure
utilized should facilitate performing
ILL transactions directly
between borrowing and lending
libraries. The choice of an
intermediary, if required to
complete the loan, should be
stipulated by the uniform ILL
procedure.

18. After uniform statistical reporting
and cost analysis methods have
been developed, the ILC and
CLSU's should use these tools to
analyze the effectiveness of their
current ILL methods.

19. While the pilot IMPACT and
proposed GAC project are in
operation, the ILC and the CLSU's
should conduct a joint evaluation
effect on their patterns of inter
library loan use. The designation
of an ILL intermediary should be
based on data compiled by this
evaluation.

20. Libraries should provide sufficient
staff to perform ILL and should
provide them with training to
ensure effective performance.
21. The median turnaround time for an interlibrary loan transaction in Connecticut should be five to seven days. Whether this turnaround time is achieved should be a major criterion in evaluating grants for ILL.

22. Adequate funding for ILL should be provided by the State to allow participation by all publicly funded libraries. Libraries participating in ILL should be willing to bear a portion of the cost.

23. The State Library should oversee and evaluate the operation of a statewide ILL service.
Appendix 1

Interlibrary Loan Code for Libraries in the State of Connecticut

I. Definition

An interlibrary loan is a transaction in which library material, or a copy of the material, is made available by one library to another upon request.

II. Purpose

The purpose of this code is to facilitate interlibrary loan transactions in Connecticut.

III. Scope

Under the terms of this agreement it is permissible to request any type of material on interlibrary loan except those specifically excluded by a library’s interlibrary loan lending policy.

IV. General Responsibilities

1. Every library should have an interlibrary loan policy. Updated policy statements should be maintained online and/or in published directories. They should be in a standardized form.

2. All staff responsible for performing interlibrary loan transactions should be completely familiar with the operation of automated interlibrary loan systems in use at their library.

V. Responsibilities of Borrowing Libraries

1. Every library has an obligation to publicize its interlibrary loan service so that its users are aware of it.

2. It is the borrowing library’s responsibility to provide the proper bibliographic citations.
   a. Materials requested must be described as completely and accurately as possible following accepted bibliographic practice.
   b. When the borrowing library has access to the holdings of the lending library it should provide complete and accurate bibliographic information as it appears in the database.
   c. Sources of verification should be given for all items verified in standard bibliographic tools. When the item requested cannot be verified, the statement “cannot verify” should be indicated, along with the user’s source of reference and a list of bibliographic sources searched.
   d. Every request must include the specific date beyond which the material will not be accepted by the user. If the user indicates that there is no time limit, this information must be included.

3. Placement of requests
   a. The most efficient placement of an interlibrary loan request is directly from the borrowing library to the lending library.
   b. The borrowing library should get the patron request into the LLL system within two days of receiving it.
   c. The preferred method for transmitting interlibrary loan requests is electronic.
   d. Whenever possible, interlibrary loan requests should be filled in—
state. Libraries should search whatever statewide databases they have available to them.

e. Requests should be placed first with libraries on the same C-car route or within the same region, then to other libraries in Connecticut, then outside the state.

4. Interlibrary loan is always a transaction between libraries. Individuals going to a public library outside their community to borrow materials should do this through Connecticut, not through ILL.

5. There should be uniform ILL periods throughout the state. Standard loan periods to the borrowing patron will be four weeks.

6. A loan may be renewed unless a hold is outstanding.

7. The borrowing library must instruct the user to return loans to the borrowing library, not to the lending library or to another library.

8. The borrowing library is responsible for compliance with the copyright law (Title 17, U.S. Code) and its accompanying guidelines, and should inform its users of the applicable portions of the law. An indication of compliance must be provided with all copy requests.

9. The borrowing library is responsible for materials from the time they leave the lending library until they are returned to that library.

10. The borrowing library should be prepared to assume any costs charged by the lending library. If charges are more than nominal, the lending library will inform the requesting library and obtain authorization to proceed with the transaction.

Borrowing libraries should attempt to anticipate charges and authorize them on the initial request.

