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ABSTRACT

Interlending services have become a fact of life in the library world. However, interlending systems differ from one country to another especially in charging practices.

The ways in which interlending is organised in the United Kingdom, France and Nordic Countries are examined. Various aspects of charging for document supply in the above countries are assessed.

A survey focusing on charging for document supply was conducted among 185 French and UK libraries.

The results reinforced the idea that in France and in the United Kingdom, charging for interloans particularly photocopies, is a common practice.

Recommendations for libraries intending to charge for inter-library loans are made on the results of the study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

During the past thirty years, charging for services, has been an issue of great concern. As the number of publications on this subject shows, it has implications not only for interlending and document supply but for all library and information service activities. Also, charging has been a subject of great controversy in the information world.

Research has shown that charging for services in libraries has become a current practice in the United Kingdom (Tilson 1994). Line (1988), Allan and Dean (1993) observed and explained what reasons pushed libraries to develop a charging system for Inter library loans.

Cornish (1991) and Winkworth (1993) examined the number of European countries charging for national requests. They found that, fifty one per cent of libraries said they make a charge and forty nine per cent said that no charge is made.

Allan and Dean (1993) specified that charging end users for interlending services is increasingly becoming the norm in both public and academic libraries in UK.

Cornish (1992) observed that in France, academic libraries receive a free postal service and are not supposed to charge each other for document supply. However, it is clear that a number of French academic libraries do charge despite not being expected to do so.

Mark (1990) has shown that Scandinavian libraries are beginning to accept charging as a necessity.
Although much work has been done in charging for interlending, more studies need to be conducted to compare the situation of ILL charging practice in different European countries and give an updated picture of this librarianship field.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain trends in charging for Document Supply in the United Kingdom, France and Nordic countries. This generality was embodied in nine more specific objectives:

1. to identify the ILL systems developed in the United Kingdom, France and Nordic countries;

2. to identify why did ILL charge introduced or desirable;

3. to identify the costs of ILL activities;

4. to identify which documents (Photocopy, microform, loans) are charged and how they are charged;

5. to identify what principles on criteria are observed

6. to identify what procedures are followed

7. to identify who pays for ILL;

8. to identify what has been the impact of charges on ILL

9. to identify the future of ILL

The topic of this dissertation was identified as being of importance to librarians in providing them the necessary background to implement an ILL charging system adapted to their library.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Generality

Trends in charging for document supply in UK and French Libraries/information units were compared. The study was divided into two parts: the first part of the study was a detailed literature search and scanning of appropriate news sources. The aim of this was to compile as comprehensive a picture as possible of the current state of interlending in France, United Kingdom and Nordic countries (Norway, Finland, Sweden, Denmark). This literature search revealed a distinct disproportion between the small number of documents concerning France and Nordic countries about the subject and the large numbers of articles about the United Kingdom. Also, a broader literature survey on the subject has been taken.

Secondly, a survey of charging for inter-library loans in the United Kingdom and France, based on a questionnaire was conducted. For Nordic countries, contact was established via mail with several librarians specialised in ILL.

2.2 Survey of charging for ILL in the UK and France

Postal questionnaires were sent out in early June to one hundred and eighty five Libraries/Information services of all types in a sample identified from World guide to libraries. As there are many hundreds of libraries scattered throughout the United Kingdom and France, it was decided that in both countries, thirty academic libraries, thirty public libraries and thirty special
libraries would be selected. In addition to this, the three English National Document suppliers as well as the two respective French ones should be included.

For each category (Academic, Public and Special Libraries), the total number of libraries listed in the directory was divided by 30 giving us a procedure to find a random sample. So, for example, 100 English Academic, which, when libraries were listed in *World guide for libraries*, divided by 30, gives a result of approximately 3. This means that every third library formed part of the sample. This criterion was employed to assure the survey's objectivity.

The aim of the questionnaire was to survey libraries and information centres in relation to the following categories: Academic, Public, Special and National. This was done throughout the United Kingdom and France. By this method, it was possible to contact a large number of widely dispersed chief librarians relatively cheaply and quickly. A postal questionnaire was the chosen method.

The questionnaire employed in this survey had two versions: one written in English and one in French. It consisted of three sections and a covering letter (Appendix 1). The first section sought background information about the organisation, including whether it charged or not for any services. Section 2 requested information on charging for document supply to other libraries/information services. This included charging practice, procedures used for charging, reasons why charges were introduced, type of charge, principles on which charges were based and future intention to charge. Section 3 considered charges to users for document supply. It was based on charging practices depending on user category. The final section asked for the librarians opinion on charging.
Each selected library received the questionnaire written in its respective language to increase the chance of response. Chief librarians were asked to fill in the questionnaire and return it within three weeks to the surveyor. A stamped addressed envelope was provided with the questionnaire to encourage response.
CHAPTER 3

INTER LIBRARY LOANS

3.1 Definition

What is ILL? As Cornish (1988) specified, it is the abbreviation for interlending and document supply.

There are several ways of defining ILL, or interloans as they are sometimes called.

"Essentially an ILL is a transaction to allow materials, or copies of materials, held by one library to be available in or through another library upon request. The definition is used to include materials acquired through a document delivery service." (Cornish 1988)

"Interlibrary lending, or interlending, is an operation, often a co-operative one, to enable users to have access to the maximum possible amount of recorded knowledge in whatever format that is necessary for their needs. It is a substitute for acquiring and developing a library collection to meet the needs of users but a supporting service to enhance the collection when it fails to meet those needs on specific occasions. ILL is a consequence of the fact that no library can be totally self-sufficient." (Cornish 1988)
Mowat (1993) suggested the importance of making a distinction between interlending and document supply.

"The term interlending has the clear understanding of something which is temporarily transferred from one location to another and which will be returned. Document supply on the other hand is not so prescribed and can also cover the delivery of a piece of information for permanent retention. It seems likely that the greatest growth will be in document supply, rather than interlending."

3.2 Why did ILL become so important?

To understand why ILL became so popular it will be interesting first of all to get a better picture of the context within which document supply services have grown to such importance. As Brindley (1989) observed, in the 1930s interlending was regarded as a peripheral service, a reluctant admission of failure on the part of research library. Bushnell in University Librarianship (1930) wrote: "...the loaning of any book from one library to another is unquestionably contrary to the principles of good services...and cases must be definitely and clearly very exceptional to justify the lending of books from one country to another". This sentiment may well still be held by some, but the reality is that no-one is self-sufficient, and interlending and document supply is an integral part of all library services today (Brindley 1989).

Few will dispute the claim that the last few years have seen a growing consciousness of the importance of document supply (Line 1983). Over the last decade, the steadily increased number of interlibrary loan transactions among libraries has been a common
observation (Allan and Dean 1993; Line 1982; Kennedy 1987; Mowat 1993; Line 1988; Brindley 1989). As an exemplification of this phenomenon it has been noticed that in 1981-82, the total number of inter-library loans received by public libraries was 345,000 and in 1991-1992 it raised 464,000 (Sumsion et al. 1993, p.67). The circumstances that have led to this huge growth are attributable to several factors. Line (1983) observed that in almost every country the funds of libraries of all kinds have nowhere near kept pace with demand for documents. In fact, several researchers have identified the same factors in the pressure put on inter-library supply (Line 1983; Mowat 1993; George 1993; Line 1988; Brindley 1989).

The main factor has been the rapid advance of science and technology (Line 1988; Brindley 1989). This has led to an increased number of scientists and technologists (Line 1988), and this in turn has led to a growing universe of published items (Line 1983; Line 1988) and a greatly increased demand for literature (Line 1988). There has been a very rapid growth too in the social sciences, though this has levelled off in the last decade or so, and a significant but lesser growth in the humanities (Line 1988).

A second factor has been that the funds available for acquisition in libraries have not kept pace with the output of literature (Allan and Dean 1993; Line 1988). This has led to a gradual reduction in the market for scholarly publications, and this in turn has led to increases in prices above the rate of inflation (Line 1988). The economic situation has forced trade-offs within library collections. As a result, many libraries have cut journal subscriptions. Some have sacrificed monographs to support serials. The gaps in collections have widened (George 1993).
A third factor has been the availability increase of new technology bibliographic aids and easy-to-use bibliographic tools, including on-line library catalogues and other electronic indexes and access tools (Mowat 1993; Brindley 1989).

3.2.1 In public libraries?

According to Allan and Dean (1993), lower budgets, revised information priorities that give less priority to collection building, reduced opened hours and user charges have all contributed towards changes in the ways in which public libraries borrow from and lend to others libraries.

3.2.2 In academic libraries?

The main reasons which pushed academic libraries to use ILL more and more often have been summarised as being the following ones:

- The increasing student numbers (Allan and Dean 1993)

- The rapid curriculum change and research profile development (Allan and Dean 1993)

- The higher cover prices of academic journals (Allan and Dean 1993)

- The pressure exerted on academic libraries to continue to give an adequate traditional service of document access supply (Line 1986)

- The pressure exerted on academic libraries to develop a broad collection (Allan and Dean 1993).
3.3 The situation of ILL: a recognised service

As Line (1982) explained, since no library can acquire more than a limited proportion, often a mere fraction, of what its users may require, nearly all libraries have at one time or another to call upon the resources of other libraries.

Because of this situation in libraries, it is now almost universally recognised that interlending and document supply are essential elements in library services. Also, every library now accepts that, however large, it cannot be self-sufficient (Line 1988).

3.4 The situation of ILL in the UK

As Line (1986) underlined, a fair amount of cooperation - local, regional and national - among libraries takes place already, both in information provision and document supply; it varies in extent and nature, and its effectiveness has proved hard to measure. Unfortunately for academic libraries, they inevitably tend to be net suppliers, and unless they are paid the full direct costs for their service to other libraries, expenditure exceeds income by participation in cooperative schemes. This applies to the regional systems as well as to local co-operative schemes: nearly all academic libraries supply far more to other libraries than they obtain from them. Where exceptions occur they usually consist of dependence by one academic library on another - for example, a polytechnic library may draw heavily on a university library.
4.1 Introduction

The arguments for and against charging have usually been conducted against implicit philosophical frames of reference. It might be helpful to try to bring these fundamentals into the open as a starting point. The basic philosophy of our profession has long been the imperative to provide for the social and cultural information needs of the community, especially in such areas as education and health which rely on effective and free information transfer (Allan and Dean 1993; Brindley 1989).

According to Start-Stubbs and Richardson (1984) it is doubtful if charging for interlibrary loans was ever an issue in the minds of the IFLA or even the more recent authors of the Unesco Public Library Manifesto.

In 1975, IFLA adopted a principle of universal availability of publications. The following sentence codifies this thinking:

"all individuals throughout the world should be able to obtain for personal use any publication wherever or whenever published, either in original or in copy" (Brindley 1989).
The UNESCO Public Library Manifesto, revised in 1972 embodies similar principles:

"the public library...should be maintained wholly from public funds, and no direct charge should be made to anyone for its services", and "organised co-operation between libraries is essential so that total material resources should be fully used and be at the service of any reader" (Stuart-Stubbs and Richardson 1984; Brindley 1989).

However founding librarians are concerned about access to information and the fundamental argument against charging resides, in the objectives of society in establishing library and information services for the public (Stuart-Stubbs and Richardson 1984).

4.2 Definition

First of all, it is worthwhile to explain what does charging for ILL mean? For Stuart-Stubbs (1984)

"Interlibrary loan charges are one means of distributing among libraries the actual costs of the information transfer process".

4.3 Why charge for ILL?

The growth in demand for ILL has rather unfortunately coincided with economic changes, at least in the UK, which are having a negative impact on the funding of public sector and higher education activities (Allan and Dean 1993; Line 1988; Brindley 1989). So, what happened in a situation of instability, increasing demand, and
financial stringency. In fact, the true cost of providing an interlibrary loans service have been reconsidered. As Line (1988) underlined, many libraries have tried to ration interlibrary loan demand in some way, often by a small deterrent charge (rather than an attempt to recover real costs). Without such measures, demand would almost certainly be considerably higher than it is. Partly because they have less money, partly because of the political climate, libraries are increasingly being forced to consider charging services, and supposedly "extra" services like the supply of documents from elsewhere are a prime candidate for charges.

It is in this context that the debate on charging for ILL has started.

