Serials Solutions system proposal

Proposal to license and implement Serials Solutions Resource Manager - Consortial Edition and related services

Submitted to 2CUL TSI Steering Committee by the 2CUL TSI E-Resources Team

Executive Summary

In response to our Phase 1 objective: *Make a specific recommendation on whether to implement the Consortial Version of Serials Solutions at both institutions or hold off on integrating e-resource management and data migration until we have a shared LMS*, the 2CUL TSI E-Resources Team proposes that 2CUL implement a common e-resource management system in order to facilitate collaboration across the range of e-resource activities. We believe that the most effective path to take is with the suite of tools provided by the Serials Solutions (a ProQuest company) Resource Manager system as both partners are already using some or all of the Serials Solutions system in their day to day work, minimizing the implementation effort required to be up and running together quickly. The transition will require that:

1. Cornell license and implement the Resource Manager (RM) system. This will replace Cornell's Innovative Interfaces ERM system. Columbia already licenses this product.
2. Cornell license and implement the Serials Solutions 360 COUNTER usage statistics service. This will effectively take the place of Cornell's current usage stats wiki updating process. Columbia already licenses this product.
3. 2CUL license and implement the Resource Manager Consortial Edition (RM-CE).
4. We effectively communicate with key stakeholders before, during, and after the transition.

**Cost / Savings (detail provided in Costs section below):** We estimate that the overall costs of implementing these systems across 2CUL will be amortized over the first two years, mostly in the form of opportunity saving from staff time that can be dedicated to other e-resource efforts.

Costs to Cornell:
- $26,143 year one license fees, $7,651 implementation fees, $8,200 implementation staff time
- $26,143 year two+ license fees

Costs to Columbia:
- $4,000 year one license fees, $6,000 implementation staff time
- $10,000 year two+ license fees

Savings to Cornell:
- $10,000 annually for Innovative contract and server maintenance fees
- $37,600 annual opportunity cost savings by freeing staff time with RM efficiencies, usage stats management efficiency, and 2CUL collaborative efforts. This could potentially be greater.

Savings to Columbia:
- $12,000 annual opportunity cost savings by freeing staff time with 2CUL collaborative efforts. This could potentially be greater.

In addition, we feel that the following benefits are very important for our work together as 2CUL, but are difficult to assign dollar value to at this time:

- System migration costs will be lower if we are migrating together from a shared system to Alma.
- The acquisitions migration in general will be less rocky if we have worked together toward a common goal. Acquisitions has been the most difficult function to migrate and it should not be compounded by needing to learn how to work with each other and understand each others' different systems and workflows.
- It will be easier to collaborate on purchasing and trouble shooting.
- There will be substantial costs in staff morale and buy-in if we delay deep collaboration in this area. We have critical staff support right now.
- A shared system develops a common vision for e-resource work. This saves time in cross training and project planning.
- We have Serials Solutions staff on board right now to help and there is a price break. Delay might change this landscape.
- We would be able to provide better service to our users. Shared problem solving, expertise and staff freed from some manual tasks will make response to problems more timely and efficient.
- Running reports would be simplified, allowing ready access to data for further cost saving initiatives.

**Timeline:** Ideally, we require a decision to move forward with this by mid-March in order to be able to migrate to the new systems by the summer 2014.

Proposal Details

1. What is the problem we need to address?
Our team has identified that having different systems in place for managing our electronic resource collections is a significantly greater barrier to successful collaboration than simply having different workflows. E-Resources work relies heavily on Electronic Resource Management systems and currently, Cornell and Columbia have different systems. The official delay of Alma implementation has highlighted the need to find an interim solution that will allow us to develop more common workflows, identify and perform shared work, and be better able to troubleshoot and solve e-resource problems across 2CUL.

2. How will the product address this problem?

**RM** - Both 2CUL partners currently have different ERM systems, increasing the number of complex systems staff across institutions will need to be skilled in using, and making common workflows significantly difficult to envision and implement. Resource Manager is a robust e-resource management system, providing libraries with the ability to manage e-resource collections, record information about providers, licenses, and other data that is not easily handled by Voyager, and to easily include our holdings in various other Serials Solutions services such as Summon and 360 Link. The implementation of RM in particular should be relatively low impact compared to what we would expect if we implemented an entirely different ERM system across 2CUL as both partners maintain most of their electronic holdings in the Serials Solutions knowledge base and staff from both CULs are already familiar with the system.