11. The borrowing library should adhere to any restrictions placed by the lending library on the use of the materials borrowed.

12. The borrowing library should initiate notification of the patron within twenty-four hours of the completion of the ILL transaction.

13. If the request was made through a third party, the borrowing library should provide that party with any required notice of receipt and return.

VI. Responsibilities of the Lending Library

1. The decision to lend materials is at the discretion of the lending library.

2. Lending libraries should process requests within two working days, or cancel requests and notify the borrowing library within two working days.

3. If the borrowing library has made a good faith effort to provide complete bibliographic verification, the lending library will make every attempt to fulfill the request.

4. Whenever possible, the lending library should provide the borrowing library with a reason why it is unable to fill a request.
Appendix 2

Evaluation of ILL Systems

Part I: Comparison of Auto-Graphic's ILL System and the OCLC GAC ILL System

A. Comparison of Costs and Vendor Claims

Each vendor was asked to provide information about its interlibrary loan system based on specific comparison parameters. Because the responses differed greatly in the amount of detail included, it was necessary to take information from additional sources in the case of Auto-Graphic and to reduce and extract information in the OCLC response.

IMPACT SYSTEM Costs (per site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workstation, including one floppy, one 30MB hard drive, 640 K, two CD drives, parallel port, 2400–baud modem</td>
<td>$3,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual maintenance</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact annual software license</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL annual software license</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL telecommunications installation</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two CD set of reQuest database (statewide database)</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,982</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other costs to each participating library would include the installation of a telephone line, an electrical surge protection device, an optional printer, and a standard microcomputer table. The Impact unit has no unusual environmental requirements.

ANNUAL COSTS (per site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workstation maintenance</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software licenses</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software maintenance</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD updates (quarterly)</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

(Minimum $750/month for entire state) $9,000

DATABASE CONSTRUCTION

(annually for four updates, one million new records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New holdings, one million records @ .015</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number indexing, 2 million records @ .0016, four updates</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing titles, 2 million records @ .02, four updates</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority control, 2 million @ .0075</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross referencing, four updates</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape extracts, 1.2 est. new records</td>
<td>$34,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. tape charges</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$247,626</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAINING

Auto-Graphic would depend on the local group to provide training for new libraries coming into the group but would sponsor workshops to explain system upgrades and modifications.
SYSTEM FEATURES

Database

Currency: Re-mastering is a local decision. Current planning is to produce quarterly updates of the request database.

Number of records: Approximately 838,000 titles, 2.25 million holdings records in first issue. Project goal is to double the size of the database within a year.

Ease of adding new records: MARC tapes extracted from OCLC or local system, shipped to Amigos or other vendor for processing, then to Auto-Graphics for addition to request database.

Access to serials records: Yes, but limited. Future masterings may include Connecticut Union List of Serials.

Access to out-of-state records: No

Placing a Request

System supplied: All data from the bibliographic record plus borrower and lender symbols, request status, current date, needs before date, substitute?, photocopy?, verification, request number, database record number, suggested lenders.

User supplied: Copyright compliance, authorized by, patron name, volume, number, date, and pages for photocopy requests, amount will pay, send microfilm or hardcopy, notes.

Free text space: Yes

Default settings: Yes

Referrals per transaction: One

Lender string system supplied: System displays list of suggested lenders according to borrowing library's individual lender priority list. The list can be overridden by the borrower.

Can materials not in the database be requested: Yes. Borrower can request a blank ILL work form.

Responses to Requests

Automatic referral to next lender: No.

If not filling, does system allow lender to say why: Yes. By changing status value of request or by responding in Notes field.

Are status changes for requests made automatically by system: No. Manual change required by borrower or lender.

Is a limited response time built into the system: No. Group protocols required.

Overdues

Is status change to "Overdue" automatic: No.

Provision for billing built into the system: No.

Does system allow borrower to notify lender of lost item: No status value for lost materials; may use Notes field.

SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

Routing Pattern

Is routing automatic: No, semi-automatic. Borrower keys in symbol of next library for referral; system automatically supplies new lender's call number.