4.4 Charging policy for ILL: worldwide experience

Charging for interlibrary loan and document supply is a very emotive issue and one which challenges all kinds of assumptions and prejudices, commitments and social attitudes.

It has been demonstrated by Cornish (1992) policies regarding charging for interlending vary considerably within countries and between countries. Views round the world vary from charging for all transactions, to charging for none.

In many European countries libraries do not charge, but there is not always consistency in each country. Overall, for national requests, fifty one per cent of libraries said they make a charge and forty nine per cent said that no charge is made (Cornish 1991; Winkworth 1993).
In the UK, a survey, carried out to discover the facts of the current situation, revealed that the feelings for charging ran high, even though, according to those surveyed, only a small number of universities charge extra for thesis lending. Several others, though, were known to be actively reconsidering their charging policies (Allan and Dean 1993).

Nevertheless, an interesting picture has emerged from the United Kingdom where the BLDSC (British Library Document Supply Centre) form is considered a national currency for interlending and has a financial value. Despite this, twenty nine per cent of libraries said they do not charge for interlending. Overall fifty six per cent of libraries said they made a charge and forty four said they did not (Cornish 1991).

The broader issue of charging between libraries, as well as that of charging users, has been picked up by FIL in their response to LINC (Library & Information Co-operation Council). This survey carried out in 1993 revealed that sixty eight per cent of UK libraries make some charges for ILL, with a preference for a flat-rate charge based on the British Library Document Supply Centre charge (Winkworth 1993).

In France libraries receive a Government subsidy for interlibrary loans through free postal service and thus, are not supposed to charge (Winkworth 1993).

In the United Kingdom it is not legally possible to supply photocopies free of charge because of the provision of the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 (Cornish 1992).

CDST (Centre de Documentation Scientifique et Technique) in France and the British Library Lending Division (and
most other libraries) in the UK are apparently the only institutions that make proper economic charges. Other libraries make nominal charges, recover the cost of postage, charge for photocopies, or make no charge at all (Line 1983).

According to Line (1983) most countries in Western Europe are still reluctant to impose charges for inter-library lending.

Sometimes there is a differential charging policy between requests from within the country and international requests from outside, or between supply of items published at home or abroad (Winkworth 1993).

4.5 ILL charging practices

Because in the UK document supply is based on the "fee" of the BLDSC form, the sum is easy to identify and pass on to the end user. It is also a simple process to raise income by increasing charges made to other libraries which wish to borrow material through the interlending system, by using the BLDSC form as "currency" (Allan and Dean 1993).

As ILL is a co-operative exercise it is usually conducted under an agreed Code of Practice. Such Codes of Practice may apply to a number of areas. For example:

- A national code of practice

- A code which applies to members of a particular network or consortium

- A code agreed between libraries in a specific geographical area within a country
- A code agreed nationally amongst libraries of a particular type (public university, etc) or in a particular subject field

- A regional code (Cornish 1988)

4.5.1 Charging end users

Before tackling this subject, it would be proper to give a definition of end user. In fact, it is the person who will ultimately use the document requested (Cornish 1988).

Charging end users for interlending services is increasingly becoming the norm in both public and academic libraries. Public libraries are somewhat restricted by legal requirements but are able to charge their own users, or other libraries, premium rates for specialist collections such as music sets (Allan and Dean 1993).

Winkworth (1993) explained that there is no necessary link between charges between libraries and the imposition of charges on users. But it has been recognised that libraries have been more inclined to charge users where the costs to the library can be readily related to use: e.g. photocopies, access to remote electronic databases and services, ILL. It could be argued that such discrimination is illogical, reflecting more the urge of librarians to control the expenditure of resources for which they are responsible than a user perspective.

Some libraries charge the user a flat fee for each interlibrary loan request processed (or successfully completed) which is based on some kind of average cost of providing that particular interlibrary loan. Other
libraries charge the user a fee which is at least partially based on the actual cost of providing the particular item provided (Bierman 1991).

Line (1983) underlined that when the individual user is charged it is mostly for photocopies.

4.5.2 Charging external users

Some libraries charge at least some outside user groups the total cost of providing interlibrary loan service including direct, indirect and overhead costs. Thus, over the years borrowing libraries have utilized three ways of paying for interlibrary loan access: they pay for it completely out of their operating budgets, they pay for part of the access out of their operating budgets and pass part of the cost on to the user a fee equal to the total cost (direct, indirect, overhead) of providing the service (Bierman 1991).

4.5.3 Charging fees for lending books through ILL

For Everett (1986) charging fees for lending books through ILL is one of the hottest library issues on the academic scene today. Not surprisingly, within the profession the issue tends to divide libraries along the lines of net borrowers, who argue that the exchange of books through ILL traditionally has been free, and net lenders, usually larger research libraries, who counter that they can no longer provide this free service in the face of rising costs and sinking budgets.
4.5.4 Charging for ILL in UK academic libraries

Academic libraries are far less restricted by regulations than public ones. As interlibrary lending traffic continues to increase steadily and limits on the number of requests processed per user remain ineffective as a means of cutting demand, charges are being introduced in one form or another. During a recent FIL conference, it was estimated that the cut in demand reported at libraries where end users were charged directly was roughly forty per cent. Those charging indirectly (for instance through cost centres like departmental budgets) report a less marked decrease, but it seems inevitable that the trend to offset the growing cost of interlending by charging users will continue (Allan and Dean 1993).

4.5.5 An increased of ILL charges

For Cline (1987) charges for interlibrary loan services have increased markedly over the past fifteen years, and high prices now constitute a major dilemma for both librarians and users of the service. Free ILL service is a thing of the past.

4.5.6 Pricing problems for ILL

No one now questions that borrowing libraries have an obligation to pay for ILL service, but many people do question the price they must pay for that service. It is unfortunate, but true, that ILL fees are out of control. The crux of the matter is the absence of standardization (Cline 1987).
4.6 Practical approaches to charging issues

4.6.1 For charging

Winkworth (1993) gave some positive reasons for making a charge between libraries when one library serves another's primary clientele include:

"- to make each library take full responsibility for its own client group
- to protect services to the primary client group
- to avoid unauthorised use of funds
- to ensure cost-consciousness in decision making
- to control large co-operative workload
- to obtain income for new developments
- legal requirements (eg. photocopies of copyright work)"

4.6.1.1 For charging libraries

Line's (1988) view on charging for interlibrary lending is a simple one. It is clear that interlibrary supply is not free. So, for Line (1988) and Brindley (1989), there is no more reason why libraries should be able to obtain an item from another library free or at a subsidised rate than to acquire an item from a bookseller or supplier at less than cost. Obtaining items from elsewhere is a form of acquisition, perhaps temporary, like the loan of a book, but acquisition none the less. In this perspective, it is logical that libraries should charge
one another for direct costs.

According to Hustache (1988), charging is the only way for the major suppliers to be able to offer an interlending service of stable, or possibly enhanced, quality in conditions where the demand is steadily growing or where their resources are shrinking. Otherwise their service is bound to decline slowly or even stop completely until the burden is spread among other libraries because requesters are not satisfied.

The second reason is that charging will eventually lead not only to a continued but also an enhanced quality of the service rendered to the requesting libraries (Hustache 1988).

The third reason why interlending should be paid for by requesting libraries is that there is really no other means for them to consider document provision as a whole, be it from their own stock or from remote sources (Hustache 1988).

The point is not to recover in full all the costs incurred by the supplying library but rather to provide it with a significant compensation. Therefore Hustache thinks that cost evaluations should be made by one or several prominent supplying institutions in a given country since, hopefully, their operating costs are lower than those of the average library and that an agreement should be reached upon a common tariff (Hustache 1988).

For Brindley (1989), if an interloan is regarded as a temporary acquisition, then the relative costs of acquisition or loan can be properly assessed, always assuming that the library knows the true costs associated with purchase, including all the processing to get a book on the shelf. This, supports the need for better
management information, both on the costs of services and activities, and on the patterns of inter-library borrowing, and to be able to relate these to a library's collection development policies and practices.

It seems more reasonable to regard ILL as a resource sharing practice, or a surrogate for acquisition. If in fact an explicit or implicit choice not to purchase an original publication has been made in the past, then it is appropriate to regard inter-library borrowing as a delayed acquisition activity and therefore one that should be paid for at the going rate (Brindley 1989).

4.6.1.2 For charging academic departments

Some researchers as Line (1986) are convinced that charging academic departments for interlibrary access can keep demand down to a manageable level. Such a practice has the great advantage to deter frivolous demand or irresponsible use. Moreover, charges for interlibrary access, deprive academic librarian of the incentive to optimise the balance with related activities - interlibrary access against acquisition and retention.

4.6.1.3 A way for costs recovery

Income from charges allows the lending library to meet all or part of its operating costs.

4.6.1.4 A method to provide a better service to customers

Income fees may permit lending libraries to improve the efficiency of their services by hiring more personnel (Stuart-Stubbs and Richardson 1984).
4.6.2 Against ILL charges

For Cornish (1992), many librarians still resist charging and reasons for this vary from pragmatic ones such as the expense of charging or the inability to retain income due to philosophical arguments about worldwide availability.

Other librarians appear to have difficulties with the concept of realistic charges for interlibrary loans because these seem to conflict with a code of free library service.

4.6.2.1 Scholars and researchers point of view

Scholars and researchers generally have sided with the net borrowers in opposing such fees, fearing that they will not be able to afford research and that access to knowledge will become the right of the rich (Everett 1986).

4.6.2.2 Against charging end users

According to Brindley (1989), Line (1988) and White (1988), the issue of inter-library loan fees to cover direct costs should not be confused with charging end users. To charge users is a different matter, and can be interpreted as penalising them for the inadequacies of one's own selection policy practice. Both researchers saw no particular reason to charge users for inadequacies of the library.

For Hustache (1988), the end user should certainly not be charged for interlending because the library does not have the requested document in stock at the moment.
FIL sees this trend to charge users as inherently wrong and argues that the access to formal education is effectively being denied to those who cannot afford to pay. Those users who will be affected most severely will be those embarking on self-directed or distance learning courses (Allan and Dean 1993).

Perhaps there is some case for methods of rationing, as many libraries operate. For example, only so many requests in process at one time or a handling charge to deter frivolous use (Brindley 1989).

4.6.2.3 Against charging libraries

As Hustache (1988) wondered should the supplying library charge the requesting library for interlending? Many people think that, since libraries are likely to place requests to others at some time, they should satisfy incoming requests if they are to expect a similar gesture when they are in need. This is perfectly sound reasoning as long as the flows of requests are more or less balanced on each side. Unfortunately, this is not often the case. For instance, only ten per cent of French university libraries issue as many as they supply.

Another reason for not charging would be that in some cases the different libraries within an interlending network are funded by the same body, so that it would seem a waste of time and money for them to charge each other.

Other arguments underlined by Winkworth (1993) which have been used to oppose any charging between libraries include:

- 'the common good'
- the strong should aid the weak

- collection of charges is disproportionately expensive

- explicit funding from a third party (eg. Government)

- supplier wishes to encourage use

- charges will discourage use.

4.7 Methods of charging between libraries

According to Winkworth (1993) there are a variety of methods of charging between libraries. Most of these do not involve payment transaction by transaction:

- barter, where a broadly 'fair' exchange occurs naturally

- regular bulk payment from receiver library to supplying library

- deliberate subsidy by Government to allow one library to support others (eg. French University libraries)

- transaction-based charges (may be based on total record or occasional survey)

- levy or 'top-slice' from individual funds towards a shared service (eg. JANET academic network)

4.8 Libraries strategies for charging

Cornish (1990) showed that libraries have established a
wide variety of policies on how they pay for lending fees. Whether the library absorbs the lending fees or passes those charges back to the individual.

According to Bierman (1991) a variety of options exist. Some borrowing libraries pay the entire cost of providing ILL services out of their operating budgets. They "absorb" all of the staff costs, telecommunication costs, and fees imposed by lending libraries.

It has been observed by Jackson (1993) that libraries which absorb ILL charges do so to promote patron goodwill. Some of them have tallied the amount paid in borrowing charges and determined that the total is a very small fraction of their overall budget. Others decide that the amount of staff time spent collecting fees from patrons would be out of proportion to the amount of money actually collected. Another argument given is that the library has penalized the patron once by not purchasing the title and should not penalize the patron a second time by passing along lending fees.

