chapter five

Licensing Electronic Resources in the Global Environment:

A Conversation

Angela Carreño and Bill Maltarich
As interviewed by Scott Collard

Introduction

The following is an edited conversation with Angela Carreño, Head of Collections, New York University Division of Libraries; Bill Maltarich, Librarian for Collection Management, New York University Division of Libraries; and Scott Collard (interviewer), Head of Social Sciences, NYU Libraries.

When NYU announced its intention to open global campuses and to provide a research environment comparable to that found at the Washington Square campus in New York City, Angela and Bill were tasked with understanding the ramifications of such a project on electronic collections in particular. Revising licensing agreements with vendors, helping them understand how NYU envisioned this networked campus, and implementing the shared NYU approach all fell to them. In this interview they discuss the details of their approach, what they encountered, and some of the important areas of focus for others seeking to create a more unified licensing environment for dispersed campuses.

Scott Collard: Angela and Bill, I'd like you to take us back to the time when you first heard about NYU's plans to go global as a networked university

and the desire that NYU expressed to have equal or similar access to materials across the global university. What were your first thoughts about how that process would look and what did you think the challenges and issues might be?

Angela Carreño: When I first heard that we were going to have a global campus, I immediately thought that we had two advantages. One was that NYU already had a main library that pulled together all disciplines, so we were already in a routine of licensing NYU wide. And for the few libraries that fell outside of that—divisional libraries, the law library, and the medical library—we already had a routine of licensing jointly and thinking of NYU as a single site. The other practice that helped a lot was to have a centralized payment routine for electronic resources and ways to handle shared payments. Both practices we were able to take and apply to how we were going to approach the global site.

The other thing, that was obvious to us pretty far in advance, was the need to talk to vendors and give them time to think about the impact on the market of having global campuses and give us some sense of what the budget impact was going to be. The vendors needed that and the Dean of Libraries needed it, because we definitely wanted to make a budget proposal that recognized believable and responsible budgets that tied in with this transition. The two sort of work together, because in order to make it believable and reasonable we had to have some sense from the vendors what the impact was going to be.

Bill Maltarich: I remember the first thing was that question, "What is it going to cost the libraries to do this?" Then we thought, well, the best course of action is to try to talk to one vendor first—one who we have some clout with and a good relationship with and spend a lot of money with—and try to set a precedent for the pricing that would make sense. So you could go to publisher B and say, "Well, I just talked to publisher A and they said for the first five years don't worry about it." You could say, "Well, I'm surprised you are going to try to charge us because these giant places have said don't worry for a while." We didn't quite put it that way, but that was the strategy.

Angela: You started talking to them before anything existed. When they said, "Well, what's the student body?" I had to speculate. Planning tells me that this place is going to grow organically over time. I don't know how long it'll take, but eventually there will be 2,500 students. In year one, we think we are going to have a class of 200. That 200 is going to be it, in year one.

We knew when we got started that it was going to be an undergraduate liberal arts education. That's significant because vendors want to know what kind of level of research is going to be going on in any relevant discipline that ties in with their product. Being able to say that it's undergraduate education, primarily, and liberal arts focus, helped them think through their marketing path.

Combined with that, I had to explain to them that faculty are going to rotate from the Washington Square campus and spend time there teaching—and there would be some local hires—so faculty permanently at the site. That combination of faculty received a promise that the research environment would come pretty close to what you had on the Square. We felt like we have to do it because we made a promise to the faculty that teach there. So we're just going to try to open up everything.

Bill: I think one of the things we thought through was, right now, we license everything for everybody. How do we continue that? The reasoning was it's so much easier to know you do the same thing for everything, than to say for these kinds of things you have access in one spot and for the others you don't, and so we told vendors that too.

Angela: Yeah. Vendors understand the workflow and process that goes into the management of electronic resources, and how you want to streamline that whole process, and make the administration of electronic resources a clean, straightforward thing. They tend to listen to that sort of reasoning too.

