DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 733 IR 052 397

AUTHOR	Bolin, Mary K., Ed.
TITLE	Comparison of WLN, RLIN, and OCLC.
INSTITUTION	Idaho Univ., Moscow. Library.
PUB DATE	27 Apr 88
NOTE	38p.; A product of the Utility Review Committee.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bibliographic Utilities; *Cataloging; Comparative Analysis; *Costs; *Interlibrary Loans; *Library Acquisition; Library Networks; Library Services; Library Technical Processes; Reference Services
IDENTIFIERS	*OCLC; *Research Libraries Information Network; Western Library Network

ABSTRACT

This report examines the costs of and services provided by the three major bibliographic utilities, OCLC (Online Computer Library Center), RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network), and WLN (Western Library Network). The services examined include acquisitions, cataloging, interlibrary loan, and reference. To examine costs, the format of the monthly WLN invoice was used to compare the three networks at approximate activity levels for the coming fiscal year. Both the costs and the advantages and disadvantages of using each of the three utilities, or some combination of the three, for the University of Idaho Library are presented, and equipment, maintenance, and start-up costs are projected. The text is supplemented by a number of tables. (EW)

Comparison of WLN, RLIN, and OCLC

Utility Review Committee:

Mary K. Bolin, editor and compiler
Ron Force
Donna M. Hanson
Monte L. Steiger, Chair

April 27, 1988

University of Idaho Library
Moscow, Idaho 83843

I. Purpose

The charge of this committee was to assess the three major bibliographic utilities by examining cost and services provided.

II. Method

The services examined included acquisitions, cataloging, interlibrary loan, and reference. To estimate costs, we used the format of a WLN monthly invoice to compare the three networks at approximate activity levels for the coming fiscal year. We talked to representatives from RLIN and OCLC, and received literature from both. Ruth Sawyer, the OCLC representative for this region, spent a day in the Library talking to faculty and staff and to the Committee. We had access to the full OCLC database for two weeks at the end of December so that anyone who wished to could become acquainted with the system. We have search-only access to RLIN through our membership in CLASS and have used it as a source of cataloging information since February of 1987.

III. Description of the three major utilities

A. WLN

The Western Library Network (WLN) currently has nearly 300 members contributing current or retrospective cataloging records. About 200 additional libraries have access to WLN's holdings through search-only access, or purchase of the Resource Directory or LaserCat. WLN's member libraries are in Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Montana, Idaho, Canada, and Arizona. The largest members include the Seattle Public Library, Washington State University, Portland State University, the University of Alaska, and the University of Idaho. Other fairly large member libraries include the Washington State Library, King County Library System, the University of Montana, Montana State University, Boise State University, and the Idaho State Library. The rest of the membership consists of small to medium-sized academic, public, school, and special libraries.

WLN began in 1977 as the Washington Library Network. It is a division of the Washington State Library in Olympia, where its offices are. The WLN's computers are in the Washington State University Computer Center in Pullman. While WLN has expanded beyond the borders of Washington State to become the predominant utility in the Pacific Northwest, it has remained a regional rather than a national network.

WLN offers cataloging, acquisitions, interlibrary loan, union listing, retrospective conversion, contract cataloging, microfiche catalog production, as well as CD-ROM and microfiche versions of its database. The WLN database has approximately 4,000,000 records.

B. RLIN

The Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), which began in 1972, is a not-for-profit corporation owned by the Research Libraries Group (RLG), whose members form the core of RLIN. While non-RLG libraries may become members of RLIN, they have very little influence over decision-making and priority-setting for the network. As the name implies, RLIN caters to the needs of large research libraries. RLIN grew out of Stanford University's BALLOTS system, and the network's headquarters and computer are in Stanford, California. RLIN Libraries who are not members of RLG receive RLIN's services through the Cooperative Library Agency for Systems and Services (CLASS) in San Jose, California.

RLIN has about 140 member libraries who contribute cataloging. Some of these include Stanford, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, the University of Michigan, Cornell, and the University of Pennsylvania. Aside from these and other RLG libraries, the membership consists of a variety of academic, public, and special libraries, including law, art, and medicine.

RLIN offers cataloging, acquisitions and interlibrary loan as well as dial-up, search-only membership, and has a database of approximately 12,000,000 unique bibliographic records.

C. OCLC

The Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) began in 1967 as the Ohio College Library Center. As that name implies, it began as a consortium of academic libraries in Ohio. It is now a not-for-profit corporation run by a board of trustees, some of whom are from OCLC member libraries. OCLC has approximately 6,000 members throughout the United States and overseas. The largest members include libraries such as Indiana University, the University of Illinois, UCLA, the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Washington, and Ohio State University. Other members include libraries of all types and sizes. Sixty-three of the sixty-nine land grant colleges and universities belong to OCLC.