4.9 Effects of charging for ILL

As Barwick (1990) underlined, the whole question of charging is in itself a topical issue. There is a feeling that there is unfair competition between the free services of public information sources and the priced services of the private sector. Sometimes charging can have a negative result in that users are turned away.
CHAPTER 5

COST ISSUE

5.1 Introduction

As any services offered by libraries, inter-library loans service generates a cost. Thus, libraries are free to absorb this cost or recover it totally or partially by charging. When a library decides to charge, it must take into account a certain number of costs to help it to establish its tariffs.

5.2 Different costs

As Winkworth (1989) observed, charges can broadly, be based either on "what the market will bear" or on actual costs. Assuming in a library context, that maximising profit is not a major goal, charges must therefore be viewed in the context of costs. The question then arises, what are the costs? It appears essential to distinguish the different types of costs. Several interpretations of "cost" may be relevant:

- Direct or marginal: the cost incurred directly in document supply transactions, excluding capital costs (such as acquisitions) and indirect or overhead costs (such as accommodation and management). They should include consumable (such as paper for photocopying), depreciation on machinery, and possibly depreciation on stock (Line 1990; Mustache 1986; Winkworth 1989; IFLA 1987).

- Total: the full costs, including overheads, direct and indirect costs. In the case of document supply, total
costs would include the acquisition of material to meet demand, an element of senior management costs (eg a portion of the librarian's salary would be attributed to document supply), accommodation overheads, and so on (Line 1990; Winkworth 1989; IFLA 1987).

- External costs: That part of the cost of a whole activity which is borne by someone other than the provider (eg., the difference in costs between a staff-operated and self-service photocopying service; self-service is cheaper for the library because the user does more of the work) (Winkworth 1989).

Distinction also has to be made between visible costs such as the costs of forms, postage, paper, etc; and hidden cost; in particular the time of staff who are employed anyway and who devote some of their time to document supply (Line 1990; IFLA 1987).

It is useful to make a distinction between fixed costs, such as accommodation, equipment and stock; and running costs, such as telephones, postage, etc (Line 1990; IFLA 1987).

Finally, there are also service costs (the cost of running a service such as document supply) and unit costs (the costs per unit such as interlibrary request) (Line 1990).

It is obvious to everyone that costing is not easy, particularly when, as in the case with document supply, the main costs are those of staff time, and this time is often divided between several duties (Line 1990). Moreover, other costs vary according to source used, method of communication and even the weight of material which must be returned to the supplier (Cornish 1988).
CHAPTER 6

FUTURE OF ILL

6.1 Increase of the demand for ILL

Whatever the solution, demand for interlending seems unlikely to decrease, particularly as information to the end user becomes more readily available through the use of CD-ROM and networked services (Allan and Dean 1993). This trend is emphasised by Mowat (1993), who believed that there are convincing reasons that the demand will grow even faster.

6.2 What future for ILL charges in the UK?

For Line, the effect of charging would vary according to the type of library.

In the case of public libraries, which account for only twenty per cent of demand in the UK, one would expect a substantial reduction in demand (Line 1988).

In the case of academic institutions, departments rather than individuals would pay, and money would thus move around the institution; no more and no less would be spent (Line 1988). This opinion goes in the opposite direction to Allan and Dean (1993) who thought that the trends to counterbalance the growing costs of ILL by end users will very likely continue.

The same apply in industry. Although the amount of money spent is not affected, the costs become more visible if charges are made, and this could well have the effect of constraining if not reducing demand. A major question is
of course what costs are charged a contribution to costs, direct costs, or full costs, the full costs probably being roughly twice as much as direct costs (Line 1988).

For George (1993), all indications are that charges are likely to increase.
CHAPTER 7

NATIONAL INTERLENDING SYSTEMS

7.1 Models of national interlending systems

For Fjällbrant (1988) interlending can be organised in a number of ways as a simple link between two libraries, as a decentralised hierarchic system, as a centralised system based on the use of dedicated interlending supplier, as in the United Kingdom, or as a network based on a number of selected libraries, as in Sweden.


**Line et al-UNESCO Document-1980**

Model A: A dedicated centralised collection
Model B: Concentration on a few libraries
Model C: Planned decentralisation
Model D: Unplanned decentralisation

**Vickers and Line-IFLA UAP Document-1984**

Model A: Dedicated centralised service
Model B: Central shared service
Model C: Concentration on a few libraries
Model D: Decentralised planned provision, supply and retention
Model E: Decentralised unplanned access
Model F: Regionally based system

If the "models" are used, the UK, and perhaps France, exemplify Model A, centralisation, supported in the UK's case partly by planned decentralisation (Model C) and unplanned decentralisation (Model D), and in France's case, by Model D. Sweden, Finland and Norway are, or will be Model B, concentration on a limited number of libraries, supported by C and/or D (Line 1983).

7.2 UK and French ILL systems

According to Lupovici (1988), in Great Britain the situation is, for a foreigner, one of the most complex. The ILL process from the library point of view does not seem to be clear. For example, how does one choose to go through the regional network first or go to the BLDSC directly? Nevertheless, the BLDSC replaces the need of locating a document by supplying it instead using its own procedures to locate the item. A few countries add to the location and request tools, a centralised document delivery system. This exists in France and Great Britain in parallel with regional systems.

As Lupovici (1988) precised, in France and Great Britain, a national union catalogue is used as a centralised location system or a dominant one. This aspect is important because it has a determining influence on national ILL regulation, particularly for national tariff policy.
7.3 **UK and French document suppliers**

According to Bradbury (1990) the Document Supply Centre of the British Library at Boston Spa continues to receive record numbers of requests year after year, and the same is true of the other big European document supply centres such as INIST in Nancy.

The LIB-2 reports have pointed out the main document delivery centres in Europe:

- First of all the British Library Document Supply Centre,

- Secondly, the French CNRS (Lupovici 1988)
CHAPTER 8

THE UK ILL SYSTEM

8.1 The British library lending division as a central document supplier

The interlibrary lending system in the United Kingdom differs in fundamental respects from that in any other country in the world, in that supply is much more highly centralised. The United Kingdom is the only country where acquisition in support of other libraries is concentrated almost entirely on one library, the British Library Lending Division (Line 1984; Lupovici 1988).

As a result of the acquisition policy, the Lending Division is recognized as the central point of a national acquisition policy, around which other libraries in the country can plan their own acquisition and retention policies (Line 1982; Lupovici 1988). The BLDSC accepts material disposed of by other libraries, and adds it to the stock if it does not already have it, so that it also serves as a national repository. It should be made clear that the United Kingdom has no official stated national acquisition policy or national retention policy, but in practice it has a much more complete and adequate one that most other countries (Line 1982).

The Lending Division receives seventy eight per cent of all interlibrary loan demands made by British libraries: ninety per cent of requests for journals, sixty two per cent for books, and fifty nine per cent for other forms of material. These figures are for all subjects; the proportions are certainly higher for science and technology, but it is not known how much higher (Line
1982).

8.1.1 **BLDSC: a major worldwide document supplier**

It has been reported by Kennedy (1987) that The British Library Document Supply Centre (BLDSC), formerly the British Library Lending Division, fills almost 40,000 photocopy requests each week from its collection of 188,000 serials titles. Priced to recover at least the direct costs of providing copies, the BLDSC photocopy document delivery serves users worldwide.

8.1.2 **Who use the BLDSC?**

The largest proportion of UK demand on the British Library Lending Division comes from academic libraries, followed by industrial and commercial organizations, government libraries, and public libraries (Line 1984). Almost all academic and special libraries turn first to the Lending Division for almost all materials. For public libraries the Lending Division is normally a second resort, after the regional systems, but a relatively small proportion of demand from public libraries is in science and technology, and in any case about half of all demands on the regions cannot be satisfied by them and are passed on to the Lending Division (Line 1982; Line 1984).

In 1992/1993, the BLDSC received 2,631,847 requests from the UK. Forty five per cent of them were from academic libraries (including colleges), forty two per cent from special libraries and only twelve per cent from public libraries (Sumsion et al. 1993, p.152).
8.1.3 BLDSC charges

As is well known, the British Library Document Supply Centre (BLDSC) charges for all services, using flat rate prepaid mechanisms in most cases. The flat rate covers the normal services and additional charges are made for extra services including fax transmission and urgent action (Cornish 1992).

8.1.3.1 BLDSC reasons for charging

The Lending Division's charges in the UK are set to recover all direct costs incurred in handling requests. It took a few years to reach this position, but it has put the Lending division on a much sounder basis, since loan/photocopy operation is now entirely self-supporting (Line 1983).

8.1.3.2 Forms of payment

All requests have to be made on prepaid forms, which cover the direct costs of supplying items; if items are supplied by other libraries these receive the payment instead by sending the completed forms back to the Lending Division and having them replaced by new ones (Line 1984).

Requests are accepted only on BLDSC standard forms, which are bought in packets of 50 or 20. This greatly reduces invoicing and accounting costs, and cuts out all accounting transactions at the requesting and despatch stage.

In the case of International Loan Service, the forms are bought in advance, in the same way as in the UK; forms
are bought in packets of 20, the current prices per form being cheaper for Europe than for other continents. In case of the International Photocopy Service, standard forms are used, but have in themselves no value. Instead, photocopy coupons are bought in advance, and one coupon has to be used for each ten pages or part thereof of a photocopy (Line 1982).

8.1.3.3 The financial advantage of using the BLDSC system

Smith's study (1983) has shown that, if all costs are considered, it is generally cheaper to use the Lending Division than other systems even when no direct payment is paid to other libraries.

8.1.4 Forms of request

Requests can be received in several ways. The ARTTel (computer-to-computer) system is the most popular form (46.6%), but the postal system still represents 37.7% of form of request. Telex, database links, fax and telephone are used in the case of urgent action service request (Sumson et al. 1993, p. 149)

8.1.5 Despatch of BLDSC items

Items are despatched either by first class mail, or, for nearly half of all despatches, by road/rail transport schemes (Line 1982).
8.2 The ILL regional system in the United Kingdom

There are nine regional systems in Great Britain: seven in England, one in Wales, and one in Scotland.

It important to specify that, in spite of the BLDSC system, regional systems carry about fourteen per cent of the British traffic (Lupovici 1988).

8.2.1 ILL regional system organisation

The English and Welsh region are essentially cooperatives, with membership based on subscription, usually according to the size of population served in the case of public libraries, and on flat-rate fees (which vary between regions) in the case of libraries.

The Scottish system is based on and managed by the National Library of Scotland, which incorporated the Scottish Central Library, soon after the NCL came into the British Library; there are no subscriptions, and in effect all Scottish libraries are members, reporting their holdings to the Scottish Union Catalogue.

Each English and Welsh region has a Regional Library Bureau, located in a major public library excepted for LASER, which has its own accommodation, and Wales, where the National Library houses the headquarters (Line 1984).

Only the Yorkshire and Humberside region has a central bookstock, and the regional systems function mainly as switching centres. The bureaux maintain the union catalogues, in particular the ISBN lists; these lists, which are held on the computer and produced in updated versions every two months on computer output microfiche, are now by far the main means of locating items within regions.
8.2.2 Who uses the ILL regional system?

Members include virtually all public libraries, for which they normally serve as a first resort after local stock, a good number of academic libraries, and some others. The total number of requests recorded in regions is over a million a year, the majority of these (60%) come to the British Library Lending division (Line 1984).

8.2.3 Why is the ILL regional system used?

As Feather, Matthews and Pritchett (1994) ted, some libraries tend to use the ILL regional system instead of the BLDSC because of the service cost of the latter last one. For public library users, BLDSC is not always the most efficient channel of supply. BLDSC does not supply popular fiction, and is increasingly selective in its acquisitions of popular and semi-popular material of all kinds.

8.2.4 Form of payment

Most requests are made on Lending Division prepaid forms, thus insuring that borrowers pay suppliers (Line 1984).

Most public library requests go first through one of the nine regional systems, where their average chance of

---

satisfaction within the region is twenty three per cent (Line 1983).