Bill: It's one of those things where it carries extra weight because it's true and makes so much sense. "Do you really want to manage 15 percent of your stuff going to different portions of NYU? Because we don't." And they say, "Oh, no we don't either."

Scott: Let's say the Dean of my library comes to me and says, "We are going to open a campus internationally." What are some of the first considerations that come into play as soon as you know you are starting to go this direction?

Angela: Most places will be familiar with the phenomena of the new program being approved on campus without library involvement. And everyone has experienced the "Oops! They didn't think about the need for library resources when they established the program." For sure you want to be included in planning for that foreign site or program and you want to have a chance to contribute to budget talks about what it's going to take. And as I hinted, that has to be backed up with work on assessing what the budget impact is going to be in dialogue with relevant vendors, being able to answer for your Dean, "How did you come up with your estimate?"

Bill: We didn't have to think too much about this, but it seems to me like—fundamentally, at the beginning—you have to say, are we going to manage these e-resources for this spot? We knew we were going to try to do it all as one entity, but it's conceivable that you could sift through all it takes to license for everything, and think, "Well, we need so little stuff over there, why don't we just let them do it. They can have their budget and do what they want." It wouldn't have worked for us, but that's the first step: how do we work together? Is there a budget and they get their own resources? Or do we try to stretch that money as far as we can by pooling it and saying there's only 50 more people there interested in this thing so it shouldn't cost more?

Scott: What about that process of defining what is what for the vendors? I've heard you guys talk about that: What's a site, what's a campus, etc.?

Angela: We've certainly dealt with foreign sites from the very beginning. I mean as soon as we started licensing electronic content we had to talk about foreign sites. NYU has had several presidents that believed a global experience should be part of an undergraduate education, so consistently we've talked to vendors about the study abroad sites; they were used to that. We had a history of submitting IPs that related to those sites. When Abu Dhabi came up, I think, the dialogue not only was influenced by the fact that we were talking about study abroad sites, but also doing NYU-wide licensing—taking medical and law into consideration with shared payments. We were able to talk about that trend intensifying and that it just fits NYU's philosophy of education.

Scott: But vendors had a different feeling for how growth was going to happen because of these portal campuses where the study-away sites always seemed static?

Angela: We were very transparent. We gave them a timeline of how that student body was going to grow. I gave them as much information as I had about the curriculum. Sometimes they wanted to know what the facility was like, and we had to talk about temporary facilities and planning down the road to move to a permanent facility.

Bill: But all the vendors thought of Abu Dhabi as different. We were able to frame it as, "We've always done this. It's just the next step in doing it." The idea that there might be some staff in Florence or Prague who are always there, but the students are back and forth—and Abu Dhabi wasn't going to be quite the same. Truly, that it's a campus—as opposed to a study-away site—made a difference to them. What we tried to do, and probably what I would advise anybody to do, is say, "OK, we realize this is different. This feels different and it makes a difference to you. What about it is different? How will we know when this site or another site hits that trigger point where it's different and it matters to you?" That way we can plan for it.

So for Shanghai, we had some "This again?" reactions. It would be nice to know when somewhere is going to be a blip on the radar so that you can go to them and tell them more. If everybody understands what matters—what makes a place different—then you can plan and predict and also meet them with that information rather than wait for them to say, "Oh, I saw an article about a Shanghai campus. What can you tell me about that?" Already you're starting out on a weird foot, right?

Angela: Yeah. You don't want to be like that.

Bill: No, no, no. It has happened. But it's because it's some obscure vendor that you forgot to tell.

Angela: A year after the campus opens, a vendor gets in touch with you, "Hey, what's this IP?" You say, "Didn't we talk to you? Sit down. We have to talk to you!"

Scott: Could you guys talk about the idea of the day-one collection and what your planning was to think about starting with a certain collection?

Angela: Day-one was a combination of a core collection and collections to meet specific instructional need, based on syllabi. Core would be like Loeb's classics. Making sure you have those standard sets that meet a predictable instructional need. That was going to be the print side of the collection when they started out.