In most parts of the country, OCLC members belong to a regional network which brokers OCLC services to them. This is not true of the Pacific Northwest. Libraries here deal directly with OCLC through the OCLC Pacific Network (PACNET) in Claremont, California, which despite its name is not a regional network but the western office of OCLC.

OCLC offers cataloging, acquisitions, serials control, union listing, interlibrary loan, retrospective conversion, contract cataloging, CD-ROM authority files and subsets of the database, and an integrated local system.

The OCLC database has approximately 17,000,000 records. In the hit rate studies we did for this report, there were ten records with duplicates out of 160 items searched. This coincides with OCLC's estimate that the database is 5-7% duplicates, and could indicate that the number of unique records is somewhere between 15.8- and 16,150,000. Some of these are "allowable duplicates"; for example, UK-MARC records from the British Library are allowed to coexist with LC records for the same item.

IV. Costs

A comparison of the costs of using WLN, OCLC, and RLIN for our current kinds and levels of activity shows that using OCLC would cost between 77% and 85% of what WLN charges for the same activities and services. The cost for using RLIN would be 89-91% of the WLN charges. Using OCLC for technical services and interlibrary loan, while tapeloading into WLN and using LaserCat (1) and searching WLN online, would cost 97-104% of current WLN charges. Using RLIN, it would cost between 109% and 112% of what we currently pay WLN for those activities. The number of terminals online and the level of activity, especially the number of inquiries, affect how widely separated the amounts are.

OCLC and RLIN both charge more than WLN for using a record for cataloging. Likewise, equipment maintenance and telecommunications costs are greater for OCLC and RLIN than for WLN. Inquiry costs, however, are far lower for OCLC and RLIN. OCLC rewards members for high activity by allowing four free inquiries for every "produce" transaction (for cataloging, ILL, acquisitions, etc.) The inquiries which a library does have to pay for also cost less on OCLC and RLIN. OCLC's "over threshold" inquiries cost .08, vs. WLN's .16-.20 charge for every inquiry. RLIN users pay for CPU time which amounts to approximately .05 per transaction. Furthermore, WLN charges .15 for adding records to the database. RLIN does not charge for this, and OCLC gives a .50 credit for adding to the database.

The real savings from belonging either to OCLC or RLIN would be in original cataloging costs. It is possible that using RLIN or OCLC for cataloging we could devote $54-84,000 in professional salaries to other activities. Both OCLC and RLIN have databases which are three to four times larger than WLN's 4,000,000. About 75% of WLN's database consists of LC-MARC records, which all the networks have in common. The

---

(1.) OCLC currently allows tapeloading of OCLC-derived records into the WLN database, but not LaserCat, although they are continuing to negotiate with WLN about this.

University of Idaho ranks fifth in holdings in the WLN database and is a major contributor of original records. This would not be the case with either of the other networks. WLN's database can only continue to shrink relative to that of the other utilities since WLN does not have a large number of large libraries contributing. The financial burden borne by the largest WLN members will probably increase, because WLN will not be able to recruit new members to share the burden. Since they are a vital source of revenue, WLN cannot reward large libraries for their contributions by giving volume discounts or credit for original cataloging.

Section VIII of this report talks about the need for some product which will serve as a public catalog. This has cost implications when comparing the three networks. The microfiche catalog produced through WLN costs about $20-30,000 per year. While one of the estimates we received indicated that one other vendor could also produce a COM for about that price, the estimate from another vendor was for more than three times that much. That would more than eliminate any savings realized; however, even if we were to begin using RLIN or OCLC for cataloging, there would be no need to find another way to produce a microfiche catalog unless we chose not to tapeload into WLN, or if WLN were no longer in operation.

V. Public service

WLN's greatest strength is probably its excellent software which allows title keyword searching, subject searching, subject browsing, and the display of local holdings online. The linked headings file allows global updates and corrections to name and subject headings. Human intervention and machine matching algorithms prevent the occurrence of most duplicate records. The user may choose to display records in full MARC format, card format or a brief display. These things allow WLN to act like a local online catalog and make it the best of the three major utilities for reference use.

RLIN's searching software is also excellent, including subject searching, keyword access, boolean searching, and many access points. Like WLN, RLIN allows the searcher

to choose from various display formats. Local holdings are maintained online in a different way from WLN. When an RLIN user attaches holdings to a bibliographic record, a copy of the local version of that record with any changes the library made is stored online. (When RLIN claims to have 25,000,000 records, they are including these "clustered" records in the count.)

OCLC is the weakest of the three systems for public service use. There is no subject or keyword access, and local holdings are not displayed. When a record is retrieved, the user can see that the library has holdings attached, but not whether the call number in the record was used for the item, nor if the item is in a special location. OCLC is currently marketing CD-ROM subsets of its database with more powerful and flexible searching. Subsets of the database are also available through Dialog with subject and keyword searching. OCLC is redesigning its system in several phases which will be complete in three to five years. When the project is complete, the system will have keyword and subject searching and local holdings display, but this redesign is still not intended to make OCLC act as a local system in the ways that WLN does. Some of the enhancements will only be available in a separate system and at an additional cost.