8.3 Conclusion

While there is no overall control of interlending in the UK, there is good coordination of interlending involving the British Library Lending Division and the regional systems, which together account for the bulk of requests (Line 1984).
Events have taken a different turn in France, where a Centre de prêt has been set up. Since 1980, it has collected one copy of all French imprints received on legal deposit by the Bibliothèque Nationale (BN), as well as a duplicate of all microfiches produced as part of the BN's conservation program. When further resources become available attention will be turned to foreign literature. It is to provide this that the CADIST system set up. France has of course had for some years the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique's major collection of serials, reports, conferences and dissertations in the Centre de Documentation Scientifique et Technique (CDST), and in view of this it is rather surprising that the volume of inter-library loan demand is relatively low (Line 1983).

9.1 French catalogue system

In France, there is a national union catalogue for serials, called CCN (Catalogue collectif national des publications en série) which uses the ISDB records as reference records in its bibliographic file and which has operated online, and quite effectively, since 1983. It is used to locate libraries material as well as an inventory. More than 2700 libraries are involved in this catalogue but only about 200 are very active in the ILL process. Those libraries are using, on the same computer, a dedicated electronic mail service to send their ILL request, called PEB (Prêt entre bibliothèques).
CCN and PEB have been strong tools to unify the ILL process and the main French ILL virtual networks: the research laboratories belonging to the CNRS (National Centre for Scientific Research); the medical research using the INSERM network; and the universities ILL network (Lupovici 1988).

But for books, 3 national union catalogue co-exist as described in the LIB-2 French report:

- the first one, for foreign books only, is still maintained by the Bibliothèque Nationale. But this catalogue is on cards and is out of date (Lupovici 1988).

- the second one is not a union catalogue for location, but mainly a national file set up for the public libraries belonging the Ministry of Culture for shared cataloguing (Lupovici 1988).

- the third one, called PANCATALOGUE, is computerised but it is just starting. It will be mainly the union catalogue of academic libraries and will not give any significant help for locations during the two coming years (Lupovici 1988).

9.2 French ILL system for charging

The Centre de Prêt adopted a charging system by prepaid price labels, which must be stuck on all requests without any formality and invoicing a posteriori. Thus, all the administrative work is done before the loan, which is simplified and speeded up. The tariff of these labels follows the recommendations of the DBMIST and the CNRS. Labels are sold by order book of 20, one label being redeemable against 10, (or part thereof) pages of
photocopies, or one loan for the private sector or for a foreign country. It is necessary to stick the required number of labels in respect of the number of photocopies desired. When the number of pages is unknown, only one label must be supplied. A back pay, will be possibly asked for additional labels (Chauveinc 1986).

As for the telex, an invoice indicating the number of labels to provide will be enclosed with the documents sent off. These invoices can be accumulated and paid every 3 or 6 months, by using the same system of prepaid labels (Chauveinc 1986).

This charging system modified the relations with the BLDSC which from now on use the labels of the CP (Centre de Prêt) for its requests in France (Chauveinc 1986).

**9.3 INIST: the French document delivery centre**

As Lupovici explained (1990) INIST, the French Centre National de Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) Institut de l'Information Scientifique et Technique, was founded in 1988 as a new administrative structure combining the services previously provided by two CNRS documentation centres in Paris, the CDST for scientific and technical information, and the CDSH for humanities, social science and economics.

INIST stores 26,000 periodical titles. This centre set up a huge collection of documents, mainly periodicals and research reports, on-which is based the analysis of articles in the PASCAL database. It works like a real document delivery centre. It has been the most important participant in the EEC electronic storage and document delivery project named TRANSDOC (Lupovici 1988).
9.4 French ILL decentralised system in academic libraries

As Lupovici (1988) and Deschamps (1991) explained, to deal with acquisition sharing and with document delivery sharing, France has developed since 1980 a national co-operative acquisition network. This network has been developed by the Ministry of Education. It has assigned responsibility for developing comprehensive collections in special subject fields to certain designated libraries, called Centres d'Acquisition et de Diffusion de l'Information Scientifique et Technique (CADIST). About twenty libraries have so far been chosen (Line 1983; Lupovici 1988; Deschamps 1991).

The CADIST libraries are as follows:

- Bibliothèque d'Art et Archéologie, for art and archeology,
- Bibliothèque de l'Observatoire, for astronomy and astrophysics,
- Bibliothèque Centrale du Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, for botany, zoology, and animal and plant biology,
- Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de Lyon, for chemistry and pharmacy,
- Bibliothèque du Musée de l'Homme, for ethnology and prehistory,
- Bibliothèque de l'Université Paris IX-Dauphine, for management and economics,
- Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne,
- Bibliothèque de l'Université d'Aix-Marseille I,
- Bibliothèque de l'Université de Pointiers,
- Bibliothèque de l'Université de Caen, for modern and contemporary history, including Mediterranean Oriental history and French colonial history,
- Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire de Strasbourg,
for Germanic languages, literature and civilisation,
- Bibliothèque de l'Université Paris XI, for mathematics,
- Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de Grenoble, for physics,
- Bibliothèque de Documentation Internationale et contemporaine, for international relationships and contemporary world history,
- Bibliothèque Cujas, for law,
- Bibliothèque de la Fondation Nationale des Science Politiques, for political sciences,
- Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire Jussieu, for geology, oceanography and earth science,
- Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire de Strasbourg, for theology.

These libraries are effectively essential document supply centres (Deschamps 1991).

The CADIST collections are, as a national resource, kept separate from their host libraries' main stocks, and are to be used only when the normal interlending system fails; they are thus resources of the last resort (Line 1983).

Government funds have been made available for the acquisition of documents within specific areas, holders have been identified in Union Catalogues, and materials are made available on loan or as copies on a last resort basis (Deschamps 1991).

However other academic libraries, are also major lending centres. For other areas, and outside the university libraries themselves, there exists the Institut National pour l'Information Scientifique et Technique (INIST), which was formerly the CNRS documentation centre, and the Centre de Prêt de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Deschamps 1991).
Briefly, INIST supplies mainly photocopies of periodical articles and the Centre de Prêt offers on loan the legal deposit duplicate copies of the bibliothèque Nationale (Deschamps 1991).

9.4.1 Interlending between academic libraries in France

As Deschamps (1991) underlined, in France, University libraries are all government funded, and are under the double authority of the University President, and the Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de la Jeunesse et des sports.

The Ministère provides sixty per cent of the funding for University libraries, decides national policies for networks and co-operative projects, sets rules and procedures to implement these activities, and gives advice and counsel when required by the libraries (Deschamps 1991).

Interlibrary loan activities are considered as network activities, and as such are governed by national decisions from the ministère (Deschamps 1991).

The total collections of the university libraries are very important: more than 20 million volumes, 6000,000 microforms, 50,000 audiovisual documents, and 110,000 current periodical titles (Deschamps 1991).

Making more efficient use of these collections, through interlending is one way of meeting the ever increasing demands of students, academic staff, and researchers (Deschamps 1991).
9.4.2 **ILL charges in French academic libraries**

In France, academic libraries receive a free postal service and are not supposed to charge each other for document supply. The amount of document supply between libraries is estimated and included in their annual grants from central government. However, it is clear that a number of French academic libraries do charge despite not being expected to do so (Cornish 1992).

9.4.3 **Tariffs standardisation**

In 1983, an agreement was concluded between the DBMIST, the CDST and the INSERM (a medical research institution). This tariff reference is fixed yearly (for photocopies). It has been taken from the BLDSC, taking into account not only the direct costs, but the real cost of the service.

The tariff structure was based on a standardized fixed sum for every ten pages of the original photocopy to simplify the invoicing. Surveys conducted in the CDST and in the British Library Document Supply Centre showed that the proportion of articles of ten pages or less is, in the first case, seventy five per cent and, in the second case equal to sixty six per cent. The CDST being specialised in the exact sciences and in the biomedical sector, the difference can be explained by the average length of human science articles (11.3 pages) and social (12.2 pages), superior to the average length of scientific and technical articles (9.4 pages). An important element to notice, is that the price fixing does not take into account acquisition costs, processing cost and documents conservation costs, which are all considered as indirect costs (Hustache 1986).

The French administration for university libraries (DBMIST) has funded the libraries according to their ILL
activity to make the ILL bill cheaper for the end users (Lupovici 1988).

Moreover, it is important to specify that University libraries have a right to send ILL documents through the post free of charge although the service is slow (four to five days) (Deschamps 1991).

9.4.4 CADIST tariffs

This tariff (Appendix 2) is obligatory for all the CADIST, but only recommended to other institutions dependent on the DBMIST; however the CADIST tariff is used in all French academic libraries for ILL (Deschamps 1991).

9.5 French academic ILL system

The documentation centres wishing to borrow documents must formulate their requests according to the ISO recommendations:

- either by using the forms stipulated in the Z 45.005 AFRNOR brochure (AFRNOR is the French National Standardisation Office).

- or by using the IFLA form (Deschamps 1991).

The latter should be the only one used for international interlending.

Except as otherwise stated, the duration of ILL is limited to two weeks, postal delays excluded (Deschamps 1991).
9.5.1 French academic Interlibrary loan requests

In 1984, a specific ILL electronic message system called PIB was developed for ILL. It was used by all French university libraries, as well as other major document supply centres. In 1987 a new software called PEB (Prêt Entre Bibliothèques) was developed. In 1989, the PEB application processed over 890,000 requests (Deschamps 1991).

9.5.2 French academic network configuration

According to Deschamps (1991) any end user in possession of a terminal or a microcomputer with a modem card, or of a Minitel 1 B (videotext mode), may access to the PEB through the X 25 telecommunications network called TRANSPAC, after signing an agreement with the Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de la Jeunesse et des Sports, Direction de la Programmation et du Développement Universitaire, Sous-Direction des Bibliothèques.

9.5.3 French academic ILL Tariffs

As Deschamps (1991) explained, SUNIST sends each month to the users an invoice for machine resource usage during that period. For ease of administration, charges are based on overall connection time, and the specific tariff is officially published in the 'Bulletin Officiel Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de la Jeunesse et des Sports'. The average cost for participating libraries is 3,30 FF for sending requests, and 0,20 FF for receiving them.

To complete the system, the DBMIST has since 1984, subsidized the institutions under its supervision.
according to the number of photocopies that they received for ILL (Hustache 1986).
CHAPTER 10

INTERLENDING IN NORDIC COUNTRIES

Inter-Library Loans has always been considered a normal - and also very important - part of the library service in Scandinavia (Mark 1990).

10.1 Why is ILL so important in Scandinavian academic libraries?

Scandinavian countries have a very decentralised educational system, and because of that an effective Interlending system is a necessity (Mark 1990).

10.2 Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish ILL systems

The proposed Swedish and Norwegian systems is to concentrate demand on a limited number of libraries or rather, to encourage and aid this concentration, which tends to happen naturally because the libraries in question have larger and wider ranging stocks than others (in Finland, sixteen libraries supply ninety per cent of inter-library loans, and in Norway five receive forty seven per cent of the requests) (Line 1983).

10.3 The Scandinavian tradition

There always has been, and there still is, close cooperation between the libraries in the Nordic countries (Mark 1990).
What is also a characteristic of all the Nordic countries is that there is a strong spirit of cooperation between research and public libraries, although the first category belongs to the governmental system and the second to the municipal system. It is therefore possible for users to get access to library material held in the research libraries through the public library system, and (generally) to obtain this material free of charge (Mark 1990).

The interlending systems in the Scandinavian countries are also strongly connected. Until recently it has been a rule that, before trying to obtain a book from another country, libraries should always try the other Scandinavian countries first, no matter what the subject, language, and so on, of the book is. Most libraries in Scandinavia still adhere to this rule. However, there has been a change in the pattern, mainly because of the charging policies of some of the research libraries, but also because of the possibility of express deliveries from some big Document Supply services (for example, the BLDSC) (Mark 1990).

The financial situation in both public and research Scandinavian libraries is undoubtedly better than in the other European countries libraries (Mark 1990).

10.4 ILL charges in Scandinavia

10.4.1 Why did ILL charges introduced in Scandinavia?

As it has been demonstrated earlier, some restrictions have begun to apply within the last few years, not only in the Scandinavian countries, but throughout Europe. There are two main reasons for that. One is what can be described as the domino effect instigated by the British
Library: the British Library started charging for Inter-Library Loans and one by one the other European countries followed. The other reason is what could be called a shift to the right in the political systems of most European countries. One of the effects of that is that politicians want people to pay for what they are helped to obtain (Mark 1990).