For us, starting out, there was a thought that delivery of print from the Square was going to be an acceptable service. For some of the research material that was either difficult to acquire or highly specialized and out of scope, the Square was going to be able to deliver on request. It turned out that that service was very costly. It became apparent that, wherever possible, we should try to transition to electronic, even if it ties into a legacy collection that we have on-hand in print.

In terms of the transition to the e-book, I think the existence of the branch campus forced the Division of Libraries to rethink the transition to the e-book on a faster track than other places. If possible, we should move ahead with prospective collecting that favors that e-version [electronic] over the p-version [print]. It became even more compelling when it was obvious that you couldn't be sending print over there on an ongoing basis intensively.

Bill: I think, in a way, the fact that we did things the way we did them made day-one on the e-side easy. We wanted everything that we had electronically to be available to Abu Dhabi across the board on day one. We asked ourselves, what did we already have in place? What should we? Is there anything we need to do right away for when they open? And then, is there a change in the way we collect going forward that's going be a change in our collecting policy? That was certainly the realization with the e-book. If we looked at a syllabus and said, "Well, should we buy this in print or should we buy it and get it in electronic?" All of a sudden, it makes sense to buy electronic. It just serves everyone's needs more immediately.

Angela: I would say the approval profile for the day-one collection was set up without great integration with the profile that was set up on the Square. As time passed, we got better at integrating the profiles: thinking more carefully about the duplication in print, thinking more carefully about e-preferred, and being on the same page in terms of what is transitioning to e-only. I think when we got started those profiles just went on separate tracks.

Bill: What's interesting to me is when you talk about day-one stuff—I don't think at either spot were there local e-resources that we had to add as part of their day-one collection. That is, "You can't open a library in Abu Dhabi and not have this." It didn't really happen; you know? There was no local e-collection that had to be added. I can't imagine that that will always be true everywhere.

Angela: And sometimes they couldn't wait, or it wasn't clear to them what the options were. I can think of two examples offhand where it would have been much smarter to join forces and talk to the vendor and get an add-on fee as part of the NYU license, but they had to go it alone

Scott: Do you want to talk a little bit more about transparency with vendors?

Angela: You should have a clear sense of what it is you're trying to set up: if it's a separate site with its own budget that's going to do licensing or if you're trying to add the site to your institution's license content. In either case you want to be transparent about what you know about the site, because some of this is built on trust and vendors find things out! You get more accomplished if there's an honest dialogue.

Bill: I think part of it too is that you want to tell them everything they need to know to understand what's going on, and you also want to help them understand it in a way that fits into your plans. They don't always know how to understand your site. Part of being transparent is sitting down and talking through it so that then you both understand. And it makes clear, "What is it?" and "How do we understand it together?" so that you know what future changes will matter.

Angela: One of the things they're very careful about is, "What's the potential impact on my revenue, my market potential?" That's a definite focus with vendors and we wanted to project that the use and the programmatic need for the content was not terribly significant, not a big add-on. We had to do that in an environment where they hear "Abu Dhabi"—we thought maybe they'd see dollar signs—and we don't think it matters because the relevance of some specific content to their specific teaching program is minimal. I think, in most cases, they really did listen to curriculum and what the student bodies were going to be and what is fair. In most instances, they're trying to think, "What is fair?" not "What I can get away with?" and "Let me squeeze here."

Bill: Yeah. Yeah. I think that's true, but I think at the same time, too, they know about our sites. I'll talk to people sometimes and they'll know what courses are running in both those sites. They'll say, "What are these new chemistry places? Well, I see they all of a sudden opened all these labs." It makes sense—because some of the things they find out about, I didn't know about—and that's another kind of transparency. I don't go search the site like they did to try and find out what's going on.