Can request be routed to in-state and out-of-state libraries: No.

Is routing hierarchical: Yes, if borrower builds a hierarchical lender priority list.

Is referral strategy structured: Yes, strategy is built into borrower's priority lender list default.

Does system allow for individual profiling of holding symbols: Yes, borrower can use default settings to assign other libraries to display groups and lender priority list.
Load-leveling

Does system provide mechanism to even lending loan among participants: No. Lender priority lists may be altered, however, to accommodate uneven lending within the group.

Hit and fill rates

What hit and fill rates could be expected: No data available yet on which to base an estimate.

BENEFITS

Pre-existing conditions

There are at least sixty library sites in the state that already have CD-ROM workstations or PCs with CD-ROM drives. Most of them are now actively using their workstations to search the request database. Of that number, twenty-six sites have received both the Impact PAC software and the Impact interlibrary loan software, and their workstations are already set up with a modem and telephone line.

Vendor support

Auto-Graphics states that they are in the process of establishing regular workshops for Impact users. In addition, they have an east coast toll free telephone number for technical questions and will provide training for a person designated by request to be the technical liaison between the vendor and the local group.

Other benefits

Access to union catalog data: Yes.

Access to MARC cataloging records: Yes.

Can the system transmit reference questions: Yes. User can ask for a blank reference request form from the "Initiate a Request" menu.

Electronic bulletin board: No. Auto-Graphics claims this is in development and due for release in June, 1989.

Who owns the database: Connecticut libraries.

OCLC GAC SYSTEM

Costs (per site) — OCLC states that almost any video display terminal or microcomputer workstation capable of asynchronous communication can be used to dial access OCLC. They suggest that a typical video display terminal installation might include the following costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modem</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications software</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A library that elected to use a more flexible microcomputer workstation that could run OCLC's Terminal Software would have a higher installation cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workstation</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual maintenance</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modem</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC terminal software</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,055</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other costs would be the same as an Impact installation, including a telephone line, an electrical surge protection device, an optional printer, and a standard microcomputer table.

ANNUAL COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workstation maintenance (optional)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATABASE SEARCHING FOR EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display of library holdings</td>
<td>$.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of union list holdings</td>
<td>$.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib. record search over threshold (four free for each ILL produce)</td>
<td>$.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending credit</td>
<td>$.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENDING REQUESTS

For each ILL request sent $1.03

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Authorization for dial access $216.00/year
Dial access connect time $7.30/hour

TRAINING

Nelinet provides training at the rate of $300 per day for up to six people or $60 per person for seven or more people. OCLC also offers a self-paced computer based training program for the ILL system.

DATABASE CONSTRUCTION

Collecting 61,726 bibliographic records for Connecticut libraries now served by cataloging processing centers @ .04 $2,469.04
Master retrospective conversion/tapeload of 61,726 records @ .10 $6,172.60
TOTAL $8,641.66

Monthly conversion/tapeload of current cataloging by processing centers $.16 per record
Conversion of retrospective cataloging $.10 per record

MEMBERSHIP

Libraries that elect to become full OCLC members would be charged $500 annual fee by NELINET. GAC members are not charged a membership fee by OCLC or NELINET.

SYSTEM FEATURES

Database

Currency: All records in the database are immediately available to all system users as soon as they are entered.

Number of records: OCLC reports that there are 4.26 million Connecticut locations representing 101 OCLC members and sixty-five libraries served by processing centers.

Ease of adding new records: Full members' new records are added to the GAC database as new items are cataloged. Machine readable bibliographic records from other sources that are in MARC 2 format and meet OCLC's tape and records requirements can be tapeloaded into the database.

Access to serials records: Yes, OCLC reports more than 82,000 Connecticut serials holdings records in the OCLC database contributed by 360 libraries participating in CULS.

Access to out-of-state records: Selective users would have access to the Connecticut records that would form the GAC database and to the holdings data within the group. Full OCLC members would have access to the complete 19 million-record OCLC database and all holdings records therein. Selective users could also access abbreviated bibliographic records from the complete OCLC database but no holdings data outside of the GAC.

