Opportunities for an OA Button-enabled discovery/inter-library loan service: Evidence gathering and use cases

1.0 Project background and purpose of this document

This document describes three potential options or “use cases” for the integration of Open Access Button (OAB) technology into UK HE ‘discovery to delivery’ processes, including but not limited to, inter-library loan processes (where one library will request content from another library to meet a user requirement). This document goes on to describe the potential strengths and challenges of each option and presents qualitative and quantitative evidence gathered from UK HE libraries to inform Jisc as it considers whether there is a business case for developing a pilot service in this area.

In addition this document also considers the potential of using the OAB technology to encourage the deposit of open access versions of published items where a researcher at a UK HE institution has identified a wish to access the published item. Looking in any detail at alternatives to the OAB was not within the scope of this work, although any similar or related work has been noted in 6.3.

Jisc has a longstanding interest in helping libraries in the UK Higher Education (UK HE) sector to promote the discovery and use of Open Access content where it is available. Work carried out by Jisc, the Open Access Button and Imperial College London had identified that there were opportunities to improve the visibility of Open Access content during the process of a library user discovering content, and the library enabling the user to access that content.

Libraries wish to enable their users to access materials (e.g. articles, books, chapters) as quickly, easily and efficiently as possible. Jisc wishes to support libraries in achieving this aim by:

- Making it easier to use Open Access versions of published works to fulfil user requirements where the local library has no subscription or holdings covering the required materials
- Reducing the number ILL requests that need to be processed and made by libraries, through the use of Open Access materials to meet user requirements
- Improve efficiency of the ILL process

At the same time Jisc also aims to:

- Increase the use of Open Access materials
- Increase the amount of material made available through Open Access
- Minimise the impact of subscription cancellations on libraries and their users through the use of Open Access options where available
- Exploit existing investment in the Open Access Button technology
This project is to understand and collect evidence regarding the needs of UK HE libraries in relation to a service which meet the aims as described above. The outputs of If there is a requirement for such a service, the evidence gathered will be used to inform a Jisc business case.

The findings outlined in this document will be used to:

- Inform detailed case studies with specific institutions (to be conducted in Workpackage 2 of the project)
- Inform delivery approaches and how these can be underpinned by an appropriate IP model and business model (to be addressed in Workpackage 3 of the project)

2.0 Open Access Button

The Open Access Button is a service and set of technologies which is intended to help researchers gain legal access to articles and data, specifically through the use of open access content.\(^1\)

The Open Access Button will search for open access versions of a given publication (searching across aggregated repositories including oaDOI, Share, CORE, OpenAIRE, Dissem.in, Europe PMC, BASE) and provide a link to an open access version if one is found.

Where the search for an open access version is unsuccessful the Open Access Button will attempt to identify the contact details for the author of the publication and offer the option for a request to be made to the author that they make an open access version of the publication available. If a researcher wishes to make such a request, they are asked to explain why they wish to access the publication. Authors are given guidance on which versions of a paper they can legally share, and once a request is completed the article received is shared with others. This latter functionality will be referred to as 'author request' in the remainder of this document.

The Open Access Button is currently available as a browser extension (either as a browser plugin or a bookmarklet\(^2\) - a browser bookmark that runs javascript to deliver functionality within a browser environment), and a web page where article details, URLs or identifiers (DOIs, PMIDts and PMCIDts) can be entered. However, underpinning these services is a set of APIs\(^3\) which deliver the core functionality of the Open Access Button. These APIs are freely available to use and the software used to provide the Open Access Button functionality in the browser is available as open source under the MIT License.\(^4\)

\(^1\) https://openaccessbutton.org/about

\(^2\) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bookmarklet

\(^3\) https://openaccessbutton.org/api

\(^4\) https://github.com/oabutton
3.0 Methodology

This document is based on a series of semi-structured interviews with 15 UK HE libraries (listed in 9.0 below).

The libraries were self selecting, having responded to an email or tweet describing the project and asking for expressions of interest. However, despite this the interviewed libraries represent a reasonable geographical spread of institutions across the United Kingdom. The libraries also represent a relatively diverse set of institutions, including 6 Russell Group members, 3 University Alliance members, and 1 MillionPlus member.

While the roles represented from each institution varied across interviews, most interviews included staff working with Inter-library loans, and many also included staff responsible for managing discovery services, open access services and library systems management.

In addition to the interviewed institutions, a project Advisory Group was established consisting of representatives from:

- The UK HE Library community (including representatives from SCONUL and RLUK)
- The UK HE Open Access / institutional repository community (including a representative from UKCoRR)
- The British Library
- Jisc

The role of the advisory group was to

- Review and comment on potential use cases for the OAB developed within the project
- Highlight any potential additional use cases not proposed within the project
- Participate in individual interviews to share perspectives on the opportunities for an OAB-enabled service both from the perspective of their own institutions/organisations, and more broadly for the wider community
- Offer a strategic view on any potential services which may be developed as a result of this project

Members of the advisory group are listed in 9.0 below.
4.0 Discovery to Delivery

Discovery to Delivery (D2D) is a phrase used widely in libraries to describe two sets of discrete activities supported by libraries:

- Discovery: User finding details of content they wish to read/access
- Delivery: Library providing access to the relevant content discovered by the user

The following business process diagram describes the discovery to delivery process at a high level, with a focus on the ‘delivery’ aspect, based on interviews carried out with 15 UK HE libraries.

