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I. Situation at University of Vienna / Vienna University Library
II. The e-book delay (e-books vs. e-journals)
III. Approaching the sixfold beast – trying an analogy to the parable
IV. Conclusions 1: What academic libraries need from publishers?
    ... and possible incentives
V. Conclusions 2: Change management in academic libraries
University of Vienna: 93.000 students; 6.800 researchers;
15 faculties and 4 centres (w/o Medicine)

Library: single-layer organization but main library with central services + 42
dislocated special libraries (=departments)

Present challenges: Installation of new library system ALMA 2016/17
Implementation of tender procedures within acquisition

Boundaries of term e-books in this presentation: no reference works (Oxford Reference Online), modular publications, FTXT databases (ATLAS), series (Lecture Notes)
Mission statements and Acquisition models

Mission statements (in extracts):

• „Online wherever possible/feasible – print wherever necessary“ → massive shift from print to online
• E-books are purchased to replace print rather than supplement it
• Test new and various acquisition models and evaluate them; work with vendors and agents to modify them / create new ones

E-book models employed by Vienna University Library (2016):

• Individual purchase, Pick & Choose
• E-book packages
• Demand Driven Acquisition (only Evidence Based Selection, EBS)
• Subscription
• Variations and combinations of the above
• (currently no Short Time Loan)
## Characterization of Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Cost per Title</th>
<th>Librarian’s influence</th>
<th>Complexity of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Purchase</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>EUR 242,00*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packages</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>EUR 47,82</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBS overall</td>
<td>8,38% licenced: EUR 14,96 purchased: EUR 178,45</td>
<td>100% (but supported)</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>EUR 0,15</td>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High Cost per Title is explained by spendings on reference works et al.
## Models Titles/Spendings (as at August 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition Model</th>
<th>Titles total</th>
<th>Increase 2015</th>
<th>Costs 2015 (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Purchase</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>EUR 49.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packages</td>
<td>13.160</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>EUR 118.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBS overall</td>
<td>20.671</td>
<td>7.860</td>
<td>EUR 156.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereof purchase</td>
<td>1.661*</td>
<td>801*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription</td>
<td>275.000</td>
<td>275.000</td>
<td>EUR 45.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Selection process 2015 not completed due to multi-year contracts.

**BUT:** Alone during the first 2 months of 2016 22.000 EBS, 2.000 subscription, and 45.000 e-books from an EBS/package hybrid were added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-Journals</th>
<th>E-Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales models</td>
<td>Highly standardized</td>
<td>Extremely diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortial acquisition</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central platforms</td>
<td>Electronic Journals Library, Linking Services</td>
<td>None (only some aggregators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of users / authors</td>
<td>Web-based; to be cited</td>
<td>identical to print; to be read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary users (?)</td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>Students, lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to replace print</td>
<td>Buy archives to weed print, e-journals instead of print</td>
<td>Archives: logistically difficult, quantitatively insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional services</td>
<td>OA, linking services, suppl. data</td>
<td>Limited (similar to print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-dateness</td>
<td>E-early</td>
<td>Often delayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The belly / body may represent the content and main part of the elephant but we don’t know what it contains. In case of e-journals expectations of authors and users match quite well but ....

e-books:  composite vs. monograph
scientific /scholarly vs. object of research
highly specific vs. popular
text books

As manifold as the content appears as different are customers, expectations and markets. And there obviously exists an additional market for most e-books than academic institutions only. This difference did not exist in the world of the printed book (phps. except text books).

The first librarian has to distinguish between different things bearing the same name.
Approach 2: the **tusk** / spear

The tusk = ivory = valuable (if immoral).

Providers have to create specific business models for their product(s) which warrant highest profits.

Obviously publishers do not sell only content but models (individual, package, DDA, STL, subscription ...).

This is okay if customer specific models can be provided.

The second librarian has to understand, perhaps even anticipate business models and to choose from a multitude of them.
Approach 3: the trunk / snake

The elephant’s trunk is often interpreted as a snake.

Let’s characterize the snake biblical and see it as evil and malicious. In our context it’s restrictive Digital Rights Management.

Publishers see e-books as creatures deserving protection. Probably assigned by authors to do so.

For the reader those are incomprehensible obstacles, for the desk librarian hours of (thankless) conversation trying to explain them. No other e-book topic creates as much annoyance for users as restrictive DRM.

The third librarian has identify possible dangers and to decide what’s acceptable (related to price).
The legs are the elephant’s foundation.

Successfully licensing huge and dynamic e-book models stands and falls with the quality of the metadata.