Placing a request

System supplied: Selected data from the bibliographic record, borrower symbol, request status, current date, OCLC record number, request number, verification.

User supplied: Needs before date, lender(s) symbol(s), patron name, ship to address, bill to address, ship via, amount will pay, copyright compliance, note.

Free text space: Yes.

Default settings: Yes.

Referrals per transaction: Up to five.

Lender string system supplied: No, but OCLC claims it is under development.
Can materials not in the database be requested: Yes. Borrower can request a blank ILL work form.

Responses to requests

Automatic referral to next lender: Yes.

If not filling, does system allow lender to say why: No.

Does system allow for "Conditional" response: Yes.

Are status changes for requests made automatically by system: Yes.

Is limited response time built into the system: Yes. If a response is not received within four working days, a request is automatically referred to the next lender in the string.

Overdues

Is status change to "Overdue" automatic: Yes.

Provision for billing built into the system: Yes, through lender charges and maxcost fields on ILL work form. System does not generate a bill.

Does system allow borrower to notify lender of lost item: No status value for lost materials; may use Notes field.

Is referral strategy structured: No.

Does system allow for individual profiling of holding symbols: No.

Load-leveling

Does system provide mechanism to even lending load among participants: No.

Hit and fill rates

What hit and fill rates could be expected: OCLC reports a hit rate of 94% for full member libraries that do cataloging on the OCLC system; and that in 1987-1988, of 73,826 ILL requests placed by Connecticut libraries on the OCLC system, 52.2% were filled by other Connecticut libraries.

BENEFITS

Pre-existing conditions

OCLC reports there are 164 OCLC workstations/terminals in use in seventy-two libraries in Connecticut. Of those seventy-two, sixty access OCLC through a dedicated line, and twelve are dial-access users.

Vendor support

OCLC supplies support to its members through training, documentation, and a toll free user help desk telephone number. User support is also provided by NELINET.

Other benefits

Access to union catalog data: Yes. Full members see holdings data from entire OCLC online union catalog; selective members see only holdings records of their ILL group.
Access to MARC cataloging records: All records in the OCLC union catalog are in MARC format, but selective users may access only abbreviated bibliographic records from outside their group.

Can the system transmit reference questions: There is no specific reference request in the ILL system, but OCLC states that libraries can use an ILL worksheet to submit reference questions as long as all of the required fields in the worksheet are completed.

Electronic bulletin board: No.


Other useful by-products of the ILL system: The ILL micro-enhancer software package, the online Name/Address Directory, OCLC’s ability to provide “customized reports of ILL activity to individual libraries, referral agents, and to the group.”

Among the questions asked were why a GAC was chosen, how it was financed, other methods of ILL used, training, hit rate, turnaround time, what was best and worst about the system, the role of subsidies, ILL volume, and what would cause selective users to become full users.

Choosing a GAC

There was no consistent pattern in forming a GAC. In one case, the impetus came from libraries along the border in an adjacent state. In others, the State Library organized the GAC. In the last state, the medium and small private academics urged the State Library to start a GAC. When most of these GACs were begun, the CD-ROM system did not exist. Other options considered were in-house hardware, and other commercial vendors. A GAC was the least expensive. One State Librarian commented, “The universities wouldn’t have cooperated with anything but OCLC.”

All of the states had some form of central referral similar to the ILC, most based on a union card catalog. They all used U.S. Mail for delivery. North Carolina had an Inwats system, using toll free lines. Interestingly, that Inwats system still exists, side-by-side with the GAC. In two cases, the State Libraries maintain special staff and collections to support ILL; in one, they act as a referral center only; and in the fourth state, they handle ILL searches and referrals with members of the general reference staff as they have time. In half the states the GAC members are public libraries only; the rest include various types of libraries. In most states the State Library took on the role of sales manager for the system. In Florida, selective users had to have an outgoing traffic of 500 loans a year to join. A written commitment to follow protocols was also required. Libraries joined for obvious reasons—such as access to holdings records, decreased turnaround time, and higher hit rates. Two intangibles cited were the prestige of participating in a system with larger libraries and the involvement of libraries in networking committees at the planning stage.