As can be seen, once the user has identified relevant material such as a journal article they wish to view (this is the discovery phase), the library can offer a ‘local availability check’ and inform the user if they can access the material. This check will vary depending on the type of material but it would typically include a check of the library’s print holdings (e.g. for a book) and a check of the library’s electronic resources (e.g. for a journal article).

---

NISO Discovery to Delivery Topic Committee [http://www.niso.org/topics/d2d/](http://www.niso.org/topics/d2d/); Big Ten Alliance Discovery to Delivery Summary [https://www.btaa.org/projects/library/discover-to-deliver/intro-summary](https://www.btaa.org/projects/library/discover-to-deliver/intro-summary); Lowering the barriers from Discovery to Delivery: a JISC funded EDINA and Mimas project [https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/3895](https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/3895)
These checks are typically fully integrated into a library’s main discovery systems (such as the library
catalogue or discovery services powered by Primo6, Summon7, EDS8, and similar systems). Link
Resolvers9 and their underlying knowledgebases (which record which electronic resources the library can
provide access to) are often part of this process, usually with a focus on providing access to the full-text
of scholarly articles through library subscriptions to electronic journals.

Where discovery systems outside the library’s direct control support the OpenURL standard (NISO
Z39.88)10, it maybe possible to provide similar functionality to library users within third party discovery
channels (for example Google Scholar supports the use of OpenURL11).

In the case that there is no immediate availability of the resource within the library, either in print or
electronically, the library may offer the user the option of making an inter-library loan (ILL) request for
the item, where the library will attempt to obtain the desired item from another library.

For all the libraries interviewed requests were made through an online form, usually requiring the user
to go through some authentication process before submitting a request.

Almost all libraries interviewed for this project reported that once an ILL request was submitted by a
user, it would go through a set of checks (manual and/or automatic) including:

A. Checking the metadata submitted for accuracy
B. Checking if the library already has access to the item either in print or online
C. Checking if the item is available through open access

In the case of (B) or (C) the user would be informed and the ILL request would not be sent off to another
library. However, from the interviews it seemed that a check for open access content was not always
done, or was not done consistently across the libraries. In several cases it was suggested that the checks
carried out would often depend on the experience and knowledge of the member of staff who
happened to pick up the ILL request.

Only one library interviewed had a completely unmediated ILL request process, with requests sent
directly to the British Library for supply. In this case a specific agreement had been reached with the
British Library to provide ILLs for a fixed cost.

6 http://www.exlibrisgroup.com/category/PrimoOverview
7 http://www.exlibrisgroup.com/category/Summon_Web-Scale_Discovery
8 https://www.ebscohost.com/discovery
9 http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2004/04/ljarchives/the-lure-of-linking
While some libraries provide inter-library loan requests freely to their members, it is not unusual within UK HE for there to be some mechanism in place to ensure the library mitigates the risk of uncontrolled expenditure on such requests. During the interviews for this project examples were found of the following mechanisms used to control the number/cost of ILL requests:

- ILLs only available to specific categories of user (e.g. only staff, only researchers)
- A limit on the number of ILL an individual user can make during a given time period
- A charge made to the user for each ILL request made

Based on the interviews, some institutions use one or more than one of these mechanism, while a few use no limiting mechanism offering ILL facilities to all users without any charge or limit.

While there maybe some overheads to administering such limiting mechanisms, these were not identified by any site as being significant. Some sites which levied a charge to the user for each ILL request made did so by adding this to their library account charges (where overdue charges etc. would also be recorded), which meant that the overhead to the library staff and user was minimal.
5.0 OAB within the Discovery to Delivery process use case descriptions

Through the interviews with libraries, feedback from the project Advisory Group, and previous work carried out by the Open Access Button team, three broad use cases have been developed for integrating the Open Access Button technology into the Discovery to Delivery process in UK HE libraries. Note that this does not include the use of the 'author request' aspect of the OAB technology which is considered separately in 7.0 below.

These use cases look only at the operational aspects of integrating the OAB technology, and do not consider the question of what these integrations might look like in terms of design and user experience. Workpackage 2 will investigate each of the use cases in more detail, including the design and user experience aspect.

The options outlined in these use cases are not exclusive, and multiple options could be adopted by any potential service. The three use cases are described here with a brief list of advantages and disadvantages. The use cases are prioritised in 6.0 below.