Thus, in most libraries the attitude towards charging for Inter-Library Loans has changed. The bigger libraries, which were often the net lenders in the Interlending system, found it more and more difficult to finance the Inter-Library Loan traffic. Scandinavian libraries had to face this fact, even though it was still a small part of the total budget in a library and a great deal of the money would just be transferred from one library to another (Mark 1990).

There is now a more pragmatic attitude in the Scandinavian libraries, and libraries are beginning to accept charging as a necessity, but librarians still want to find a solution which would allow them to maintain the most valuable principles in their library system, which are:

- that all libraries can be considered as facets of one whole system

- that libraries can be used by people throughout each country and that there will be no charges for borrowing material (Mark 1990).

10.5 Scandinavian interlending policy

ILL service is only to a very small extent accessible to libraries outside the Scandinavian countries because of
the language barrier. In ILL between the Scandinavian countries there is an acceptable balance (Mark 1990).

10.6 ILL charging trends in Sweden

The Office of the National Librarian in Sweden has produced a Report with the title *Free of charge and free to charge*. The aim of the report was to establish guidelines for the charging of fees for library and information services at Swedish research libraries. The Report put forward proposals for a charging system for ILL. The basic idea behind the proposal was that some library services could be considered basic services, and they were to be provided free of charge. ILL of monographs was a basic service, and therefore free, but when photocopies were delivered as a substitute for an ILL, they could be charged for, except for photocopies sent to State-financed research libraries (Mark 1990).

According to Cornish (1992), Swedish libraries were split 50:50 on whether or not they charged for ILL.

In fact, a number of libraries in Sweden are charging each other for photocopies. In the Swedish Report there were no direct guidelines for the charging system, but it was mentioned that the fee had to take into consideration three factors: the direct cost for the lending library, the market mechanism, and a central policy for charging for public services (Mark 1990).

10.7 Finnish ILL system

According to Cornish (1990), in Finland, despite the fact that a requesting library must use its nearest neighbouring library for ILL, a study found that the
practice is to apply to the one which offers the longest loan period.

10.7.1 **ILL charging trends in Finland**

Finland also has a decentralised Interlending system based on ten research libraries with special responsibilities. They normally charge for photocopies, and there is also a tradition for charging loans to users from trade and industry. But there is still no common charging system (Mark 1990).

10.8 **Interlending in Denmark**

The ILL service in Denmark is rooted in the existing economic and library political division of responsibility between state and local authorities, as expressed in the Danish Public Libraries Act. The basis for the ILL service is:

- the collection of materials in the individual library and in the library service as such as regards titles and copies

- the division of tasks and the coordination between different types of libraries

- retrieval possibilities

- the service rendered in the individual stages of the ILL

as well as the Public Libraries Act and the Ministerial Order on Public Libraries, and the principles,
institutions and guidelines, which are described in Bibliotekernes Lånesamarbejde (Hansen 1994).  

The fundamental principles for ILL service between Danish public and research libraries have most recently been stipulated in an act. There is no specific law as regards the research libraries, but the new Public Libraries Act does mention in part 4: Other government tasks within the public library area.

In the Ministerial Order it is stated:

"The public library shall seek to procure from the county library or other libraries any books or talking books required by users, which the library itself does not possess. The public library may seek to procure other types of materials. Expenses in connection with procuring or returning materials shall not be charged to the user" (Hansen 1994).

10.8.1 County libraries

The tasks of the county libraries in connection with the ILL service are stated in paragraph 7 of the Act:

"Each county library shall assist the local libraries in the county by lending or providing books and other suitable materials which the libraries concerned do not possess themselves, and by giving

---

2 These information are taken from a letter dated 11 August 1994 between Lone Hansen and Sylvie Clavel
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advice and technical assistance to the extent this is deemed necessary. The county library shall, moreover, function as local public library for the district".

10.8.2 Other government tasks within the public library area

The institutions involved in ILL are described in Bibliotekernes Lånesamarbejde. In paragraph 12 of the Public Libraries Act from 1993 the following is stated:

"Within the public library area the government shall pay the following expenses:

1) a special superstructure function for book material,

2) a special superstructure function for talking books

3) a central repository library function

4) a central immigrant library function"

In paragraph 13 it is stated:

"The State and University Library shall act as main centre for book material by making available books, periodicals and other copyright deposit material, purchasing and lending foreign literature to the public libraries and shall act as loan centre by effecting loans from home and abroad to the public libraries".

"The Danish Library for the Blind shall act as main
centre for talking books material by making available talking books and periodicals to the public libraries, reading impaired borrowers, and shall act as loan centre by effecting audio-material from home and abroad to the public libraries" (Hansen 1994).

In Denmark, a high proportion of all the country's holdings is concentrated on three major libraries. These libraries between them satisfy a high proportion of all interlending demand in the country (Line 1979).

Mark (1990) specified that since 1985, the State and University Library is the central body for all Interlending in Denmark. Its responsibilities are to trace items required and to arrange for inter-library loans on behalf of public libraries and smaller research libraries in Denmark, to provide locations to the larger research libraries to enable them to transact their inter-library loans direct, and to act as a national centre for foreign loans.

10.8.3 ILL charging trends in Denmark

As will appear from the above, in Denmark it is not legal for the public libraries, when procuring material from home or abroad, to charge the end user. It is not explicitly stated that the libraries are not allowed to charge each other, but it has been and indeed still is common practice not to charge for the loans between libraries.

The research libraries, too, have not been charging for ILL neither between the research libraries themselves nor for ILL to the public libraries (Hansen 1994).
Two research libraries (the National Technological Library of Denmark and the Copenhagen Business School Library) have, however, stated that taking effect from the 1st January 1995 they are going to charge the sum of DK 50, per ILL to the research libraries, but not to the public libraries. This decision led to the setting up of a working group which has been given the following terms of reference:

- to analyse the consequences of charging for ILL between the research libraries

- to suggest a model for settling accounts between the research libraries

- to put forward proposals as to the amount of the fee.

The working group is expected to finish its work during the autumn of 1994, whereupon a decision will be made as to the charges for ILL between the research libraries. It is the intention that there is to be no charge for ILL to the public libraries or between the public libraries (Hansen 1994).

10.8.3.1 Photocopies

The main principle for the public libraries as well as the research libraries in Denmark is not to charge the end user for unrequested copies, i.e. copies delivered instead of loans.

The following guidelines apply to the research libraries regarding charges for photocopies:

1. There will be no charge for unrequested copies, which are being delivered instead of loans.
2. There will be no charge between government financed libraries for the initial 10 copies. A fee may be charged for requested copies between libraries, if the number exceeds 10.

3. A fee may be charged for requested copies to individual borrowers.

In order not to distort the lending paths or put too much pressure on the individual libraries it is recommended that the price per copy be fixed at DK 1, and it is also recommended that there will be no dispatch fee between the libraries, but that clearing arrangements may be adopted (Hansen 1994).

The State and University Library charges for procuring photocopies abroad (Hansen 1994).

10.8.3.2 Telefax

There are no written guidelines in Denmark for charges in connection with the use of telefax. The State and University Library and the Technological Library for example charge for the use of telefax, but there are no general rules for charges in connection with the use of telefax (Hansen 1994).

10.8.3.3 Microforms

Likewise there are no written general guidelines regarding the charges for microform. The individual library delivering the microforms decides whether or not to charge and in case of the first - how much (Hansen 1994).
10.8.3.4 Common charging policy

In Denmark there has also been a discussion about common charging policy. The Office of the National Librarian has put forward suggestions for paying for some services (for example, for documentation and for photocopies), but there is not the same tradition of charging in Denmark as in the other Nordic countries. In the proposal from the National Librarian it is stated that charging for photocopies should only apply when the user actually asks for copies, and it is also suggested that there should be no charging between libraries. The technical University Library in Denmark has its own policy for charging. In Denmark, as in other countries, the aim is to establish a common model for charging for library services, but it is still considered desirable in Denmark to have a system which will maintain the spirit of close cooperation between countries. At least the National Librarians in each Scandinavian country have decided to investigate the possibility of making a common proposal for a charging system for library services (Mark 1990).

In Denmark, ninety per cent of the book loans are free of charge and often photocopies too (Lupovici 1988).

10.9 ILL Norwegian system

In Norway, which has a National Office for Research and Special Libraries, a structure is proposed, with eight libraries to carry the main burden of acquisition and supply (Line 1983).

According to Barwick (1990), in Norway the only defined interlending policy for research and special libraries dates from 1983 and is based on the University of Oslo (acting as the National library) and seven specialized
libraries. As these libraries received no state financial support, charges for photocopying were gradually introduced and spread. Various elements in planning a national interlending policy are discussed such as subsidies, resource sharing and alternatives to interlibrary loans. Until the future role of the National Library is clarified, it is unlikely that the official steps will be taken and interlibrary lending will continue to depend on goodwill.

10.9.1 ILL charging trends in Norway

In Norway an Interlending policy was established about ten years ago. The idea was that some libraries should have a special responsibilities in the Interlending system, and they would, of course, receive compensation in their budgets for duties. However, they never received any money to cover these extra functions, and because of this some of the big libraries started to charge for ILL (Mark 1990).

Normally, in Norway there are no interlending charging concerning books (Resde 1994). However, the situation still differs from library to library as technical libraries charge for book loans (Mark 1990).

In 1987, a university library made an attempt to charge for lending books. They were, however, told by Ministry of responsibility that charging regular book loan was not advisable (Resde 1994)*.

The majority of the charging libraries only charge for photocopies (Mark 1990).

* These information are taken from a letter dated 7th July 1994 between Torill Resde and Sylvie Clavel.
Public libraries do not charge but these libraries are only responsible for a small number of the total number of interlibrary loans. In Norway, Public libraries are based on the principles of free library services by law. These laws are executed by the Norwegian Directorate for Public and School Libraries (Statens Bibliotektilsyn).

The Norwegian library system for research and higher education are more used to charging for interlending. In 1987, the Subject Specialized Libraries (there are seven of them, each taking care of one or more special subjects) decided to charge for the delivering of copies to other libraries. As a result of this, several other libraries started to charge. There are several different practices both concerning methods and prices. It is difficult to form a shared solution of the charging practices.

A voucher system has been discussed, but not accepted. In 1990, it was submitted for consideration by their office, the National Office for Research and Special Libraries (Riksbibliotektjenesten), but not approved by their advisory Council, mostly due to protests from net suppliers who already have a charging practice of their own. Rejection was also due to mail expenses (Resde 1994).

The Norwegian Library Association (Norsk Bibliotekforening) has for several years been against charging for interlending. However, last year their "Special group for reference services and interlibrary lending" presented a report "A solidarity network of libraries". The report gives some suggestions for solutions of the problem. The same matter was discussed at a conference in Bergen, Norway. However, there are so far no results or solutions concerning the interlending charging. Any attempt to create common rules in this
area have been without any success (Resde 1994).

This summer, the National Office for Research and special libraries has appointed a special working party to look at the charging procedures in research and special libraries. This working party will try to establish a charging system through the electronic ordering system of BIBSYS, the major Norwegian library system for research and higher education. The group will propose common charging as well. However, this concern charging not for the loan in itself, but for the actual costs connected to the loan procedures (Resde 1994).
CHAPTER 11

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

11.1 Response rate

The responses to the questionnaire for UK and France, analysed by type of library, are given in Table 1 and Table 2.

By mid July 1994, one hundred and forty five questionnaires were returned, representing a seventy eight per cent response rate. However, two questionnaires were completed with insufficient detail to contribute to the study. Moreover, ten libraries replied that they did not participate in interlending activities. This gave an effective response rate of seventy seven per cent.

The responses were made up of twenty four UK academic libraries (80%), twenty three French academic libraries (76%), twenty two UK public libraries (73%), twenty two French public libraries (73%), twenty one UK special libraries (70%), seventeen French special libraries (56%), three UK National document centre suppliers (100%), two French National document centre suppliers (100%).