**360 COUNTER** - Implementing 360 COUNTER at Cornell will maximize the common systems used in e-resource management across 2CUL. Cornell currently harvests COUNTER usage data manually from over 100 providers annually, posting the individual reports on a wiki space for selectors and assessment staff to use. Gathering this data is currently a time-consuming process (~1.5 FTE/year to gather and maintain the reports and administrative information) and the current system provides no added functionality to merge or analyze reports (Cornell should expect to be able to save significant time in this area). Among the features of 360 COUNTER are usage report harvesting, and consolidated reporting. Finally, having data from both Cornell and Columbia gathered and stored in a common system will allow for more joint data analysis, potential shared maintenance, and to take advantage of future enhancements in the Serials Solutions assessment systems.

**RM-CE** - Adding the consortial level service to RM will set a foundation for much greater collaboration in the areas of E-resource troubleshooting, accounts management, and common workflows. As we integrate RM-CE features into our workflow, we will identify areas to reduce duplication of effort, reconcile holdings between partners, and gain valuable experience working together.

If 2CUL moves ahead with Alma or another joint management system in the future, our work in all of these systems will help us migrate to a new system with a common vision.

3. Has a trial taken place? What were the results?

Columbia has been using RM and 360 COUNTER systems in production since 2007 and 2009 respectively. Several Cornell staff have had read access to Columbia’s systems for six months.

Cornell has had an active trial to RM since September 2013 and 360 COUNTER since mid-January 2014. Reports from various stakeholder groups are below:

- **E-Resources Unit** (Liisa Mobley, Rebecca Utz, Sally Lockwood, Heather Shipman, Jesse Koennecke) - Tested the general functionality, workflow features, and data management aspects of the RM system from a Cornell specific perspective. The e-resources staff are already familiar with the Serials Solutions staff interface while working with the currently subscribed Serials Solutions services (MARC Updates, 360 Link, and Summon). Adding ERM features to this existing workflow, rather than in a completely different system will likely show some increased efficiency in some areas of e-resources work. Members of the unit have reported overall satisfaction with the system and they have unanimously expressed a desire to make the change. The response from this team suggests that Cornell would consider migrating the the Resource Manager system even if 2CUL were not a factor.
- **Discovery & Access Team** - Two public interfaces at Cornell rely on the Innovative ERM system currently. D&A has been considering updating these services to utilize the Integration Layer data or other systems, rather than Innovative. They are examining this in depth during their February sprint. It is likely that they will be able to replicate these services using a combination of Voyager data incorporated into the integration layer, the License Term API provided by RM, and the RM journal A-Z list interface. More detail about this can be found in Appendix 1: Implementation Details.
- **Technical and Data loading group** (Gary Branch, Heather Shipman, Peter Martinez, Pete Hoyt, Chris Manly) -
  - Record loads - The group discussed how the current processes for updating Voyager, Innovative, and Serials Solutions will be affected by the transition. They raised no concerns about making the change to RM and feel that any changes that are required in scripts or processes will be minimal. Heather feels that the record loads into the Innovative ERM currently account for up to 24 hours every month. This time can potentially be recouped, or used to manage more frequent updates from RM to Voyager. Either way, we save some time or keep systems in better sync.
  - System hosting (Chris Manly) - The Innovative ERM system is locally hosted on a Cornell IT server. This requires regular maintenance and updates in addition to a $2000/year fee. RM and 360 COUNTER are cloud-hosted systems, managed by Serials Solutions. The cost for this service is included in the annual fee structure for the services.
- **Usage Statistics group** (Rich Entlich, Sally Lockwood) - Looked at the 360 COUNTER product. Cornell Trial began 1/22. Detailed feedback may not come until Feb 7 or later. The initial assumption is that it will benefit 2CUL to have the COUNTER data from both partners in the same system. The testing team is determining if there are any show-stopper issues that would impact operations.
- **2CUL TSI E-Resources Team** - Our team concentrated on the overall picture and has been impressed with the potential we see for our TSI work. We particularly focused on articulating how the RM-CE layer will be initially populated and workflow issues that arise from working in a consortial system. 2CUL has not had an opportunity to trial the consortial aspects of RM-CE, the pricing offer provided by Serials Solutions (see pricing below) assumes that the first year of work in the consortial environment will be a pilot. We have worked out an implementation model with Serials Solutions and will test various use cases in a sandbox version before going live.

4. Is the product needed at both institutions?

Yes. Resource Manager and 360 COUNTER are already in place at Columbia. Both products are needed at Cornell to maximize common systems. Additionally, adding the RM-CE layer requires that both partners be operating on the RM system.