Financing covered the gamut of options. Most states used LSCA money to finance the initial...

B. Summary of Interviews

Methods

In an attempt to break down what seemed a monumental task, we drew up a list of parameters, factors to be compared in the systems. This list was sent to the vendors, and they filled in the appropriate information which was supplemented from other sources. In addition to the claims of the vendors, we needed input from those actually using the system. A series of telephone interviews was conducted with administrators and ILL librarians in four states: New York, Florida, North Carolina, and Oregon. New York has regional GAC systems, Florida and North Carolina have statewide GACs, and Oregon is part of multi-state GAC. Unfortunately, we were unable to interview a selective user in Florida, so information on that state’s GAC comes from the State level. Two librarians sent in unpublished studies on GACs. The questions used were based on the parameter list and on a survey done by the South Central Research Council of New York.
hard- and software for member libraries as well as telecommunications charges and per-
loan subsidies that varied from $1.40 to $2.48. Florida required members to request funds
from local governments for second year operations, as subsidies covered the first year only. All Florida GAC members were successful in obtaining funding. Oregon is a curiosity. Their LSCA money was used for start-up costs for libraries becoming OCLC full members. The cessation of these funds was the impetus for a
GAC as the State looked for cheaper ways to bring libraries online. Except for New York,
most states now fund only some telecommunications charges, modest loan reimbursements,
and maintain the central referral agency. North Carolina is contracting for 2x25 lines
from Triangle Park to Ohio at a cost of $600 a month per line. They expect this will lower
charges enough that more libraries can afford to join.

Benefits

Far and away, the advantage cited most was speed. Turnaround time for loans was one to
two weeks. Most of these states don’t have delivery systems, so they use the U.S. Postal
Service. New York and Oregon have some regional courier service. Tremendous interest
was expressed by the interviewees in Connecticut. Some also envied us Connecticard. FAX
transmission exists but is not extensive in most states. The one state that provides FAX
machines requires libraries to participate in OCLC in order to get one.

The second advantage cited was autonomy. Librarians liked to “be able to handle requests
themselves.” “I don’t like to be dependent,” said another. “A sense of increased professional
responsibility” was expressed by a North Carolina librarian.

Third was better public relations. “I have better satisfied patrons and they’re using ILL
more.”

Fourth was holdings information, particularly for special libraries. Bibliographic citation
access was mentioned. “We originally perceived this as a monograph system, but it’s
most useful for serials.”

Other advantages mentioned were total freedom in the lender string, ability to track the request
at any stage, ease of use, and finally, increased fill rate. One selective user’s rate shot up 21%
in one year. The average fill rate is in the low 70s. This is somewhat lower than the system
claim of 78%. Libraries also listed use of the database as an authority file and as a source to
verify orders as additional benefits.

Disadvantages

Substantial efforts were made to elicit negative comments from those interviewed. Aside from
cost, most could find nothing major wrong with the system. Further questioning did uncover a
few problems.

Cost was the main objection. The only libraries leaving the system were several New York
libraries whose subsidy was being dropped. They hope to rejoin when they can get funding.
Cost is also preventing selective users from becoming full users. However, most states
report a slow drift from GACs to full users.

A second objection is the truncated entry. Some libraries had hoped to use this system for cheap
cataloging. One librarian questioned said her “branch librarians were frustrated by their
inability to see certain fields.”

Third were complaints about using the Name and Address Directory, particularly for fees.

Fourth, many selective users found themselves bypassed in the routing of OCLC updates and
technical memoranda.

Others found the search strategy awkward, the lack of explanation of unfilled requests
frustrating, and telephone line distortion annoying (probably a local problem). Some
librarians could not use their microenhancers because their hardware was too old to be
compatible. One State Librarian commented on the “quirkiness of OCLC.”
Finally, there were complaints about inadequate training. The least satisfactory were 1½-day sessions conducted by a state library. The best was Florida which scheduled one-day classes conducted by the regional network, SOLINET, for no more than two libraries at a time. This was supplemented by additional training provided by the State Library for those who needed still more help.