For both countries, the high level of response from librarians in all types of library must reflect a broad and high level of interest in this area.
Table 1: Response to the postal questionnaire sent to UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Type</th>
<th>Number posted</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Percent returned</th>
<th>Number usable</th>
<th>Percent used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Response to postal questionnaire sent to France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Type</th>
<th>Number posted</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Percent returned</th>
<th>Number usable</th>
<th>Percent used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.2 Number of people per unit

Responses from the sample of libraries across the UK and France, to question 3; "How many full time equivalent are employed in your library/information service?" are presented in Table 3A for UK and Table 3B for France.

The average value for the total number of persons employed by unit differed considerably from UK to France for certain types of library.

In the UK, eighty per cent of academic libraries employed more than forty one persons against sixteen per cent in French Academic Libraries.
For Public libraries, forty per cent of UK libraries employed less than forty one persons against seventy six per cent in French libraries.

Finally, fifty per cent of UK libraries had less than forty one employees against eighty two per cent of French libraries. This difference may be explained by considering the size of the library unit.

Table 3A: Number of employees per unit in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>&lt;10</th>
<th>11-60</th>
<th>41-80</th>
<th>&gt;80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>6 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
<td>6 (28%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
<td>12 (33%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3B: Number of employees per unit in France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>&lt;10</th>
<th>11-60</th>
<th>41-80</th>
<th>&gt;80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>15 (62%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>14 (52%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>22 (53%)</td>
<td>38 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 Charging local users

Results of question 4: "Do you charge your local users for any services?" appear in Table 4A for UK and 4B for France.

The survey showed that seventy five per cent of UK
libraries did charge their local users for services against sixty nine per cent in French libraries. Clearly, the finding indicated the importance of charging in the library world.

It appeared that sixty two per cent of UK Academic libraries charged their local users against seventy five per cent of French Academic libraries. These results are entirely consistent with those reported from a recent study carried out in the UK by Tilson (1994).

Table 4A: UK respondents indicating their employment of charging for local users for any services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>15 (62%)</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>18 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>48 (75%)</td>
<td>21 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4B: French respondents indicating their employment of charging or not their local users for any services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>18 (75%)</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>13 (70%)</td>
<td>4 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>45 (62%)</td>
<td>20 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.4 Charging libraries for ILL

Table 5A and 5B summarize the results to question 5: "Do you make charges for any documents supplied by photocopy, microform or loan, to other libraries? If so, what do you charge for?"

Seventy seven percent of the UK libraries surveyed and seventy eight per cent of the French libraries charged other libraries for ILL. These results for UK are ten per cent higher that those from a previous survey carried out by the UNESCO in 1992 (Cornish 1992) and by FIL in 1993 (Winkworth 1993).

Broken down by type of library, the data indicates that in both countries, charging other libraries for ILL is likely to be a more current practice in academic libraries. As Line (40) underlined, this is the consequence of the pressure to reduce expenditure under which academic libraries are in the present time.

Up to this point, these results are consistent with those of Tilson (1994) who found that seventy five per cent of UK academic libraries charged for ILL.

Table 5A: UK respondents indicating their employment of charging other libraries for ILL supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Charge other libraries for ILL</th>
<th>Charge for photocopies</th>
<th>Charge for microform</th>
<th>Charge for loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>21 (87%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>20 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>16 (72%)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>15 (68%)</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>54 (77%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>52 (74%)</td>
<td>12 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5B: French respondents indicating their employment of charging other libraries for ILL supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Charge other libraries for ILL</th>
<th>Charge for photocopies</th>
<th>Charge for microform</th>
<th>Charge for loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>21 (91%) 3 (12%)</td>
<td>21 (91%) 2 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (40%) 9 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (28%) 14 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>15 (65%) 7 (32%)</td>
<td>15 (65%) 7 (32%)</td>
<td>6 (32%) 12 (58%)</td>
<td>2 (10%) 18 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>12 (70%) 5 (29%)</td>
<td>12 (70%) 5 (29%)</td>
<td>5 (65%) 6 (35%)</td>
<td>2 (14%) 12 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>2 (100%) 0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (50%) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>50 (78%) 11 (12%)</td>
<td>36 (54%) 14 (23%)</td>
<td>19 (41%) 27 (59%)</td>
<td>10 (19%) 46 (81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4.1 Photocopying

In the questionnaire libraries were asked to specify what sort of documents they were charging for.

For the UK it appeared that almost all the libraries which specified that they were charging for ILL supply, also charged for photocopies.

For France, all the libraries surveyed charged for photocopies. These results can be explained by considering that photocopies would be the property of the borrower.

11.4.2 Charging for microforms

Charging for microform was mentioned by fifty eight per cent of UK libraries and forty one per cent of French libraries.
11.4.3 Charging for loans

Fifty per cent of UK libraries charged other libraries for book loans against only eighteen per cent of French libraries.

11.5 Charging practice evolution

Results of question 6: "Has your charging practice changed in the last 5 years?" are given in Table 6A and 6B.

For the UK, thirty four per cent of libraries responded that their charging practice had changed during the last five years.

When they explained in what direction, two UK academic libraries specified that charges had increased specially towards full cost recovery for ILL.

Table 6A: UK respondents indicating if their charging practice for ILL changed in the last 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>7 (31%)</td>
<td>15 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>12 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
<td>38 (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6B: French respondents indicating if their charging practice for ILL changed in the last 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Rational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another academic library began to charge for Theses (two BLDSC vouchers). In another one, some charges were introduced three years ago.

Charging external users was mentioned by another one. Surprisingly, only one library mentioned that it began to charge photocopies according to the Copyright Act.

The most common idea cited by three UK Public libraries which replied to this question was an evolution towards a charge increase for greater recovery. Also, one library underlined that it introduced some charges and another one an annual review of charges.

As to UK special libraries, the same phenomenon as in the other libraries happened, that is to say an increase of the charges. Also, one library specified that it tends to charge the commercial sector more. Finally, another library specified that due to cost restriction, external users began to be prohibited.

As to French Academic libraries, three of them underlined that the charging system began to be computerised. One library introduced a periodical invoicing system.
French Public libraries which responded to this question explained that photocopy and microform charges increased and full postage cost began to be invoiced.

One French special library started to charge for the postage of documents supply.

11.6 ILL charging policy

To question 7: "Do you have a document outlining charging policy?" the following figures appeared in Table 7A and 7B.

Sixty five per cent of UK libraries and sixty per cent of French libraries did not have a document outlining their charging policies. It seemed to be the UK academic libraries which were the more concerned about the question.

Table 7A: UK respondents indicating if they have a document outlining charging policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>17 (77%)</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>14 (83%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK total</td>
<td>44 (65%)</td>
<td>33 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7B: French respondents indicating if they have a document outlining charging policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Yes (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>10 (47%)</td>
<td>11 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>14 (52%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>30 (60%)</td>
<td>3 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In France, the result is different as fifty two per cent of the academic libraries possess such a document. Also, it is important to underline that almost all of them cited a document established by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de la Culture). This document (Appendix 2) reviewed each year recommends some tariffs to implement for photocopies.

As to French special libraries, 50 per cent indicated that they had such a document. But unfortunately, none of them sent a copy.

The INIST, sent one copy of its price list (Appendix 3).

11.7 Charging procedure

Table 8A and 8B present the results of question 8: "What procedure do you use for charging?"

The use of standard forms and invoicing for each items were clearly the two most popular procedures used for ILL charging in UK libraries.

Eighty five per cent of academic UK libraries mentioned that they used standard forms. This result is totally normal considering the National ILL centralised system.
developed in UK based on the BLDSC standard forms. On the other hand this system seems to be used far less by UK public libraries which have a higher tendency to use invoicing for each items. This finding can be explain by the fact that public libraries form part of ILL regional network.

In France, a totally different picture came out. From the questionnaire, it appeared that libraries either invoice each item or send a and periodical invoice.

Table 8A: UK respondents indicating the procedure they use for charging ILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Invoicing for each item</th>
<th>Invoicing periodically</th>
<th>Standard forms</th>
<th>Coupon/Vouchers</th>
<th>Credit cards</th>
<th>Debit account</th>
<th>Direct payment</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>11 (52%)</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>18 (82%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (42%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (26%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (46%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>35 (62%)</td>
<td>23 (38%)</td>
<td>35 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8B: French respondents indicating the procedure they use for charging ILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Invoicing for each item</th>
<th>Invoicing periodically</th>
<th>Standard forms</th>
<th>Coupon/Vouchers</th>
<th>Credit cards</th>
<th>Debit account</th>
<th>Direct payment</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td>18 (85%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>10 (66%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (26%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>7 (53%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (30%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (total)</td>
<td>22 (158%)</td>
<td>21 (153%)</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Very few French libraries mentioned using standard forms.

Debit account procedure or the use of coupons or vouchers seem to be largely more popular in French libraries than in UK ones.

In both countries, it is obvious than libraries do not seem to be attracted to offering a credit card charging system. It is highly likely that this is due to the cost of such a system.

Also, three French libraries used another procedure for charging which consist of a payment by stamps.

11.8 Charging system

Table 9A and Table 9B summarize the results of question 9; "Is the charge a standard one, e.g National, or one agreed with other libraries/information services?"

In the UK, fifty five per cent of the libraries which replied to this question, mentioned that the charge is a standard one from which thirty two per cent is a National standard (BLDSC forms) and sixteen per cent a Regional one. This can be explained by the National and regional interlending systems developed in UK.

In France, fifty two per cent of the respondents followed a standard charging system from which thirty nine per cent is a National one.

It is extremely important to underline that regional standards are totally non-existent in France. Also, all the academic libraries mentioned they had implemented the National standard which is proposed by the Ministry of Education.
Table 9A: UK respondents indicating what sort of charge they use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>12 (63%)</td>
<td>9 (49%)</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
<td>6 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>6 (48%)</td>
<td>8 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (30%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>21 (52%)</td>
<td>23 (48%)</td>
<td>16 (32%)</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9B: French respondents indicating what sort of charge they use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Rational</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>14 (60%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>14 (60%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>4 (30%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>27 (52%)</td>
<td>22 (42%)</td>
<td>19 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.9 Reasons for charging

Responses to question 10; "On what principles are charges based in your organisation?" are given in Table 10A and 10B.

For both countries, a large number of libraries (approximately fifty five per cent of them) charging for ILL did so, to give a contribution to costs.

One of the UK special library mentioned that charging provided a method of recovering some of the expenses including also the cost of librarians time spent retrieving items.
Table 10A: UK respondents indicating principles on what their charges are based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>To make a surplus</th>
<th>To cover full costs</th>
<th>To cover direct costs</th>
<th>To make a contribution to costs</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>1 (43)</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (23%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>3 (56)</td>
<td>15 (36)</td>
<td>13 (25%)</td>
<td>31 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10B: French respondents indicating principles on what their charges are based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>To make a surplus</th>
<th>To cover full costs</th>
<th>To cover direct costs</th>
<th>To make a contribution to costs</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>12 (57%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (30%)</td>
<td>8 (61%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>19 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (53%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In France, thirty eight per cent of the libraries charged to cover direct cost against only twenty three per cent in the UK. This difference can be explained by the position of academic libraries which do not have the same philosophy on the question. Only eighteen per cent of UK academic libraries wanted to cover direct costs against thirty eight per cent in France.

In the UK, libraries had a higher tendency to charge to cover full cost than in France (twenty six per cent did against only ten per cent) in France.
11.10 Reasons for having introduced charges for ILL

When asked "Why were charges introduced?" in question 11, a certain number of options were offered to respondents. Results to this question are stated in Table 11A and Table 11B.

The desire to make a general contribution to their funds was the single most reason cited for introducing a charging policy (by fifty five per cent of the UK respondents).

Whereas for fifty per cent of French respondents, charges were introduced to make users aware of the cost of document supply. This reason was only cited by twenty two per cent of UK respondents.

For both countries, approximately one quarter of the respondents specified that it was because they could have no longer provided a service on their own resources.

A similar picture in both countries appeared when, twenty per cent of libraries explained that thanks to charges they hoped that they could control the demand.

A certain number of respondents gave other reasons than the ones proposed for having introduced a charging policy.

One UK academic library explained that it was due to the copyright law in 1988.

For two UK academic libraries, it was to recoup costs.