VI. Resource sharing and regional considerations

Whatever source the Library chooses for bibliographic records, we must have a means of communication and access between the University of Idaho Library and other institutions with whom we have resource sharing agreements. We must also provide information for all other Idaho libraries for whom the University of Idaho Library serves as a primary source for library materials. In order to meet this requirement, there must be a way for the requesting library to find out what our holdings are, and we must also be able to get information about the library holdings of our resource sharing partners.

We now have formal resource sharing agreements with Washington State University,

Montana State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Alaska. We have similar agreements with Boise State University, Lewis-Clark State College, and Idaho State University. We aiso have informal resource sharing agreements with the hospitals in Moscow and Lewiston; these last two are an outgrowth of our participation in the Circuit Rider Grant Project. We also serve as a primary source for many large industrial or business libraries in the state.

Of these libraries Washington State University, Montana State University, the University of Alaska, Boise State University, and Lewis-Clark State College are members of WLN. Idaho State University is a member of RLIN, and Oregon State University belongs to OCLC. The hospitals rely on our collection for journals, some of which they contribute to our collection. Their holdings, like ours, are listed in the Region X Medical Library List. Theirs are also listed in WLN.

At the present time we use WLN as our primary source of location information and interlibrary loan for these institutions. If we cannot identify a source in WLN we try to find one through OCLC or the Resource Sharing Service at the University of Washington.

VII. Technical Services

A. Cataloging.

WLN is an excellent cataloging utility for a small public or academic library. The database is large enough to contain a very high proportion of the material received by smaller libraries, and the reviewing of original cataloging by WLN staff is geared toward smaller libraries who may not have the cataloging tools found in a larger library. (2)

The University of Idaho did not benefit from having its own records reviewed; our

---

(2.) At one time, all records being input into the database were routed to a review file, where they were examined by WLN staff before they entered the database. About four years ago, WLN implemented a program called "sample review", in which most of the records of libraries whose cataloging was consistently accurate enter the database without review. All retrospective conversion records ("r" level) enter the database without review.

workflow was hindered by this practice. (The University of Idaho is now on "sample review", and only one in six of the records we input is checked by WLN.) We probably benefit from having the records of smaller institutions reviewed, since it probably adds consistency to the database. In effect, however, the University of Idaho and other libraries on "sample review" are subsidizing this service for members of the network whose records are still being reviewed by WLN, since WLN regards it as a privilege for us rather than a decrease in workload for the network staff, and does not give us a price break for being on "sample review."

WLN is the only major utility which can actually claim to have authority control. WLN maintains a file of authorized name, subject, and series headings which are linked to the bibliographic records in which those headings appear. These headings are from LC-MARC and member-input bibliographic records and from sources such as LC's Weekly List of new subject heading terms. There are some cross references in the headings file as well, particularly for subject headings. The link between the headings file and the bibliographic records makes it easy for WLN staff to make global changes and updates. WLN staff continually update the subject vocabulary and the forms of personal and corporate names which are found in the database. This maintenance is one of the ways in which WLN acts more like a local automated system than RLIN or OCLC, and it is very beneficial for reference use as well as for copy cataloging. Nevertheless, it is actually more difficult to get current authority information from WLN than it is from either of the other networks. OCLC has the entire Library of Congress Name and Subject Authority Files, with all cross references, available online. RLIN has the entire Name Authority File. They are in separate files, not linked to bibliographic records. This makes updates to bibliographic records more difficult, since corrections to headings must be done on each record individually or by periodic global flips. While the forms of name and subject headings which appear on OCLC and RLIN records are generally correct, there are more obsolete or invalid headings in those systems than in WLN,

especially on older records. LC's authority files are essential to professional catalogers, however, as well as being useful for other librarians as well, and having those files online would be at least as beneficial for original cataloging as WLN's file of authorized headings. The authority files in OCLC and RLIN are constantly updated. They contain headings contributed by NACO (National Coordinated Cataloging Operations) members and through the Linked Systems Project. Twenty-nine of the forty-two NACO libraries in the country belong to OCLC; one, the Montana State Library, is a WLN member; the rest are RLIN members. The online authority files in OCLC and RLIN contain "early notice" records, and records in the process of being changed by LC. These would be very useful to original catalogers. WLN's headings file is generally clean and up-to-date, but it does contain headings which are obsolete or invalid, as well as multiple forms of the same heading, particularly for series. With WLN's approval, WLN members routinely use the form of a heading which is found in the WLN database rather than looking in the microfiche LC Name Authority File or the LC Subject Headings for a more current form.