Load—Leveling

Much of the burden of increasing volume is falling on the medium—sized public and the small academic libraries, particularly community colleges. The processing centers are swamped too. North Carolina’s system went from 3,800 to 17,000 OCLC requests sent through the State Library in the space of three years. The director of a large North Carolina library that was interviewed said her ILL volume quadrupled in one year.

There were a number of complaints from full users about selective users who were improperly trained. It was claimed that they didn’t know how to submit requests. Inadequate training leads to incorrect citations, failure to check the Name and Address Directories for charging policies, unverified requests, lack of copyright compliance, and failure to update records.

Overwhelmed libraries are attempting to cope in several ways. They urged the use of strong protocols with sanctions. The New York state regional system studied and revoked the GAC membership of a library that constantly failed to check its message file. This system is so concerned about increasing ILL volume that they have scheduled a workshop on the subject by Virginia Boucher.

Most libraries have tried to cope by tightening their rules on what they will lend. The universal prohibition is on new books. The usual period is six months, although one processing center refuses to forward requests for items published in the last three years. Another won’t refer requests for items costing less than $15. One medium—sized library, a full user, is so overburdened that it lightens the ILL load by letting requests sit in their message file until they cycle to the next library. Some libraries have added staff, and others are thinking of charging even within the GAC. Most of the full users don’t blame their troubles on the GACs but on the phenomenal growth of ILL due to patrons’ rising expectations.

Probably the best summary of most interviewees’ opinions on GACs is a comment made by Mary-Carol Lindbloom, coordinator of Interlibrary Loan and Online Services for the South Central Research Library Council of New York. “If you want maximum access to the resources in the country, you have to use OCLC.”

Auto—Graphic’s Impact System

The Auto—Graphic system is so new that it is not presently (3/31/89) in use anywhere. New Jersey is scheduled to begin using the system in April, 1989. George Steinbach of Auto—Graphics told us that New Jersey is still a “beta” or test site. Maine recently began using a CD-ROM—based catalog somewhat similar to reQuest. However, this is not a test of the Impact system. There seems to be no one with experience with the Impact system who could be interviewed at this time. We should conduct interviews with the New Jersey librarians after Impact has been in operation for one year.

Part II: The LSC Interloan System

The Library Services Center of Ontario has developed a cost effective, centralized interlibrary loan system that does not require building a database of bibliographic holdings. The LSC Interloan System operates with a database of requests, a feature that makes the turnkey cost of this system a fraction of the cost.
associated with creating a union catalog for a system with a database of holdings.

The LSC Interloan System is comprised of four major components:

- Interloan
- Film Booking
- Electronic Mail, and
- Statistical Reporting

The Interloan System operates on a bulletin board concept, storing a database of requests which are available to each library in the system. Each library can place, search, trace, cancel, request or renew any request placed on the system.

The Film Booking function provides automatic booking of films and the respective delivery schedules. A Calendar display facilitates booking films up to one year in advance.

The Electronic Mail function is available to each library in the system. In addition to the free text field in the interloan function, the message field enables libraries to place complex subject or reference requests on the system.

The Statistical Reporting function automatically manages monthly, quarterly and annual interlibrary loan activity including net lending, net borrowing, out-of-region requests, summaries of items borrowed and loaned and extracts of subject classifications of items loaned.

The LSC Interloan System operates on a Hewlett Packard 3000 Series mini-computer at the central site and workstations comprised of a personal computer, modem and dot matrix printer at the local library.

The LSC Interloan Features

The rates and statistics used in the following report are based on the Ontario Library Service—Trent's interlibrary loan activity in 1987. The Trent Resource Sharing Network (TRESNET) includes ninety-four libraries generating 105,300 interlibrary loans.

Requests

The System provides three screens for management of requests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select function - ILL, Film Booking and Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select Action - Inquiry, Request and Interloan, Fill-Release, Fill-Reserve, Search Requests, Check-in, Place, Cancel, Reports, Out-of-Region, Overdue, Renewal and Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Access - Patron Name, Author, Title and ILL Request Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All screens and fields are pre-formatted for easy input. There are two sixty-character free text lines.