5. What staff will use the product?

...
- E-Resources - Extensively for workflow, resource management, troubleshooting
- Selectors - View usage stats and resource information for collection decisions
- Batch processing - Perform batch loads from RM to Voyager and other systems
- Assessment - Access and process usage stats and package information
- Public Services (particularly Interlibrary Loan and E-Reserve) - To look up license permissions and available holdings

Costs and benefits (Cornell costs itemized in draft Cornell order form):

RM for Cornell (Columbia already subscribes to RM)

License fees: $11,693/year plus one time set up $1969 (includes data population services) and a onetime consultation fee of $3990

Cost recovery by cancelling Innovative contract:

- Innovative ERM License fee - currently approximately $7,500-$8,000/year. This is paid until September 31, 2014.
- Innovative ERM server (locally hosted): Once we get through the migration to the linux VM, our server cost for the III ERM will be about $2000/year as the server is currently spec'd. (We may need to adjust its provisioning depending on actual performance once it's up and running in production.) The support contract with III is in the ballpark of $10K/year. Let me know if you need more specific numbers than that - Chris Manly

Benefits and potential savings:

- Record loads to update the Innovative ERM require considerable attention for one week every month. During this time there is impact on patrons (non-updated holdings, public display inaccurate, and slower response times) and staff time of 10-20 hours per month. Some of the time saved could be spent handling more frequent Serials Solutions MARC updates loads, keeping Voyager and Blacklight more in sync with our electronic holdings managed in RM. This will reduce delays between purchasing content and having that content appear in discovery various discovery tools. (est. $9,200 annual opportunity savings, effective as soon as implemented)
- The RM knowledge base comes populated with some license, resource, and provider information. This must all be manually entered into the Innovative ERM system. The E-Resources and Cataloging units should save a few hours per week in data entry. (est. $10,600 annually effective as soon as implemented)
- Selectors will be able to access the system with relatively little training to view title lists, license terms, contact information. As a web based tool, this will be possible remotely (such as during a conference). Innovative ERM system has limited simultaneous connections and requires considerable training to get new users up to speed.
- Cornell staff are already using the Serials Solutions system for maintaining MARC record updates, Summon, and the OpenURL resolver. This has significant impact on training time, procedure retention, and ease of use by reducing the number of systems involved in e-resource management without loss of functionality or access to information.
- Cleaner matching of resources between management and discovery systems. This has significant impact on our ability to effectively troubleshoot resource access issues.
- Knowledge base Notifications alert us to changes in platforms, database titles, and other important maintenance issues. This will allow for more pro-active work to reduce access problems.

360 COUNTER for Cornell (Columbia already subscribes to 360 COUNTER)

License fees: $10,450/year plus onetime set up $688

Funding sources: Collection Development and Research & Assessment will benefit the most from 360 COUNTER.

Benefits and potential savings:

- Annual harvesting of usage statistics - This will be mostly automated - SUSHI compliant resources each month, Non-SUSHI resources 2x yearly. System alerts us when changes are coming, usage harvesting data is out of date, - Sally Lockwood currently spends 12 weeks at about 75% of her time to harvest. If we can recover 50-70% of this time to handle only the non-COUNTER resources, more complicated issues and updating the system, considerable effort is recovered. This amounts to approximately $4,800 in annual opportunity savings.
- Selectors will be able to access the system and make customized consolidated reports. This is possible, but complicated and labor intensive in our current wiki-based environment.
- There is potential for 2CUL collaboration regarding how to handle non-COUNTER compliant resources, uploading cost data, and troubleshooting SUSHI problems.

RM-CE for 2CUL

License fees: $14,000 total, split between CULs for first year. $20,000 total years 2+.

- Standard pricing is about 20k for you all but since this is a pilot (and you all are good PQ customers), we can cut that to 8K for the year of the pilot and see how it goes. There is also an implementation fee of $2,000 and a consulting fee of $3995. We can create a statement of work to be sure we are aware of what the implementation looks like. This will allow you to take time to work on the project without limitations and see how it works for you. - Kate Howe, Serials Solutions

Benefits and potential savings: We estimate that starting with year 2, 2CUL will begin to see opportunity savings in the form of staff time freed to perform other activities. There are many opportunities to put this time to better use on other e-resource activities that have been unachievable previously. The initial areas listed below will be the first priorities to tackle as 2CUL work, and we estimate approximately 125+ hours per year (5 hours per week) of savings from these efforts for each partner totaling approximately $25,000 across 2CUL.

- Platform changes and other resource maintenance can often be time intensive projects. We can handle these tasks collaboratively and can make the changes for both institutions when both CULs have content in the same collections.
We plan to implement the system over a two month period. There is potential to use Serials Solutions journal A-Z list to provide this service. If not, the Discovery & Access team will address any changes. The group has concluded that any necessary changes will be minimal and should not require major time commitments.