While most OCLC and RLIN members have subscriptions to their archive tapes, WLN maintains its members' cataloging records (although WLN members may also subscribe to their tapes.) The maintenance which WLN does means that a WLN member can generally count on having the most up-to-date version of a record on its tapes, reflecting its latest use of it and any changes or corrections which may have been made to the record. This is very beneficial for microfiche and online catalog use of archival tapes. WLN members are generally spared the labor and expense of sorting out multiple uses of a record and exerting authority control on their archival files. The amount of maintenance which WLN does makes what it charges for a microfiche catalog fairly reasonable.

B. Acquisitions.

The acquisitions systems offered by the three utilities all work in basically the

same way, with some variations in which features are available. A cataloging record in the database is used as the basis for creating an order record. The order screen contains other data elements such as vendor, fund, location, remarks, claim period, etc., which are default values or or filled in by the operator. A paper or electronic order is created using this record. When the item arrives in the library, it is received using this same record, and fund and payment information are updated. There are many reports and products available including printed purchase orders, reports of encumbrances, and so forth, which the library may choose to receive.

The WLN acquisitions subsystem is one of the best services the network offers. It includes direct electronic transmission of orders to vendors; fund accounting; automatic claiming; automatic transfer of information from a bibliographic record when an order is created; name-address directory; a variety of reports and products including account status, account history, and detailed encumbrance reports, notification slips, in-process slips and printed purchase orders; the ability to set and change default values; the ability to create orders for supplies, equipment and furniture.

OCLC currently has two different acquisitions systems. The online Acquisitions Subsystem is being phased out, although it will still be available for about two more years. The other option is the ACQ350 system, which is microcomputer-based. This system has only been available since February of 1988, and is still in the early stages of implementation. The ACQ350 user creates an acquisitions database on a hard disk using records downloaded from the OCLC database. All transactions are automatically backed up on tape as well. Acquisitions information is then available in the hard disk database, rather than being attached to bibliographic records in the online system. There can be a single workstation, or several connected through a local area network. Both the ACQ350 and the online acquisitions subsystem feature direct electronic transmission of orders to vendors; fund accounting; automatic claiming; automatic

transfer of information from a bibliographic record when an order is created; name-address directory; a variety of reports and products including vendor performance, account status, account history, and detailed encumbrance reports, notification slips, in-process slips and printed purchase orders; the ability to set and change default values; the ability to create orders for supplies, equipment, and furniture.

One disadvantage of the ACQ350 system is that no record of orders is carried into the main database. Therefore, orders must be searched twice: once in the main database for verification and once in the ACQ350 system. This also means that users cannot determine if an item is on order, or received but not cataloged, unless they are searching at a terminal which is connected through a local area network to the microcomputer dedicated to the ACQ350 system. OCLC is planning to add a history file similar to the WLN acquisitions history fiche. At this time, however, all historical information must be maintained on the ACQ350 hard disk.

RLIN's acquisitions system has electronic transmission of orders; automatic claiming; automatic transfer of information from a bibliographic record when an order is created; name-address directory; a variety of management reports; the ability to set and change default values; products such as notification slips and in-process slips, printed purchase orders; and the ability to create orders for supplies, equipment, and furniture. RLIN's system has no fund accounting, however, so that, among other things, a library cannot use it to determine how much of a given fund has been encumbered or expended as the year goes on. Moreover, the system does not have a broad base of support, since many of the RLG libraries who represent the largest and most powerful libraries in the network use a systems such as Notis for acquisitions. Stanford University is one RLG library which does use RLIN for acquisitions, but they are considering changing to Notis (which they have selected for an integrated automated system). Stanford's Acquisitions Operations Manager stated that they liked the acquisitions system "bibliographically," meaning that it was easy to take advantage of

the large database and flexible searching, but that there was no fiscal control or fund accounting, and that RLIN was considering phasing out the acquisitions subsystem altogether. Another person at Stanford said that there were not many RLIN acquisitions users, mainly because the large RLG libraries had never begun to use it, preferring to develop an in-house system or use the acquisitions module of an integrated system.

VIII. Hit rate comparison

A. Cataloging and acquisitions:

The same groups of items were searched in WLN, RLIN. and OCLC. These samples consisted of fifty "first search" monographs (material which has just entered the Cataloging Dept.); fifty monographs from the original cataloging backlog; fifty music scores from the music original cataloging backlog; and fifty purchase request forms (pre-order searching of monographic unit orders.)

For the purposes of the sample we searched the same number of copy and original cataloging items; however, copy cataloging actually represents 80% of the output of the Cataloging Dept. In other words, in the course of a year we ultimately find copy in WLN for four fifths of the things we catalog. Non-music original and music original cataloging represent about 15% and 5% of our total cataloging output respectively. The hit rate study seems to indicate that using RLIN or OCLC we would find 40-64% of the scores and 60-86% of the monographs which we do not find in WLN. Unit orders generally represent about one third of our monographic acquisitions, with approval books making up the remaining two thirds. Virtually all approval items have MARC records in the WLN database, since our approval plan is based on them.