Original data from publishers or other providers often is neither sufficient nor compatible to catalog standards/formats. Post-editing by union catalogs or even OCLC is too slow or does not fit exactly to a customized package.

While libraries definitely have to scale down some of their expectations, providers likewise improve services.

The fourth librarian has to realize e-books as sets of metadata and find solutions to seamlessly integrate them into and remove (!) them from the library system. A completely new task compared to print.
Approach 5: the **ear** / fan

Okay, that’s a little bit far-fetched: Ears are symbols for being observant and perceptive. The other fact about elephant ears is that they are not primarily for better hearing but quite effective cooling aggregates (like fans).

E-books should not simply stay electronic versions of printed ones forever. Without losing the character of a book (sustainability, citeability, homogeneity ...) many additional web-based services could be added.

The fifth librarian has to see e-books as opportunities for innovation. He has to be open-minded and anticipative. He has to shed earlier ideas without forfeiting them.
Approach 6: the tail / rope

Let’s face it: the elephant (like all mammals) has only one tail.

Doublets are neither affordable nor desireable in today’s library budgets. Electronic publication is founded on the idea of access independent of time, location and number of items.

E-books are not the complements of printed books but their substitute. Archival rights have to be guaranteed where necessary.

The sixth librarian has to recognize this replacement function, to purchase e-books instead of printed ones, to decide what should be permanently available und to convince (and comfort) his fellow librarians.
What do we want from publishers? / 1

Wish list (for the scientific publisher):

• Standardized and compatible metadata for seamless inclusion into search engine/OPAC
• Granular data available via web scale discovery services (based on chapters)
• Complete and simultaneous (to print) availability of (scientific) portfolio
• DRM light (no session/user based limitation to download, at least in case of purchased content)
• Services to easily combine bibliographic, usage and price data (esp. for EBS)
• Transparency of package contents, flexibility of models (no “only eligible within package“ cases), reliable front lists, affordable solutions for text books
• Direct order interfaces with immediate online availability of content
• Optional download of chapters or whole book
• Up-to-date e-features (identifiers [DOI, ORCID], linked references, supplementary data)
What do we want from publishers? / 2

Special case EBS (Evidence Based Selection):
Some publishers hesitate to offer EBS (alternatively to PDA or classic purchase).
Only very few publishers are able to provide the critical mass of content to sustain an attractive EBS on their own.

Possible incentives:
Library budgets are still stagnating \(\rightarrow\) continuous obligations (multi-year journal, database, consortial contracts) bind increasingly higher shares of budgets \(\rightarrow\) earnings from (e-)book sales will become less reliable for providers.

Publishers providing EBS or participate in cross publisher projects may meet the following benefits:
• Income is guaranteed based on contract (in advance)
• Usage statistics may motivate customers to spend even more money
• Advantage over competitors
Conclusions for Vienna University Library / Budget spending

Change continues (and accelerates):

• Furthermore e-preferred
• Cumulative strategic change from holdings/archival items to accessibility of content (formerly only in case of databases and huge journal packages [Freedom Collection...]) \(\rightarrow\) also from Archival to Research Library
• Bulk of e-books via different big deals; individual purchase only complementary
• Centralization of budget
• (Cumulative funding of production [OA] instead of consumption (licence)
Conclusions for Vienna University Library / Monograph holdings

- Number of books (decreasing percent for years due to journal and consortial expenditures) is considerably growing!
- Effort for information and communication internally (librarians) and externally (users) is continuously increasing.
- DRM changes (reduces) the worth of a purchased/licenced product and increases need for communication further (≠ e-journals).
- Necessity to implement new workflows and competencies at metadata management. Fast, comprehensive and precise deletion of huge amounts of data creates specific manpower requirements.
- Traditional union catalog structures have to be completely redesigned. New and different requirements for the library system!
Centralization of budget will continue (and accelerate), too, with implicit impacts:

• Less budget to be distributed to Special Libraries (decentralized departments)
• Much less intellectual selection
• Much less orders/invoices (=administration) assigned for much larger part of budget
• (Highly) automated data migration
• Shift of tasks for the better part of library staff from collection development to information and communication (on very different levels: technical, use, scientific)
• Speed beats thoroughness (fulfillment happens before „cataloging“)
• Much less printed items $\rightarrow$ loans $\rightarrow$ stacks management, reference library
• Bundling of competencies of the 6 librarians (resp. market for agents)
• Inclusion of subject librarians/heads of special libraries in EBS decision processes and enabling them to work with evidence based data
Thank you for your attention!