Management of and Access to Print Collections in some National and Repository Libraries in Europe: collection for use or for preservation
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Main trends in the academic document management

• Cost-effective management of especially printed document storing and delivery
• The digitisation of the scientific communication
• The overgrown amount of publications
Globalisation and digitisation of document dissemination

• The number of published documents is astonishing:
  – netcraft.com has estimated that there are 663 million internet sites in
    the world and Google has estimated the number of the books in the
    world is about 130 million.
  – As to the so far published scientific articles the estimate is 50 million.
  – These numbers mean for the library community that no library in the
    world can collect all the resources and for the academic community
    that the management of this amount of published documents is no
    longer possible to manage with traditional means on knowledge
    organization.
Long-tail policies

• Legal deposit
• Print repository
• Digitisation and e-documents repositories
• Single library policies
Legal deposit

• Legal deposit is a statutory obligation which requires that any organization, commercial or public, and any individual producing any type of documentation in multiple copies, be obliged to deposit one or more copies with a recognized national institution. (Lariviere 2000)

• The principle of a legal deposit system, aimed at the development and preservation of a national collection of published material, was first implemented in 1537 when King François I of France issued the "Ordonnance de Montpellier"

• It has been utilized in different other national policies: censorship, book trading etc.

• The main aim is to preserve national collections for future generations

• Different implementations even within Europe, e.g. centralized - decentralized
Print repository

• Print repositories have been developed since 20\textsuperscript{th} century
• The first initiative was made by the rector of Harvard University in 1902. (Eliot 1902) In the internet time other motives have evolved.
• The need for this kind of library has been:
  – To address collection space issues: to sort out the need for constant addition of shelves in the stocks (libraries wanted to keep low use material just in case users need it)
  – Long tail: to guarantee access to and availability of resources belonging to the Long Tail
  – Digital library: as a reserve for digital, assisting long term preservation of lesser used printed resources while the mass usage of digital resources has grown
Survey

• The questionnaire contained the following main sections (the questionnaire can be accessed from: http://elomake.joensuu.fi/lomakkeet/3729/lomake.html):
  – questions information about the library and the respondent,
  – questions about the collections,
  – questions about the usage,
  – questions about the knowledge organization of the collections and
  – questions about the collection policy.

• An e-mail about the questionnaire and its aims was send to the respondents allowing two weeks for the answering. Another e-mail as reminder was send near the closing of the deadline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Monographs (millions)</th>
<th>Serials</th>
<th>Yearly increase (shelf metres)</th>
<th>Amount of premises (square meters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Azerbaijan</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Bulgaria</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Finland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>19 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Denmark</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>160 000 volumes</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Germany</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8000 shelf metres</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>81 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Norway</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20 000 shelf metres</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Sweden</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>7700 shelf metres</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>18 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository Library of Estonia</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>900 shelf metres</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Repository Library Finland</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>45 shelf metres</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>6767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The amount of the collections
Survey results, 2

- The collections all available almost in all the libraries for the local use (89 %).
- Almost half of the libraries (44.4 %) enable the checking out of the documents.
- Copying (both paper and digital) can be done in 66.7 % of the libraries as well as the inter-library loans.
- 44.4. % of the libraries have fees for their services.
- All but one of the libraries reported that they have internet access to their collection database and all the resources are catalogued at the standard library level.
- All the libraries also announced that they have national policies or co-operation for the depositing and repositing the documents.
- 77.8 % of the respondents acclaimed that this should be done at the national level and 44.4 % insisted co-operation on the international level.
- Only one library responded that they had done cost-efficiency analysis of the repositing and that it has revealed saving in space costs.
Policy recommendations and conclusions

• Libraries worldwide house huge amount of printed resources that most likely are overlapping each other
• The efficient use of these collections should be further encouraged
• At the European level there is a need for multinational policies
• There definitely is a need for cost-efficiency analyses
• The digital preservation sets challenges for the collection management (e.g. copyright, long-time preservation)
• The competition between google-type and library type of internet searching should be openly discussed within the libraries in order to increase the efficiency of the access to the printed collections:
• Is there really a need for library databases as they are today?
• Both the preservation of printed resources and the use of them are important goals – do they need different types of solutions?
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