Angela: Yeah, and things can switch on you! When I got started it was liberal arts undergraduate education, but then I started to hear, "Oh no, engineering is important" with lots of majors and more faculty because they want to be supporting this programmatic need. So maybe engineering is a bigger deal than I thought it was going to be when I got started. You're transparent about that. I think that happened with the science, technology, engineering, and math [STEM] fields in general. Science started to take on higher profile than I thought was going to be the case.

Bill: Knowing that things switch is good too. To be able to say to a vendor, "Look, we don't use this kind of thing right now and you can look at usage; you can count full-time employees [FTE] or whatever." We know right now that we don't expect anybody to really use this, but we want a license where, let's say, in two years we reevaluate? It makes sense to try to set that up and have those measurements agreed to.

That's what it means, because for the most part they do want to make as much money as they can make. If it's wide open, how do you decide when you can charge us more? It's pretty easy for somebody at the vendor's office to say, "Sales team, this year, you need to make 10 percent more than you made last year." They say, "One thing we could do is ask NYU for 10 percent more." Then you make up a reason why. It could be a legitimate reason, but it's more legitimate if you agreed on that as a measurement than, if after the fact, they say, "Well, you did this, you did that."

Scott: Were there other unexpected things with vendors? For example, I've heard you talk about how opening Abu Dhabi meant that sometimes vendors became more interested in other things that we're doing, and there was heightened level of scrutiny suddenly.

Bill: That certainly is true. One thing I thought was interesting—is you realize that the corporate structure at the vendors matters, because they have a person whose job is to sell stuff in the Emirates and somebody's job is to sell stuff in China and you make a deal with the person here that includes those sites. They get backlash internal to their company because that person is losing commission. So yes, when you say, "Here's Shanghai, here's Abu Dhabi," people start to wonder how much are they using it there. Or they wonder, because it's China, how secure things are. Or, look more closely, you see stats because they're measuring things to try to figure out if you're using much more when you have these places. Or they say, "Wait a minute. That's China and Abu Dhabi. Let me look at your other IPs." And then you get the call that says, "Tell me about the people in Prague." Nobody asked until they started looking at all the IPs.

Scott: It sounds like different vendors have taken different tacks with us in terms of the models they've presented: everything from, "Oh, your license is fine as is," to "We're going to add on the percentage payment," or something like that. Could you talk us through a few of the different models that you have encountered?

Angela: One proposal was to follow the size of the student body down the road and set add-on payment as a ratio. For example, if the Abu Dhabi student body is 10 percent of the student body size on the Square, we'll do a 10 percent add-on.

We've had some that just have a single site fee just as an add-on. They try to establish these add-on fees regardless if the site is 30 blocks away or on the other side of the globe, right?

Bill: Yeah, which also becomes an issue for us. Because you say well…

Angela: What's a site?

Bill: Yeah. "Health Sciences, who are they? They're not a site." Then they say, "What about Poly?" because they're in Brooklyn; they're across the river.

Angela: They're not a site.

Bill: Exactly. You say, "Well, I could throw a rock out of my window and hit the Courant library!" I always say we're urban and we don't really have a campus. We just have buildings all over.

Angela: Some use FTE ranges. More often than not, the biggest FTE range is what we lock into. The 250 extra students at Abu Dhabi are meaningless in that range. If you're maximum, you're maximum. So they get a little mad. This FTE approach isn't going anywhere.

Bill: Interestingly, they're coming up with other models too: FTE combined with the usage, somehow, plus site. So, basically what they've said is any way you can measure it, we're going to charge you by that, and then add the others.

But we've also had people who've said "Oh, we're not worried. You're right, nobody there's going to use this. We'll just take those IPs. We don't care. It's fine."

We also have people who say you have all this content that you bought once. We need to do a sync fee to synchronize that and charge you a one-time amount just so everybody else can access what you bought already. I think we've tried for those to say, OK we can do this but let this synchronize Shanghai, Abu Dhabi, and everything else that might ever happen.

Angela: Yeah into the future—and we're never, never, never going to talk about this again!

Bill: Paying for it a second time, even just a percentage, we can stomach it once. Yeah. But please, we have to figure out how we don't have to do this ever again.