Responsible parties - Pete Hoyt, Chris Manly, Gary Branch, Heather Shipman, Jesse Koennecke - This group will address any changes. The data required to replicate these services is available outside of the Innovative System. In particular:

- Voyager - Fields to e-journals, packages, and the curated list of databases are recorded in Voyager bibliographic records along with relevant Subject Headings, URLs, etc...
- RM - License terms to display to the public will be recorded in the RM when it is live. Serials Solutions provides an API to query these for display where required.

Estimated time commitments during 2 month implementation period (itemized in more detail in Appendix 1):

- 2CUL E-Resources Unit staff: ~250 hours across 2CUL staff including open Columbia position (split evenly across partners in the cost estimates)
- 2CUL Batch processing: 20 hours
- Cornell Library IT: 10 hours+. Does not yet include estimate for Discovery & Access related work

Appendix 1: Implementation Details

Below are the primary areas of focus during the implementation process. Where possible, time estimates are provided. These are expected to be covered by a combination of the open Columbia position and/or absorbed by existing staff in the indicated areas.

Cornell Database Names - Responsible parties - Discovery & Access Team (interface design and implementation), E-Resource Staff (Record management and license entry). The D&A team was preparing to investigate these alternatives as part of their project.

- 948 field: webfeatdb indicates that it is part of the list curated by the Database Review Committee
- 653 subject fields used to facilitate browsability by curated subjects.
- Various other subject, alternate titles, and description fields used for broader searching capabilities
- License terms to be held in RM, linked to from appropriate records using License Data API

Cornell eJournals - There is potential to use the Serials Solutions journal A-Z list to provide this service. If not, the Discovery & Access team will have to decide if this is essential and how to implement it. The data to produce it is available in the relevant Voyager records and via the License Data API from RM. Currently, 899 codes are used in Voyager to match journals in a collection to their parent collection.

Batch Loading - Responsible parties - Pete Hoyt, Chris Manly, Gary Branch, Heather Shipman, Jesse Koennecke - This group will address any issues that arise related to batch loads between Serials Solutions, Voyager, and the Innovative ERM. We expect the required changes to be minimal although there may be potential to overhaul the processes more thoroughly in the future. Time Estimate: 10-20 hours from CUL IT and Batch processing staff

Consortial System Implementation - The specific details are still being worked out. The current plan is to replicate Columbia's Resource Manager data to populate the Consortial layer's "parent" 2CUL database, then linking to that to the two "child" databases for Cornell and Columbia. Many resources will match up relatively easily after this first pass as the 2CUL partners have significant overlap in collections. We will identify project work to match other resources as appropriate. This may be a great area for Columbia's proposed staff member to work on. Time Estimate: 40 hours testing across e-resources staff. This is expected to continue to take some time from existing e-resource staff as we identify and implement best practices.

To be tested:

- How do we handle resources where we get records from other third parties? I.E. MARCIVE, OCLC, Vendors?
- Does Columbia data as "parent" help or hinder?
- Workflow - what goes in CE layer, what goes in local? Are there one or more clear scenarios for this?

Data entry and matching collections - These aspects of migration from Innovative to RM, and connecting Cornell and Columbia's RM collections to the parent RM-CE records to be the most labor intensive aspects of implementation. Most of this work can be accomplished by e-resource staff. The goal is to sync as much as possible between the 2CUL collections records. The following staff will be essential for making this work smoothly and quickly (Time Estimate: 150+ hours during implementation from Columbia staff member and/or existing e-resources staff to match data records across collections and migrate information from Innovative ERM system):

- Columbia position - Columbia has offered to contribute the services of a full-time staff position to assist Cornell in making the transition to RM. This position will assist in the move to the Consortial version of RM as well. The position is at the same level as the current staff in Electronic Resources at Columbia.
- Various other E-Resources staff - All of Cornell's E-Resources Unit staff are prepared to spend time in the coming months. They are eager to see this work well and the process of updating data will give them valuable experience using all of the systems. Columbia's E-resources staff will help guide the process with their experience in the systems and well also concentrate on ensuring that Columbia's
records match properly in the RM-CE.

**License Record Entry** - Cornell staff will need to enter license data to match at least what is currently entered in the Innovative system. Some of this will be able to be migrated, but there will also be some manual entry and updating required. **Time Estimate:** 25-40 hours from e-resources staff during implementation to match current level of completion.

**Batch loading cost data** - This is not necessary during implementation, but should be started as early as possible to have resource cost data included in the system. This data can then be examined across 2CUL collections and utilized by the 360 COUNTER Service to estimate cost-per-use. **Time Estimate:** 20-30 hours from e-resources and batch loading staff to investigate and develop workflow.