Fill Rates

Eighty-six percent of all requests are filled within the region. To achieve this rate, each library placing a request agrees to search and attempts to fill three requests from other libraries.

Turnaround Time

Turnaround time is improved through direct library to library ILL. Eighty-six percent of all requests are filled within two weeks; of the filled requests, eighty-six percent are filled within one week.

Online Time

The average time per online transaction is 1.4 minutes. No batching is provided but the system operates twenty-three hours per day, allowing for transactions to be made during off-peak hours.

Searching Requests

The LSC System automatically records search activity so that only one library at a time...
shelf searches for a particular item. The protocol for searching is determined systemwide. If a request is not filled within the pre-established time frame, the request is automatically made available for another library to search. A protocol for the length of time an unfilled request stays on the system is also determined systemwide in advance. The status of any request is always available. The lender must cross-check its own holdings to determine the availability and “in-library” status of the materials being requested.

Overdues

The System automatically changes the status to “overdue” according to the pre-set protocol. There is no provision for automatic billing for overdue items.

Routing

There is no necessity for either lender strings or routing patterns.

Load-Leveling

One of the outstanding features of the LSC Interloan System is the significant contribution to ILL networking that every library makes. Small and medium-sized libraries substantially reduce the ILL loan burden that libraries serving populations over 100,000 usually share. By equalizing the access to all resources, net lending and net borrowing are effectively balanced so that a reimbursement system is unnecessary.

Participation by Size of Library

The ability provide materials to the network is not dependent on the size of the library’s holdings or the size of the library’s population served.

Effective Use of Network

One of the measures of effective use of the System is the time spent online per transaction. This measure is not related to a library’s size or number of holdings. Those libraries with lower use of the system tend to be less efficient.

Cost Benefits of Network Participation

A benefit of ILL is the material cost savings realized through resource sharing versus purchasing. For instance, in Connecticut if an average number of items loaned is 150,000 and the average purchase cost is $20, then the purchase cost of items alone would be worth $3,000,000.

Information on the Current Status of ILL in Connecticut

Interlibrary loan statistics for Connecticut are not easily determined, but the best estimate for ILL transactions for all libraries is 150,000 items per year. Perhaps 25% of those transactions are handled through the six cooperating library service units and the Connecticut State Library Interlibrary Loan Center with the remainder handled by local circulation networks. Probably 150 libraries currently participate in interlibrary loan in Connecticut.

The national average for the percentage of interlibrary loan activity when compared with the total circulation is three percent. There are a few states that reach a maximum ILL activity of seven percent of their total circulation.

Taking into account the relative low activity of interlibrary loan, the Library Services Center designed an appropriately cost-effective, centralized system for Connecticut. The system could handle up to 450,000 ILL transactions by 600 libraries. Each library participating would have direct access to the requests of every other library in the system. All libraries with access to a personal computer, a printer and a modem would have full access to the Interloan, Film Booking Mail and Statistic functions of the Interloan system. Additional libraries could be added to the system at any time. The Library Services Center could provide linkage with a bibliographic database.
Costs

1 Central site Hardware
Initial Expense Hewlett Packard
3000 Series $311,008
—935 Mini-Computer, a
preconfigured system with
48 Mb memory, 16 Mb
add-on memory, 307 Mb
disk storage, operating
software, six modem
connections and a dot
matrix printer.

1 Central site Software
Initial Expense LSC Interloan license and
customization $8,000

1 Central Site Hewlett Packard Support
Initial Expense Five-day classroom
instruction $2,100

1 Central site LSC Interloan Support
Initial Expense Implementation, training and
documentation $7,000

1 Central Site
Total Initial Expense $328,108

1 Central Site Hardware System
Maintenance
Total Annual Expense $11,088

Cost Options

1 Central Site Hewlett Packard Hardware
Leasing Option—Based
on $300,000 for
two-year period $13,574
per month on 4.623%,
8% APR

1 Local Library Workstation
—Personal computer,
modem, dot matrix
or serial card $1,500
per workstation

The proliferation of FAX machines in libraries, the real possibility exists that the screen-printed paper forms will be communicated electronically via FAX just as quickly as in the alternate telecommunications method.