Scott: And some vendors are content to wait and see, right?

Bill: Yeah, some people have said it doesn't sound like there's going to be much, but we'll look at usage or look at FTE in however long. Or sometimes they're harder to manage. “Tell us when things change.” It’s kind of like, well, I don’t know. There are places that have said it. There are certain vendors who pop in once a year and say, “So how are things looking?” I don’t really know what to tell them.

Angela: I can remember sending a message that a rep could use with his honchos just describing what’s going on.

Bill: What we’ve never had is somebody just saying, ”No, we won’t do it.” We’ve had to pay for things. Sometimes we’ve even had to pay more than we initially hoped. But we’ve never had anybody have a price so high where we couldn’t talk to a point where we could get it. Or say we just can’t do this in Abu Dhabi or in Shanghai.

Angela: I’ve received some licensing language that was going to be just impossible for us to implement. I think it was streaming media. The vendor is probably trying to cope with regional distribution rights and has agreements in place, with the filmmaker or whatever, that place certain restrictions on him. We want the streaming to just be regardless of location. That’s a hard one because he’s jeopardizing the delicate agreement he put in place with his content providers. He’s not going to want to do that.

Bill: That’s another reason for transparency, because if you look at many of our licenses the authorized users for NYU are any student, faculty, or staff at NYU, regardless of location.

Angela: You need to take care of the third-party content provider that has his agreements in place with film companies.

Scott: Those kinds of things seem like they’re particularly fraught in the global rights environment.

Angela: The other tricky thing is we have agreements in place that say we’re going to be governed by U.S. Copyright Law and fair use applies. But there’s also an NYU warning that the in-country copyright law governs the use of information when you’re abroad. I don’t feel like I’m familiar with copyright law in Abu Dhabi or Shanghai and some of the agreements say international copyright law. But that’s definitely a gap in my understanding when I work on these agreements. I’m going to follow the practice I’ve been following, but it’s not totally clear.

Scott: Is the story parallel when you think about technological infrastructure? You're operating in a somewhat unknown technical environment?

Angela: Shanghai was kind of scary because you hear about firewalls, and government intrusions, and censorship, and users who don't have the same level of concern for intellectual property. I'm like, well, I don't know what I'm getting into. But there were feelings like that, right?

Bill: Yes! And also when there were things where the IPs looked weird from Shanghai, because the network infrastructure connects to the west coast. When we register an IP we register it as Shanghai, but then they look it up and they're like, "Well, that's in California." I go, "OK. Let me explain to you why." You have to have some inkling of how it works (which I have only an inkling) but I have enough that I could explain why it looks like that.

We also had things where, through a change on the troubleshooting side, somebody in Shanghai would say, "I can't get to this title." You look at it and wonder is it because it's in China. It's a book that looks like it could be controversial. I don't know that it's literally about Tiananmen Square, something where it's like, "Oh, that would be a candidate for censorship." All of a sudden we're in a group where we ask IP questions and try to figure out why people can't get what they want, why they're having technological problems. In the back of your mind you have to remember maybe it's also China; maybe there's a chance that somebody is stopping this on purpose. But the truth is we've never had an access issue where it looked like that was what was going on.

Scott: I think we're talking a little bit about hindsight now. Do you have any thoughts about what you would do differently with all of the knowledge you've gotten, if you started a project today?

Bill: I would certainly do this thing I keep saying, where for the very first site you say, "This is what is different about this place." Explicitly, this is when we will consider a place to be a site. Or we will think of the growth at a site to be enough growth that pricing or something has to change, but to be explicit about it. There's an advantage to saying let's just figure it out down the road, but I personally find that a little nerve-wracking, because it can lead you away from budget. Some places may say, "OK. We'll take our ten percent now," but other places still haven't said it. How do you know when it's going to happen if you don't set standards?

Again, it may be a personality thing, but for me I feel like I would try to be explicit and have something where I could go to everyone and say, "What do you think about measuring it this way? Like FTE doesn't work because we're too big already. What do you think about doing—yeah—like a percentage of our FTE? Or what if we look at the usage and think of it?"