RESULTS OF HIT RATE STUDY

CATEGORY OF MATERIAL	NUMBER SEARCHED	NUMBER FOUND			HIT RATE (%)		
		WLN:	RLIN:	OCLC:	WLN:	RLIN:	OCLC:
COPY CATALOGING	50	45	46	48	90%	92%	96%
MONOGRAPH ORIGINAL	50	3	20	32	6%	40%	64%
SCORES ORIGINAL	50	6	30	43	12%	60%	86%
PURCHASE REQUESTS	50	22	24	40	44%	48%	80%

VIII.

B. Interlibrary loan

To compare the ease of filling requests the same group of ten items was borrowed through WLN and OCLC. Bibliographic records for the items were found in RLIN, but we do not have access to the RLIN interlibrary loan system. In general, we received the items in one week from WLN lenders and two weeks from OCLC lenders. This is not a random sample of requests. These were picked from items known to have records in the database in order to test the fill rate. Humanities and social science subjects predominate, so that the fill rate for science materials was not tested.

Item number	brief title	date requested	date received (WLN)	lending institution (WLN)	date received (OCLC)	lending institution (OCLC)
1	Suicide and depression...	11-17-87	sent but not recd.	Washington St. Libr.	12-03-87	University of Oregon
2	Guide to early Canadian glass	11-17-87	11-24-87	King County Libr. Sys.	12-01-87	Phoenix Public Library
3	Stream of consciousness	11-17-87	11-27-87	Lewis-Clark State Coll.	11-24-87	Reed College
4	Dealing with depression	11-17-87	11-24-87	Timberland Regional Libr.	12-01-87	Oregon Institute of Technology
5	Children's television commercials	11-17-87	11-24-87	Montana State Univ.	12-01-87	Eastern Washington University
6	Spinning Wheel's collectible glass	11-17-87	11-24-87	Caldwell Public Library	12-01-87	Davis Co. Libr., Utah
7	Language, mind and brain	11-17-87	11-24-87	Montana State Univ.	12-01-87	University of Oregon
8	Working with parents and infants	11-17-87	no response	Seattle Central Comm. Coll.	12-23-87	University of Mary, Bismarck, N.D
9	Standard fruit jar reference	11-17-87	12-21-87	Pierce Co. Libr. (Wa.)	cancelled[3]	Wisc. St. Hist. Society
10	Roman mines in Europe	11-17-87	1-20-88	Montana Tech	12-03-87	Reed College

---

3. This request was cancelled because the lender charges a $5.00 fee and the item had already been borrowed through WLN.

IX. Cost of cataloging:

This is based on the number of items cataloged in fiscal years 86/87 and 87/88, the proportion of original cataloging in those years and the FTE staff devoted to original and copy cataloging. We normally catalog about 20,000 items each year, 16,000 with copy and 4,000 original. Estimates for RLIN and OCLC are based on the hit rate study above, with the assumption that if 5 catalogers can catalog 4,000 items a year, it would take 2.5 to catalog 2,000. We normally do original cataloging of 3,000 non-music, and 1,000 music items each year. The estimates of original and copy cataloging per year are weighted for music and non-music items. The formula used was "Copy cataloging [16,000] + (non-music hit rate * 3000) + (music hit rate * 1000)". The FTE staff devoted to original cataloging includes some paraprofessionals doing "adaptive" cataloging of records from RLIN and OCLC, and also takes into account our use of WLN's contract original cataloging service, which we stopped in 1988. The number of copy cataloging staff remains the same for all three utilities, because we have not reached the limit of our copy cataloging productiveness with current levels of staff.

Cataloging costs using WLN, RLIN and OCLC

Original:

	WLN	RLIN	OCLC
FTE	5.0	2.75	1.52
Salaries	$120,000	$66,000	$32,000
Items per year	20,000	20,000	20,000
Orig. per year	4,000	2,200	1,220
% original cat.	20%	11%	6.1%
Cost per item (orig.)	$30	$30	$30

Copy:

FTE	8.0	8.0	8.0
Salaries	$112,000	$112,000	$112,000
Items per year	20,000	20,000	20,000
Copy per year	16,000	17,800	18,780
% copy cataloging	80%	89%	94%
Cost per item (copy)	$7.00	$6.29	$5.96
Yearly salaries(4)	**$232,000**	**$178,000**	**$148,600**

(4.) These are not totals for the entire Cataloging Department. Among the salaries not included are those for retrospective conversion, catalog maintenance and the Department Head. Estimated salaries do not include benefits.