Summary

The Library Services Center Interloan System is a centralized interlibrary loan system that would enable each library in the state to have direct access to an online means of transmitting ILL requests. All libraries with access to a personal computer, a printer and a modem would have immediate, full access to the Interloan and Film Booking system. Any library can be added to the system at any time. The system is designed to handle up to 450,000 ILL transactions by 600 libraries. The Library Services Center could provide linkage with the CD-ROM database.
Appendix 3

A Method for Measuring the Effectiveness of ILL

There are three major factors which can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of an ILL process:

- Turnaround time
- Fill rate, and
- Processing cost per request.

Measuring the last two, fill rate and cost, is quite straightforward once fill rate is defined and the cost elements agreed upon. Turnaround time, however, must not only be defined but also measured.

Definitions

**Fill Rate:** The percentage of ILL requests which result in the requested material being received by the library.

**Cost per Request:** The total number of requests divided by the direct costs of the ILL service (i.e., staff salaries and benefits, telecommunications, equipment maintenance, per transaction charges for searching and placing ILL requests, database fees, and so on.)

**Turnaround Time:** The time from the placing of the request by the patron to the notifying of the patron that the material has been received.

**System Processing Time:** That portion of turnaround time from the library placing the ILL request to receipt of the materials by the library.

**Fill Rate and Cost per Request**

Data on the fill rate and the cost per request can be gathered by the uniform statistical report. This report is to be designed by the CLSUs and the ILC.

**Turnaround Time**

Assumptions:
- That, from the patron’s point of view, turnaround time—the time period from placing the request to finding out it has arrived—is what matters.
- That no two libraries follow exactly the same procedures in accepting requests, identifying potential lenders and requesting materials, nor do they follow the same procedures in responding to requests from other libraries.
- That, in order to eliminate the local library processing variable, turnaround time for the purpose of this evaluation should be the time period from the library placing the request on the ILL network to the receipt of the material.

**Conclusion**

Evaluate each ILL process by determining how close system processing time, defined as the median number of days from library ILL request to receipt of the material in the library comes to the anticipated median of five-to-eight days. A more precise evaluation would result from measuring the time from patron request to ILL confirmation to receipt of materials, as well as the total turnaround time. However, it would be more difficult to set up such a test and would require more record keeping on the part of the participating libraries.
Method

1. Select a test group of libraries representing the following categories:
   - Use ILC exclusively—five heaviest users
   - Use CLSU ILL service exclusively—five heaviest users from each CLSU
   - Use reQuest to locate and then place requests directly with the owning library—five heaviest users.
   - Use OCLC/GAC—All participants in GAC pilot study.

2. Select one week for the test period.

Have participating libraries keep log of ALL requests received during that week. (It may be possible to use the reporting form created for the reQuest test with some modifications.)

The date the ILL was initiated should be the date the library sent the request to ILC or the CLSU, placed it through GAC or requested it directly from a reQuest library.

Other data which could be gathered are: date ILL is confirmed (GAC users only, since ILC and some/all of the CLSUs notify the library by mail when the request is confirmed), delivery method (C-Car—same route, other route, U.S. mail, Other) and whether filled in-state or out-of-state.

Libraries may want to determine what their in-house processing time is. How long after a patron places a request is the request sent out? How long after receiving the material until the patron is notified?

3. Analysis can be done by either the participating libraries or by the person(s) responsible for doing the study.

Use a spreadsheet which can calculate the elapsed time for each request based on the date initiated and the date received and can then sort by elapsed time. The median is the request in the middle.

Suggested column headings: Requesting library, Date initiated, (Date confirmed), Date received, (C-Car—Same, C-Car Other, U.S. mail, Other), In-state, Out-of-state.

Consider "day" to be a calendar day.

If asking libraries to do the analysis, keep it simple and only ask them to calculate time from date initiated to date received.