Four UK and four French respondents underlined that they followed a National policy.
Table 11A: UK respondents explaining why charges were introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of library</th>
<th>You could no longer provide a service on your own resources</th>
<th>To make a general contribution to your funds</th>
<th>To control the demand</th>
<th>To make users aware of the cost of document supply</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (41%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>8 (53%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>32 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11B: French respondents explaining why charges were introduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of library</th>
<th>You could no longer provide a service on your own resources</th>
<th>To make a general contribution to your funds</th>
<th>To control the demand</th>
<th>To make users aware of the cost of document supply</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
<td>11 (52%)</td>
<td>4 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>4 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (23%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Few UK respondents (two), indicated that these charges had always been in place since ILL was introduced in their organisation.

Only one UK and one French library showed that it was to cover costs.

For two French libraries it was to cover the postal cost.

For another one it was because the tariff policy was established by the town council and not by itself.
Finally, for another French public library, it was normal to charge ILL photocopies as the other photocopies.

For the BLDSC and the INIST, it was exclusively to cover the direct cost.

11.11 Charging for ILL in the future

Table 12A and 12B present the results of question 12: "If you do not make a charge now, do you intend to do so within the next 3 years?

French libraries who do not make a charge actually have indisputably no desire to do it in the future as twenty three of them out of twenty four specified it. This, in fact, concerns mainly some public and relatively small special libraries which could not afford the cost and the time consumed for such a system.

For UK libraries, a slightly different picture emerged. In fact twenty six per cent of the respondents who do not actually charge for ILL have the intention to do so within three years. Charging for ILL, seemed to especially attract public libraries (33 per cent of them).

The UK academic library which has the intention to charge wants to do so in order to reduce the demand.

The result obtained for UK academic libraries which intend to charge (20%) is slightly different from Clinton (1994), which found that thirty five per cent intended to charge. One possible explanation of this difference may be the weak number of respondents which reply to this question, only one for the questionnaire.
Table 12A: UK respondents who do not make a charge now, indicating their intention to charge within the next 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>1 (23%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK Total</strong></td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>11 (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12B: French respondents who do not make a charge now, indicating their intention to charge or not charge within the next 3 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French Total</strong></td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>23 (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two UK Public libraries which specified that they did not want to charge for ILL in the future but explained that their intention of not charging ILL could change following Local government reorganisation in 1996.

For UK special libraries, two respondents commented that sadly, they shall not be able to continue their policy of free everything for their users much longer. For both of them it was obvious that information should be free of charge.
11.12 Charging users for ILL

Results of question 13: "When you receive documents from other sources (as photocopies or loans), do you pass any charges on the user?" appear in Table 13A and 13B.

Charging users for loans is not a common practice either in the UK or French libraries as approximately thirty percent of the respondents mentioned it. One possible explanation to this phenomenon is that many libraries do not normally charge users for a loan and cannot see any reason for charging users for ILL loan.

Table 13A: UK respondents indicating if they pass on any charges to users when they receive documents from other sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Charge for loans</th>
<th>Charge for photocopies</th>
<th>Charge for microforms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK Public</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK Special</strong></td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>17 (94%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK National</strong></td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK Total</strong></td>
<td>20 (30%)</td>
<td>44 (60%)</td>
<td>30 (45%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13B: French respondents indicating if they pass on any charges to users when they receive documents from other sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Charge for loans</th>
<th>Charge for photocopies</th>
<th>Charge for microfiche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>16 (62%)</td>
<td>17 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>13 (53%)</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (73%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>30 (25%)</td>
<td>40 (62%)</td>
<td>39 (62%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, one library which charged users did so, to make users conscious of the cost of such a service: to avoid excess use, users should contribute to the cost of ILL.

Another picture emerged with charging users for photocopies. In the UK, fifty four per cent of libraries did not charge users for photocopies against forty five per cent which did. Charging users for photocopies seems to be something adopted by a large proportion of UK public libraries (forty five per cent).

11.13 Charging differentially

Table 14A and 14B give the results of question 14: "Do you make differential charges to different categories of users (e.g Student)? If so, please state each category."

Variable charges can be employed according to such a principle as type of user.

When asked, whether charging levels differed between types of user, eighty six per cent of UK respondents and
eighty nine per cent of French respondents indicated that this pricing technique was not used.

For both countries, it appeared clearly that Public libraries did not employ differential pricing according to type of user for ILL.

Table 14A: UK respondents indicating their employment of differential charging according to user type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Photocopies</th>
<th>Microforms</th>
<th>Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9 (35%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14B: French respondents indicating their employment of differential charging according to user type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Photocopies</th>
<th>Microforms</th>
<th>Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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However, two UK Public libraries charged differentially according to some sort of status criteria. One of them offered a free photocopies supply for unemployed, students, OAPS, children but charged them for loans. The other one, only charged external users for photocopy, microform and loans.

UK Academic libraries which charged differentially used to not charge local users but to charge external users for photocopies and loans. Nevertheless, one library specified that it was normal to charge all the users for photocopies as users keep the copies. For one of the UK academic library, staff and students did not pay for ILL but external users paid an annual fee of £100. Two libraries surcharged external users. Another academic library explained that it was for charging students for the photocopy supply in the future.

For French academic libraries, one of them precised that it offered students a discount for loans, microforms and photocopies. But for other libraries using ILL, they had to pay the full cost for loans, microforms and photocopies. Also, it specified that external users were charged more for photocopies.

Two UK Special libraries explained that non members of the library paid an higher charge for any ILL.

In both countries one library underlined that students had a 50 per cent discount for photocopies.

It is important to notice that once again the trend to charge external users for photocopy, microforms and loans was underlined by a French special library.

As to the National document supplier INIST, it offered to its clients, to universities and research units 40% of
discount for photocopies.

In both countries, photocopies and loans seemed to be the most popular documents for which libraries employed differential pricing according to the type of users.

Those libraries not employing differential pricing explained that differential charging was a labour consuming activity, especially as small amounts of money were involved for each loan.

11.14 General comments concerning charging for ILL

Table 15A and 15B show the results the question 15; "Are there any further comments you would like to make?"

A quite high proportion of UK respondents (49 per cent) and a smallest proportion of French respondents (30 per cent) expressed the need to make furthers comments concerning charging for ILL.

Table 15A: UK respondents making further comments on ILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Academic</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Public</td>
<td>11 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Special</td>
<td>9 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK National</td>
<td>2 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>34 (49%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15B: French respondents making further comments on ILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Library</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Academic</td>
<td>10 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Public</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Special</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French National</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Total</td>
<td>20 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comments concern different aspects of the notion of charging for ILL. They have been organised in the following categories:

11.14.1 Advantages of charging for ILL

For one UK academic library, cost recovery for value added services and income generating activities have been vital to continue to develop a good service.

For another UK academic library ILL has been an alternative to purchase for their own users.

A third UK academic library commented that most of ILL charging encouraged selectivity and reinforced the notion that information had a cost as well as a value.

For a French academic library charging for ILL appeared vital to recover costs and limited the demand by a conscious use.

Another one demonstrated that ILL could not be free any more because of the cost of electronic network, server, photocopies and stamps.
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11.14.2 Against charging for ILL

For one UK public library it was clear that wider charging in the area of ILL would be the death for wider access to the National Library network for its users. Consequently, it would be opposed to it. However, it specified that political and other pressures were driving them into this area.

A second UK public library explained that it was resisting any extension of charging into other fields of information work.

A French academic library showed clearly its opposition to the commercialisation of libraries. It defended the concept of free information access.

Two French academic libraries underlined that ILL was free because invoicing users was complex, the administration cost of charging users would have exceed the reverse generated from charging particularly in a small library.

One French public library was against charging for ILL if there was reciprocity.

11.14.3 Consequences of charging for ILL

For one UK academic library charging for ILL has helped to regulate demand. Since it started charging, the number of requests in the first year has dropped by forty per cent.

One French public library explained that the city decided to charge users. As a result, requests have dropped by ninety seven per cent.
11.14.4 **Charging practices**

One UK special library charged for admission

A second UK special library had extended the services for charges but needed a longer period to assess the impact on users.

A third UK special library charged for subscription

A fourth UK special library explained that its local users could order photocopies direct via DIDS ordering system and pay with their own credit cards. But it observed that very few of them used this service.

Finally, a UK National supplier underlined that the only charges produced at the library were per orders. These charges were purely to recover costs.

11.14.5 **Opinions concerning the ILL charging system**

A French academic library demonstrated that its charging system was not satisfactory due to an imbalance between fees for photocopies and free books loans.

Another French academic library thought that charges for ILL were too expensive but underlined that these prices were established by the Ministry of Education.

Two French public libraries specified that the free postal charge system was not available for Public libraries which did not depend on the State. Consequently, they demonstrated that there was inequality in the postal charges levied on the French Public Library Service.

One French public library showed that some libraries
loaned four times more than they borrowed to other libraries which was not logical according to the costs generated.

ILL was a service that one public library provided but since demand for ILL had increased, it could not assume the added financial burden which the postage rates and ILL fees from other libraries had sent on the library.

For another public library if ILL were numerous, postage could be paid so as not to affect their budget.

Finally, for the INIST, it was necessary that costs appear even if, for public service reasons, State subsidizes.

11.14.6 Future prospects in charging for ILL

One UK academic library explained that as the amount of material obtained from BLDSC increased, the library could be tempted to charge but it was likely to move towards some form of electronic Document Delivery for which it would not charge.

Another UK academic library specified that it was currently planning to charge users.

11.14.7 New ideas concerning charging for ILL

One French academic library thought that standardized charging for ILL in France would be interesting.

Another French academic library expressed the need to establish tariffs for ILL on an international level, especially European ones if, in the future it wanted to
see the ION project operating.
CHAPTER 12

DISCUSSION

This research has attempted to assess how charging for ILL is being implemented in French, UK and Nordic libraries. The survey has given both quantitative and qualitative information on this field of librarianship.

It was originally assumed by the author that in French, UK libraries, charging for ILL was a common practice.

Charging libraries for ILL

The survey concludes that approximately seventy seven percent of UK libraries and French libraries charge other libraries for ILL. These results for UK are ten per cent higher than those from a previous survey carried out by UNESCO in 1992 (Cornish 1992). It is possible that this difference is due to an increase in the number of libraries charging for ILL within the last two years.

In both countries, charging other libraries for ILL is likely to be a more common practice in academic libraries.

In Denmark, libraries are allowed to charge each other for ILL if they wish to do so. Nevertheless, it has been and indeed it is still common practice not to charge for the loans between libraries.

Danish public and research libraries as well as Norwegian public libraries do not charge for ILL.

For Finland and Sweden the author does not have updated
information on the subject.

Charging for photocopy

The analysis of the survey demonstrates that in France and in the United Kingdom almost all the libraries that specified that they are charging for ILL supply (approximately 70%), also charge for photocopies. This tendency is probably due to the fact that photocopies are not returned to the library but kept by the borrower.

Generally in Danish libraries, photocopies are free of charge. However, the State and University Library charges for procuring photocopies abroad.

In Norway, the majority of the charging libraries only charge for photocopies.

In Finland research libraries normally charge for photocopies. The National Library of Finland charges for photocopies.

In Sweden, a number of libraries are charging each other for photocopies.

Charging for microforms

Fifty eight per cent of UK libraries and forty one per cent of French libraries charge for microforms. The author was not able to provide a satisfactory explanation for these results from the survey carried out.

In Denmark there are no written, general guidelines regarding the charges for microform. The individual library delivering the microforms decides whether to
charge or not and fixes the price it wants.

In Finland, The National Library charges for microforms.

Charging for loans

As the survey showed, half of UK libraries charge other libraries for the loan of books. On the other hand, charging for loans does not appear as a current practice in France as only eighteen per cent of the libraries charge.

In Denmark, ninety per cent of the book loans are free of charge.

Normally, in Norway there are no interlending charges for loans. However, the situation still differs from library to library as technical libraries charge for book loans.

In Finland there is a tradition for charging loans to users from trade and industry.

The National library of Finland charge for loans.

In Sweden, for research libraries, a Swedish report proposed that ILL of monographs considered as a basic service, could be free of charges.