X. Cost comparison:

Cost comparison of WLN, OCLC, and RLIN, based on estimated activity for fiscal year 88/89. Activities include cataloging, acquisitions, interlibrary loan, equipment maintenance, connect charges, telecommunications, magnetic tapes, and all inquiries.

Not included are microfiche catalog, start-up costs, cost of adapting equipment, and training costs.

ASSUMPTIONS:

INQUIRIES PER MONTH:	25,000
ATTACH HOLDINGS PER MONTH: [CURRENT COPY CATALOGING]	1,400
CATALOG CARDS PER MONTH:	4,000
RECORDS INPUT PER MONTH: [ORIGINAL CATALOGING]	350
ORDERS GENERATED PER MONTH:	800
ILL REQUESTS PER MONTH:	125
ILL LOANS PER MONTH:	240 (5)
NUMBER OF TERMINALS: [ALL ACTIVITIES]	10

(5.) The University of Idaho is a net lender in WLN. The same number of loans is used for both other utilities, although we might not be net lenders in RLIN or OCLC.

SUMMARY TABLES:

ACTIVITY	1. WLN	2. RLIN	3. RLIN TAPELOAD	4. OCLC	5. OCLC TAPELOAD	6. RLIN CATALOGING	7. RLIN CAT/ACQ	8. OCLC CATALOGING	9. OCLC CAT/ACQ
ACQUISITIONS	$26,160.00	$35,760.00	$35,760.00	$12,432.00	$12,432.00	$26,160.00	$35,760.00	$26,160.00	$12,432.00
CATALOGING	$9,510.00	$38,616.00	$38,616.00	$33,915.00	$33,915.00	$38,616.00	$38,616.00	$33,915.00	$33,915.00
ILL	$1,155.00	$3,000.00	$1,569.00	$1,569.00	$1,569.00	$1,155.00	$1,155.00	$1,155.00	$1,155.00
ALL INQUIRIES	$52,650.00	$2,289.00	$8,289.00	$15,590.40	$21,590.40	$19,110.00	$14,070.00	$27,792.00	$21,792.00
MAINTENANCE/ NETWORK CHARGE	$22,980.00	$150.00	$2,610.00	$11,240.00	$13,700.00	$7,170.00	$4,890.00	$15,420.00	$13,352.00
TELECOMM.	$3,600.00	$27,720.00	$31,320.00	$19,800.00	$23,400.00	$23,004.00	$25,776.00	$17,460.00	$19,248.00
TAPES		$1,519.20	$1,350.00	$1,350.00	$1,519.20	$1,519.20	$1,350.00	$1,350.00	
TAPELOADING			$10,110.00		$10,110.00	$10,110.00	$10,110.00	$10,110.00	$10,110.00
LASERCAT	$3,500.00		$3,500.00		$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00
YEARLY TOTAL	$119,555.00	$109,054.20	$134,724.20	$95,896.40	$121,566.40	$130,344.20	$135,396.20	$136,862.00	$117,046.00

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES:

1. WLN for all activities.

2. RLIN for all activities

3. RLIN for all activities; tapeloading into WLN,

4. OCLC for all activities.

5. OCLC for all activities; tapeloading into WLN, with LaserCat and one online terminal.

6. WLN for ILL, public service and acquisitions; RLIN for cataloging; tapeloading into WLN.

7. WLN for ILL and public service; RLIN for acquisitions and cataloging; tapeloading into WLN.

8. WLN for ILL, public service and acquisitions; OCLC for cataloging; tapeloading into WLN.

9. WLN for ILL and public service; OCLC for acquisitions and cataloging; tapeloading into WLN.

XI. Options:

A. Remain with WLN for all activities.

Cost per year: **$119,555.00**

Advantages:

- Excellent searching software
- Display of local holdings
- Usefulness for reference work
- Excellent acquisitions system
- Ability to maintain regional relationships

Disadvantages:

- Lower cataloging hit rate than other networks
- No LC/NACO/LSP authority files
- Expensive inquiry costs
- WLN's lack of resources for development
- WLN's lack of national visibility and participation

B. Abandon WLN and use RLIN for all activities:

Cost per year: **$109,054.20**

Advantages:

Slightly lower overall cost than WLN

Excellent searching software

Large database would provide high hit rate

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Ability to use off-the-shelf hardware

Disadvantages:

Lack of support from the network for non-RLG libraries

Lack of support for acquisitions system

Harder to maintain regional relationships

C. Use WLN/LaserCat for public service, and RLIN for cataloging, acquisitions, and ILL.

Cost per year: **$134,724.20**

Advantages:

Takes advantage of WLN's strength for public service use and large RLIN database

Eliminates need to rekey RLIN cataloging records into WLN

Tapeloading into database helps satisfy regional resource-sharing needs

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Disadvantages:

Somewhat higher overall cost than WLN alone

Access to tapeloaded records would be slightly slower than now

Lack of support from the network for non-RLG libraries

Lack of support for acquisitions system

Harder to maintain regional relationships

D. Abandon WLN and use OCLC for all activities:

Cost per year: **$95,896.40**

Advantages:

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

Somewhat lower overall cost than WLN

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Large membership and base of support allow the network to do continual expansion and development.