It's just creating some models and then a plan for how you revisit them. Something less tentative than what I think we did. But I think we did what we had to. I don't think anybody was prepared to say, "Oh, yeah. That sounds fair. Let's do it by FTE, or let's do it by usage." Because if you do it by usage it could cost you a hundred percent of what you're paying. So some clearer definitions, even though they can cut both ways when you do that.

Angela: I guess I wonder about how sites do their branding and how it relates to the processing of their resources and that integration with centralized resources. You hope that the way you get started concentrates on a workflow or process that's streamlined. You don't want separate catalogs. You don't want a separate knowledge base. You don't want to do any of that twice; you want to do as much of that at once as possible in a networked environment. That's kind of balanced with the point I made about demand-driven acquisitions, like "Oh, gee, I wish I could have isolated them and done something special for them."

Bill: We had to set Abu Dhabi up, sort of—well, we license everything for everyone—but having that flexibility would have been helpful. In the same way that I think having—and I think we're closer to it now—a more explicit way of saying, yeah, we license these things centrally, but here's how it works when you desperately need something right away. Here's a starting place when we're talking about sharing the cost of something. Let's say this is where we start and, if there are differences in what it is, we can shift the percentages around. We do that, but we don't do that in a way where if we need to talk to somebody who doesn't do it every day we can say, pretty much, here's how it works.

I think—if I think in hindsight I would try to come up with something, even if it's kind of just a stake in the ground, that you can point to. But something where you have a starting place, even if you don't use it all the time in your day-to-day work, that you can say, "Here's fundamentally how we do this."

Angela: Probably you would invest a little more time in the integration of the approval profiles from the start, because predictably the subject specialists wanted to understand what's going on there in terms of collecting. That takes advantage of a vendor system and the reverse. The librarians at the site want to see what the librarians here are doing and try not to duplicate where you don't need to duplicate.

Scott: I think that's a good bridge to thinking about a question that would probably be on the minds of a lot of folks, which is, "How do you do this without a benefactor like NYU had?" I think we're just starting to get into this idea that there are some efficiencies and there are some economies of scale. Could you say anything about that if you were operating in an environment where you didn't have a lot of extra capital?

Angela: You'd probably be on a much tighter leash in terms of the transition to electronic. We were able to support dual-format coverage to give us some time with the transition. Maybe study the reception on the part of different communities on campus before going e-only. If you don't have that cushion, you really have to reallocate the funds from one format to the other.

Bill: Even then it depends how exactly you do it. We can stop the print from certain publishers, instead of take just the electronic, because it will serve this new campus and serve us. It's not necessarily the same price as the print. It may be more. So it's probably possible without a benefactor, but it's not possible without budgeting for a new campus somewhere. I would say, OK, as you come up with the budget, remember that the FTE at this new place is going to be ten percent of what we are. Maybe not everybody is going to price it that way, but let's estimate that's what we want them to have. It's going to cost ten percent of our budget for e-resources and you can't do it without that. There's no way you could go to someone and say we have ten percent more people in our campus doing intensive work, but we really can't pay for more than this. I don't think you need mountains of money, but opening a campus somewhere costs money for everything and I think there needs to be re-budgeting.

Angela: From the very beginning, you have to plan the budget with that in mind.

Bill: Yeah. I think to me—if I were somewhere doing this—I would say, OK here is a model and I think it makes sense for what it's going to cost, and we can't do this without that. Then I would have something when I approach vendors to say, "Look, when we did this, this is what they gave me." If you say ten percent, because it's ten percent FTE, and you felt like you could really afford that, the model makes sense. You certainly couldn't do it for free. But you don't need money raining down on you, I don't think, it just needs to be part of the budgeting you're doing.

Angela: Yeah, and you have to be tougher about that transition to electronic only. That's a collection policy decision.