Charging practice evolution

For the UK, thirty four per cent of libraries have changed their charging practice during the last five years. However, in France, only eighteen per cent of libraries have changed their charging practice during the last five years.
When they explained in what direction, the most common idea cited by UK and French libraries was that charges had increased specially towards full or greater cost recovery for ILL. Also in France, during the last five years, the charging system in academic libraries began to be computerised. The survey did not reveal whether this automation has affected the scale of charges.

During the last five years, the National Library of Finland charging practice has changed. There has been a move towards the implementation of charges to all categories of users and libraries.

ILL charging policy

A document outlining library charging policies is not something systematically applied in UK or French libraries. Approximately forty per cent of them use one. A possible explanation may be that such a document is an additional cost.

For France the charging policy document the most often cited was the one established by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de la Culture). This document (Appendix 2) recommends some tariffs to implement for photocopies specially for academic libraries.

Charging procedure

The use of standard forms and invoicing for each item are clearly the two most popular procedures used for ILL charging in UK libraries.
Eighty five per cent of UK academic libraries mentioned that they are using standard forms. This result appears totally normal considering the impact of the BLDSC in the UK and its standard forms used as a currency. However, this system seems to be far less used by UK public libraries which have a higher tendency to use invoicing for each items. This finding can be explain by the fact that public libraries form part of ILL regional network.

In France, the most common charging procedures are individual item invoices and periodical invoices.

A debit account procedure or the use of coupons or vouchers seem to be largely more popular in French libraries than in UK ones. This is due to the voucher system developed by the Centre de Prêts.

Charging systems

In the UK, fifty five per cent of the libraries use a standard charging system which is in thirty two per cent of the cases a National standard (BLDSC forms) and in sixteen per cent of the cases a Regional one. This can be explained by the National and regional interlending systems developed in UK.

In France, fifty two per cent of the libraries follow a standard charging system from which thirty nine per cent is a National one. This National standard is the one established by the Ministry of Education.

The National Library of Finland uses a National standard for charging.
Reasons for charging: costs recovery

In France and in the UK, a large number of libraries (approximately fifty five per cent of them) charging for ILL do so, to give a contribution to costs.

In France, thirty eight per cent of the libraries charge to cover direct cost against only twenty three per cent in the UK.

In the National Library of Finland, photocopies are charged to cover full costs and loans are charged to cover direct costs.

Reasons for having introduced charges for ILL

In UK libraries charges for ILL have been introduced in fifty five per cent of the cases to make a general contribution to their funds. Whereas for fifty per cent of French libraries, charges were introduced to make users aware of the cost of document supply.

For both countries, approximately one quarter of the libraries introduced ILL charges because they were not able any longer to provide a service on their own resources.

In the National Library of Finland, charges have been introduced due to a State statute on public charges, introduced in 1992.

Charging for ILL in the future

Twenty three out of the twenty four French libraries which do not make a charge specified that they have no
desire to do so in the future. This, in fact, concerns mainly some public and relatively small special libraries which can not afford the cost and the time consumed for such a system.

For UK libraries, a slightly different picture emerged. In fact twenty six per cent of the respondents which do not charge yet for ILL have the intention to do so within three years. Charging for ILL, seemed to especially attract public libraries (33 per cent of them).

In Denmark, next year two research libraries are going to charge a fixed sum, per ILL to the research libraries, but not to the public libraries. But no charge will be made to the end user. A decision will be made as to the charges for ILL between the research libraries. It is the intention that there is to be no charge for ILL to the public libraries or between the public libraries.

Charging users for ILL

Charging users for loans is not a common practice either in the UK or French libraries as approximately thirty per cent of the respondents mentioned it. One possible explanation to this phenomenon is that many libraries may assume that the end user is not responsible for its financial and acquisition problems.

However, another picture emerged as to charge users for photocopies. In the UK, forty five per cent of libraries charge users for photocopies against sixty five per cent in France. This result for France may be due to the recommendations given by the Ministry of Education concerning photocopy tariff for public and academic libraries.
In Denmark, in public libraries as well as in research libraries the main principle is not to charge the end user for unrequested copies, i.e. copies delivered instead of loans. Moreover, it is illegal for the public libraries, to charge the end user for any ILL requests.

As to the National Library of Finland, it charges users for loans, photocopies and microforms.

Charging differentially

In the United Kingdom and in France, it clearly appears that libraries (approximately eighty six per cent) do not employ differential pricing according to type of user for ILL. The main reason being the complexity of doing it.

However, libraries which charge differentially seemed to charge external users more than local users and to offer students a discount for ILL.

12.1 Recommendations

12.1.1 Libraries wishing to implement an ILL charging system

- Any libraries intending to develop an ILL charging system should first of all find some information about this complex subject and contact some libraries which have already developed one.

- Costs analysis of ILL service are a prerequisite for this development. It would help the library to decide whether or not it is worthwhile to implement such a system. Moreover, the cost analysis would have the advantage to guide libraries in establishing its tariffs.
To the opinion of the author, libraries which do not receive a large number of requests for ILL should not try to implement charges, because it will be time consuming and not financially viable.

- Libraries should define whether they would be able to absorb some of the costs or they would pass these costs to the requesting library or to the end user. If they want to charge any of the above categories, a marketing strategy should be developed. The results of this survey would give them an idea of the charging policy to adopt: prices to fix, category of documents to charge, category of users to charge. Without such an analysis, some libraries which would adopt a charging policy could see a dramatic drop of their number of customers if these ones were disagree with such a practice.

- Libraries should define clearly what procedure they would employ and create a document outlining their charging policy.

2- Finally libraries should be aware of all the new trends about the subject and specially any governmental, European or international action plan on ILL and on charging policy.

12.1.2 Future research on charging for document supply

The research outlined in this study should be replicated in other European countries, with the same categories of libraries in order to draw an updated European picture of the trends in charging for document supply. Moreover, it is recommended by the author that future surveys in different countries should employ a questionnaire written in the respective languages.
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APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

One questionnaire written in two languages, English and French was used by the author. Both versions are reproduced below.

CHARGING FOR DOCUMENT SUPPLY

Section 1: Background

1. Name of your organisation:

2. Type: (Please tick)

[ ] National
[ ] Public
[ ] Academic
[ ] Industrial or other special

3. How many full time equivalent are employed in your library/information service?

[ ] Fewer than 10
[ ] 11-40
[ ] 41-80
[ ] More than 80

4. Do you charge your local users for any services (e.g. Online searches)

[ ] Yes    [ ] No
Section 2: Charges to other Libraries/Information Services

5. Do you make charges for any documents supplied by photocopy, microform or loan, to other libraries/information services?

If so, what do you charge for? (Please tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If No to all categories, go to question 12.

6. Has your charging practice changed in the last 5 years?

[ ] Yes    [ ] No

If Yes, in what direction?

7. Do you have a document outlining your charging policy?

[ ] No
[ ] Yes

If yes, would you please send a copy?
8. What procedures do you use for charging? (Please tick)

[ ] Invoicing for each item

[ ] Invoicing periodically (e.g. quarterly)

[ ] Standard forms (e.g. BLDSC)

[ ] Coupons or vouchers

[ ] Credit card

[ ] Debit account

[ ] Direct payment

[ ] Other (Please specify) __________________________

9. Is the charge a standard one, e.g a National one or one agreed with other libraries/information services?

[ ] Yes (Standard)       [ ] No (Agreement)

If Yes, please state whether  [ ] National

[ ] Regional

[ ] Other
10. On what principles are charges based in your organisation. (Please tick)

[ ] To make a surplus

[ ] To cover full costs

[ ] To cover direct costs

[ ] To make a contribution to costs

[ ] Other (Please state)____________________________________

11. Why were charges introduced? (Please tick as many as are relevant)

[ ] Because you could no longer provide a service on your own resources

[ ] To make a general contribution to your funds

[ ] Because you wished to control demand

[ ] To make users aware of the costs of document supply

[ ] Other (Please state)

12. If you do not make a charge now, do you intend to do so within the next 3 years?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No
Section 3: Charges to users

13. When you receive documents from other sources (as photocopies or loans), do you pass any charges on the user?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you make differential charges to different categories of user (e.g. Student)? If so, please state each category.

| Category of user | Photocopies | | Microforms | | | Loans | |
|------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                   | Yes | No | Some (Specify) | Yes | No | Some (Specify) | Yes | No | Some (Specify) |
Section 4: Opinion concerning charging

15. Are there any further comments you would like to make?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Person completing questionnaire: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
Section 1: Référence

1. Nom de votre organisation: ____________________________

2. Type: (Cochez s.v.p.)

[ ] National
[ ] Public
[ ] Universitaire
[ ] Industrielle ou autre

3. Combien de personnes (plein temps équivalent) sont employées dans votre bibliothèque/centre de documentation ?

[ ] Moins de 10
[ ] 11-40
[ ] 41-80
[ ] Plus de 80

4. Faites-vous payer vos utilisateurs locaux pour certains de vos services (ex: Interrogation de banque de données) ?

[ ] Oui [ ] Non
Section 2: Paiement du prêt inter-bibliothèques par les bibliothèques emprunteuses.

5. Demandez-vous une contribution financière aux bibliothèques pour l'emprunt de documents tels que : document photocopié, microforme ou prêt ?

Si Oui, pour quels documents ? (Cochez s.v.p.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microformes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prêts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Si Non, à tous types de documents, reportez-vous à la question 12.

6. Est-ce que votre pratique de facturation a changé durant les cinq dernières années ?

[ ] Oui  [ ] Non

Si Oui, dans quelle direction ?


7. Avez-vous une circulaire soulignant vos tarifs de facturation ?

[ ] Non  [ ] Oui

Si oui, pourriez-vous m'en envoyer un exemplaire
8. Quelles procédures de paiement utilisez-vous ? (Cocher svp)

[ ] Facturation pour chaque document

[ ] Facturation périodique (ex : Trimestrielle)

[ ] Formulaire standard (ex : BLDSC)

[ ] Coupons ou bons

[ ] Carte de crédit

[ ] Paiement direct

[ ] Débit du compte

[ ] Autre (Précisez)

9. Vos tarifs sont-ils basés sur un code standard (ex : National) ou sur un accord particulier avec d'autres bibliothèques/centres de documentation ? (Cocher svp)

[ ] Oui (Standard)    [ ] Non (Accord particulier)

Si Oui, précisez s'il est

[ ] National

[ ] Régional

[ ] Autre
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10. Sur quels principes de facturation votre organisation est-elle basée ? (Cochez s.v.p.).

[ ] Pour faire un surplus

[ ] Pour couvrir les coûts totaux

[ ] Pour couvrir les coûts directs

[ ] Pour contribuer aux coûts

[ ] Autres (Précisez)________________________

11. Pour quelles raison avez-vous décidé de faire payer le prêt inter-bibliothèques ? (Cochez)

[ ] Vous ne pouviez plus longtemps satisfaire à vous seul la totalité des besoins de vos usagers.

[ ] Pour apporter une contribution générale à vos fonds.

[ ] Vous désiriez contrôler la demande.

[ ] Pour rendre l'usager conscient des coût d'un tel service

[ ] Autre (Précisez)________________________

12. Si, actuellement vous ne faites pas payer le prêt inter-bibliothèques, avez-vous l'intention de le faire dans les trois prochaines années ?

[ ] Oui   [ ] Non
Section 3 : Paiement du prêt inter-bibliothèques par les usagers

13. Lorsque vous recevez des documents provenant d'autres organismes (comme des photocopies ou des prêts), demandez-vous une participation à l'usager ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prêts</th>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies/Microformes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Si vous appliquez différents tarifs pour différentes catégories d'usagers (ex : Étudiants), précisez la catégorie et cochez la colonne appropriée.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photocopies</th>
<th>Microformes</th>
<th>Prêts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catégorie d'usager</td>
<td>Oui</td>
<td>Non</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4 : Opinion concernant le paiement du service de prêt inter-bibliothèques

15. Avez-vous de plus amples commentaires à faire ?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Personne ayant rempli le questionnaire: __________________________

Date: __________________________
APPENDIX 2

Photocopying tariff in operation at the CADIST libraries in 1993

Tariff recommended by the Ministry of Education and culture (Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de la Culture) for photocopies in 1993.

Internal tariff (1 to 10 pages or first microform copied)= 27FF
Per 10 additional pages or additional microform=13F50

External tariff France world (1 to 10 pages)=47FF
Per 10 additional pages=23F50
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