Disadvantages:

Lack of subject searching, keyword searching, and display of local holdings make system inappropriate for much public service use

Harder to maintain regional relationships.

ACQ350 system does not maintain order information online

E. Use WLN/LaserCat for public service, and OCLC for cataloging, acquisitions, and ILL.

Cost per year: **$121,566.40**

Advantages:

Takes advantage of WLN's strength for public service use, and large OCLC database

Eliminates need to rekey OCLC or RLIN cataloging records into WLN

Tapeloading into database helps satisfy regional resource-sharing needs

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Large membership and base of support allows the network to do continual expansion and development

Disadvantages:

Access to tapeloaded records would be slightly slower than now

OCLC does not currently allow records to be included in LaserCat

ACQ350 system does not maintain order information online

F. Use WLN/LaserCat for public service, acquisitions, and ILL, and RLIN for cataloging

Cost per year: **$130,344.20**

Advantages:

Takes advantage of WLN's strength for public service use, excellent WLN acquisitions system and large RLIN database

Eliminates need to rekey OCLC or RLIN cataloging records into WLN

Tapeloading into database helps satisfy regional resource-sharing needs

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Ability to use off-the-shelf hardware for cataloging

Disadvantages:

Somewhat higher overall cost than WLN

Lack of support from the network for non-RLG libraries

Access to tapeloaded records would be slightly slower than now

G. Use WLN/LaserCat for public service and ILL, and RLIN for acquisitions and cataloging

Cost per year: **$135,396.20**

Advantages:

Takes advantage of WLN's strength for public service use and large RLIN database

Eliminates need to rekey OCLC or RLIN cataloging records into WLN

Tapeloading into database helps satisfy regional resource-sharing needs

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Ability to use off-the-shelf hardware for acquisitions and cataloging

Disadvantages:

Somewhat higher overall cost than WLN

Lack of support from the network for non-RLG libraries

Lack of support for acquisitions system

Access to tapeloaded records would be slightly slower than now

H. Use WLN/LaserCat for public service, acquisitions, and ILL, and OCLC for cataloging

Cost per year: **$136,862.00**

Advantages:

Takes advantage of WLN's strength for public service use, excellent WLN acquisitions system and large OCLC database

Eliminates need to rekey OCLC or RLIN cataloging records into WLN

Tapeloading into database helps satisfy regional resource-sharing needs

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Large membership and base of support allows the network to do continual expansion and development

Disadvantages:

Somewhat higher overall cost

Access to tapeloaded records would be slightly slower than now

OCLC does not currently allow records to be included in LaserCat

I. Use WLN/LaserCat for public service and ILL, and OCLC for acquisitions and cataloging

Cost per year: **$117,046.00**

Advantages:

Takes advantage of WLN's strength for public service use and large OCLC database

Eliminates need to rekey OCLC or RLIN cataloging records into WLN

Tapeloading into database helps satisfy regional resource-sharing needs

Large database would provide high cataloging hit rate

Cost is about the same as WLN alone

LC/NACO/LSP authority files loaded

Large membership and base of support allows the network to do continual expansion and development

Disadvantages:

Access to tapeloaded records would be slightly slower than now

OCLC does not currently allow records to be included in LaserCat

ACQ350 system does not maintain order information online

XII. Equipment and maintenance requirements:

WLN:

The Library owns fourteen WLN PC's and XT's. Nine of them are currently online to WLN. The others are being used as microcomputers, LaserCat workstations or CD-ROM searching workstations. Four of the WLN terminals which are online are used exclusively for cataloging, one for cataloging and serials/acquisitions, one for serials/acquisitions, one for interlibrary loan, one for science reference and one for special collections reference. We pay a monthly maintenance fee for each terminal which is online to WLN and for the modem. In general this means that WLN sends us equipment or parts of equipment to replace what is not working. We do our own installation of these parts and equipment. We usually identify the problem over the phone with WLN staff.

RLIN:

RLIN's terminal emulation software will run on any IBM PC or compatible which will run PC-DOS, has an NSC synchronous communications card, and a display adapter which is the equivalent of Hercules graphics, EGA or Wyse 700. Our current WLN PC's provide all of these requirements, except that the graphics capabilities are most like CGA. We would have no recurring maintenance costs from the network, but could choose to have a local maintenance contract or have equipment repaired or replaced as necessary.