Bill: Yeah, when you have that kind of distance between you—maybe not everybody is dying to have an e-book or gets the e-book and says I want to have the print (but maybe there's contingency plans for how you deal with that)—but an e-book, it maybe has to suffice if it needs to serve these two places that are far apart at the same time. I think you just have to be a lot more brutal about those decisions.

Scott: Look into the future. What do you see on the horizon that's of interest or that's changing, particularly for leveraging subject expertise, thinking about how to adjust based on the changes of the campuses and changes in usage level as they grow, or the faculty change emphasis?

Angela: Growth and change will have an impact. There's talk of larger graduate programs. There's growing pride in the research impact of these places. It makes me wonder how significant that will become going forward and it's something to monitor. As soon as you're in that territory, a lot of the services that we offer are probably imminent for them as well. It becomes important for me to understand how the licensing of content that serves research needs in a variety of disciplines is going to work in both places. I don't necessarily know, and I'll have to rely on the subject specialist to help me figure out if that's going to work or if we need to do something different with the way we acquire something to make it available in both places. That starts to become significant if that research component grows.

Bill: I think when it comes to electronic resource licensing, the whole notion of geography of these places is going to be outmoded very soon. It doesn't make sense to worry about where is the campus when we have people who are all over the world doing research. If they left from New York or they left from Abu Dhabi to go to wherever and do what they're doing, what difference does it make? I understand why it's a thing we use now, why that's something that helps with pricing models, but I don't think that it makes any sense. The more you are sending people to all these different spots and everyone is logging in via their netID and password through EZProxy, it just becomes the same. So the geography is not really relevant.

Then the question is how does the publisher decide what they think they ought to charge you? How do we decide what we ought to pay? Do you use usage? Or do you use the number of people? Or do you use the number of people in specific disciplines? All of the sudden, I just think that there's going to be other ways to figure out how to charge for this.

The site campus thing is so central right now—and it's a good yardstick of how things have changed—but I think there are other things that are going to seem more relevant, really, than simply keeping track of why Prague has their IPs registered and Buenos Aires doesn't? They use EZProxy in Argentina and they use their IPs in Czech Republic. It doesn't make any sense. In the end the same thing happens; somebody at NYU goes and uses their stuff.

I think it's going to matter more when I ask, instead, do you measure usage from different places? Or just from different kinds of people? That's going to change things too. Like right now some vendors can tell you how much Abu Dhabi uses their stuff, some can't. Some just say, "Oh, NYU is one giant hunk of stuff to us." When we license with Mount Sinai—who are just uptown from us—some places can tell you what they do, some places can't. It's like if you need to measure what things are worth different ways, that kind of blunt measurement isn't going to work.

Angela: On a last note, I think discovery and access is just this ongoing dialogue we have with vendors that requires some notion of how libraries are moving; because from the very beginning you want to be talking about access and delivery of metadata from different service providers—a whole range of things that you press them on at the point of purchase. If you don't have discovery and access that feels comfortable to a networked university, then you've got a problem.

Biographies

Angela Carreño is the Head of Collection Development for the Division of Libraries at New York University. She has a subject background in Latin American Studies and is Past President of the Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials (SALALM). Angela has led, coordinated, and supported the expansive growth of licensed electronic resources at NYU since 2000. She is the primary licensing officer for the Division of Libraries and assumes primary responsibility for consortial collection development commitments. She represents the Libraries on collaborative projects with other campus units and other libraries. Since 2007, she has intensified work on the NYU electronic book collection in close collaboration with NYU's branch campus library in Abu Dhabi—a library with an e-preferred collection policy—and in support of the Manhattan Research Library Initiative (MaRLI). Angela has experience serving on numerous Library Advisory Boards established by publishers and is Past Chair of the Northeast Research Library Consortium (NERL) Program Council. She is the recipient of the 2013 Coutts Award for Innovation in Electronic Resources Management.

Bill Maltarich is the Librarian for Collection Management for the New York University Division of Libraries, where he's worked for the past nine years.