OCLC:

OCLC sells a number of different models and configurations of PC and dumb terminals. With some modification, our WLN PC's could be used for OCLC. The ACQ350 microcomputer-based acquisitions system requires a PC with a hard disk. As with WLN, we would have monthly maintenance charges for terminals and modem; however, OCLC contracts with companies such as Western Union to provide maintenance to member libraries. Instead of installing new equipment ourselves or diagnosing problems over the phone, someone from the maintenance company would come to the library to do the repair or installation. While in some ways this would probably be preferable to our present maintenance arrangement, it is also true that if a maintenance person has to travel from Seattle or Spokane to Moscow, there are many times when bad weather could cause a delay and result in extended downtime.

XII. Start-up costs for RLIN and OCLC (6):

A. Equipment purchase and adaptation:

RLIN:	terminal software:	$15.00
	hardware adaptation:	$0.00
	leased line installation:	$430.00
OCLC:	terminal software:	$0.00
	hardware adaptation:	$0.00
	leased line installation:	$200.00
	modem:	$500.00

B. Training:

RLIN:	$1,650.00
OCLC:	$500.00

C. Initial tape purchase and load:

RLIN:	
tape purchase (from WLN)	$16,225.00
tapeload into RLIN:	$35,000.00
initial RLIN tape purchase	$31,348.00
OCLC:	
tape purchase (from WLN)	$16,225.00
tapeload into OCLC:	$0.00
initial OCLC tape purchase:	$7,000.00

E. Total:

RLIN:	**$84,668.00**
OCLC:	**$25,425.00** (7)

(6.) OCLC would waive the cost of terminal software, hardware adaptation, tapeload of WLN records, catalog card profiling. They would charge us a flat $500 for all training. This offer is good indefinitely and is being made to all libraries in this region.

(7.) Using OCLC's ACQ350 system would require purchasing the ACQ350 software, which costs $5000.

XIII. The public catalog.

No matter what utility or utilities we use, we need a product which will serve as a public catalog. Currently we are using the card catalog for unconverted holdings, and the microfiche and LaserCat for current holdings. The microfiche catalog is produced by Comtrex of Spokane with fiche-ready tapes sent to them by WLN. The cost is approximately $20-30,000 per year. If we chose to use another utility for cataloging but to tapeload into WLN, we could still buy a COM catalog from WLN. If we decided to rely on LaserCat as a public catalog and no longer produced a COM catalog, we could do that by tapeloading into WLN if we chose to use RLIN for cataloging. OCLC does not currently allow tapeloading of OCLC records into LaserCat, although there is some feeling that they will eventually capitulate on this point. If we chose to abandon WLN entirely and use another utility for all services, we might need to find another COM vendor and use a microfiche catalog as our primary product until we can obtain a local automated system. The cost might be substantially more from another vendor, since the vendor would have to process our tapes to make them fiche-ready. The Committee sought estimates from several leading COM vendors. The information we have received so far is included below.

A. WLN COM CATALOG COSTS AND OPTIONS:

NEW BASE?* UPDATE FREQUENCY:	New base monthly	New base bimonthly	New base quarterly	New base 6 months	No base monthly	No base bimonthly	No base quarterly	No base 6 months
Base catalog cost	$15,870.00	$15,870.00	$15,870.00	$15,870.00				
Updates:								
1-4000 titles	$3,600.00	$1,800.00	$1,200.00	$900.00	$3,600.00	$1,800.00	$1,200.00	$900.00
4-100K titles	$4,620.00	$2,040.00	$980.00	$1,490.00	$40,740.00	$18,750.00	$13,020.00	$10,120.00
TITLES IN BASE (JULY 86)	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000				
TITLES CUMULATED JULY-JUNE	140,400	64,800	39,600	37,800	862,800	399,000	280,400	218,400
TITLES ADDED JULY-JUNE	21,600	21,600	21,600	21,600	21,600	21,600	21,600	21,600
FICHE COST	$2,500.00	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$1,500.00	$1,200.00
YEARLY TOTAL	$26,590.00	$21,710.00	$20,050.00	$20,260.00	$46,840.00	$23,050.00	$15,720.00	$12,200.00

---

*"New base" means that the entire catalog is recumulated. "No base" means that each supplement begins cumulating from records added beginning in April 1987 when the last base catalog was created. When a new base catalog is not created, the supplements rapidly get larger and larger

B. AUTOGRAPHICS COM CATALOG ESTIMATE, INCLUDES ONLY FIRST AND THIRD OF WLN OPTIONS.

AUTOGRAPHICS COSTS:	NEW BASE MONTHLY	NEW BASE QUARTERLY
BASE CATALOG COST	$12,250.00	$12,250.00
UPDATES	19,012	$5,588.00
TITLES IN BASE (JULY 88)	350,000	350,000
TITLES CUMULATED JULY-JUNE	140,400	39,600
TITLES ADDED JULY-JUNE	21,600	21,600
FICHE COST	$6,710.00	$3,660.00
YEARLY TOTAL	$37,972.00	$21,498.00