5.1 Use case 1: Integrate Open Access Button technology into the ILL workflow

In this use case the Open Access Button technology is integrated into the ILL workflow. In this use case OAB technology could be used to:

- Improve the quality of the metadata of the requested item submitted by the user
- Carry out a check for an open access version of a requested item, and where one is identified this can be used to fulfil the user’s request for the item
- Potentially the OAB checks could be integrated with the checks for local availability

The red highlighting in the diagram below indicates that within this use case the OAB technology could be integrated in the back office ILL workflow, and/or within the ILL request form. In the latter case the user could be provided with immediate feedback on open access availability without the request being passed to the ILL team within the library.
5.1.1 Advantages

- From the user perspective there is no change in how the discovery to delivery process works
- Potential to reduce the number of ILL requests to be processed (in the case of integrating OAB into the ILL request form)
- Potential to reduce the time spent processing an ILL request by automating checks that are currently done manually
- Potential to reduce the number of ILL requests that need to be sent to another library

5.1.2 Disadvantages

- While estimates vary it seems likely that less than 15% of situations where a user cannot immediately access an item result in an ILL request\(^{12}\). This would mean that at least 85% of failed accesses (from the user perspective) would not be affected by this approach, and the user may miss out on an opportunity to gain access to a desired item.
- In the case of the OAB technology being integrated into the back office process only (and not the ILL form), the request will still need to be processed in some way by the ILL team resulting in time being spent and a delay in getting the item to the user, even if an open access version is identified

\(^{12}\) The figure of 15% was mentioned at the project advisory board and is based on work commissioned by RLUK. A 2012 article (http://reviews.libraryjournal.com/2012/04/reference/plan-b-life-after-the-big-deal/) suggests a lower figure of 10%. In interviews with libraries for this project no one suggested a request rate higher than 15%, and some felt that the actual percentage of unsuccessful accesses turning into ILL requests was likely to be lower than 10%
5.2 Use case 2: Integrate Open Access Button technology into the library discovery layer

In this use case the Open Access Button technology is integrated into the library discovery layer. In this use case OAB technology could be used to:

- Carry out a check for an open access version of an item viewed by the user, and where one is identified ensure the user is offered a link directly to the item
- Potentially the OAB checks could be integrated with the checks for local availability

The red highlighting in the diagram below indicates that within this use case the OAB technology would sit alongside the current local availability checks (often achieved with ‘link resolver’ systems) which are already integrated into the library discovery systems.

5.2.1 Advantages

- From the user perspective there is no change in how the discovery to delivery process works
- Open access versions are identified and offered to the user without the user needing to make an ILL request (which may only happen in a small number of cases, see 5.1.2 above)
- Potential to reduce the number of ILL requests to be processed
- Potential to reduce the time spent processing an ILL request by automating checks that are currently done manually
- Potential to reduce the number of ILL requests that need to be sent to another library
5.2.2 Disadvantages

- Requires the user to be working within a library controlled environment to benefit
- Does not help where the user goes directly into the ILL request process (e.g. in a situation where they identify a desired item from a printed citation and enter these details directly into the ILL request form)

5.3 Use case 3: Integrate Open Access Button technology into the user environment

In this use case the Open Access Button technology is integrated into the user’s own environment. Potentially this could be in the form of a browser extension or bookmarklet (as the OAB currently works, see 2.0), or in an ‘app’ devised for a tablet or mobile device.

In this use case OAB technology could be used to:

- Carry out a check for an open access version of an item viewed by the user, and where one is identified ensure the user is offered a link directly to the item
- Potentially the OAB checks could be integrated with the checks for local availability.

The red highlighting in the diagram below indicates that within this use case the OAB technology would be integrated into the user’s environment.
5.3.1 Advantages

- Can provide access to items for the user no matter where the user is working
- Open access versions are identified and offered to the user without the user needing to make an ILL request (which may only happen in a small number of cases, see 5.1.2 above)
- Fits with the current OAB model
- Potential to reduce the number of ILL requests to be processed
- Potential to reduce the time spent processing an ILL request by automating checks that are currently done manually
- Potential to reduce the number of ILL requests that need to be sent to another library

5.3.2 Disadvantages

- Requires the user to install additional software in their working environment
- Requires development and maintenance of appropriate plugins or apps for each browser, device, operating system where the library wishes to deliver the functionality
- Does not help where the user goes directly into the ILL request process (e.g. in a situation where they identify a desired item from a printed citation and enter these details directly into the ILL request form)
6.0 Assessing the use cases

All three of the use cases described in 5.0 could be part of a potential service. As previously mentioned, these are not exclusive options, and the three approaches exemplified in the use cases could be used together.

During the interviews with the 15 UK HE libraries, the interviewees were asked their views on the three use cases, and also about the library and institutional priorities when it came to improving the discovery to delivery process.

The views expressed by interviewees are reported here, and concerns raised, or potential benefits they see may not always be borne out in the real world. Workpackage 2 will explore and report on the practicalities of implementing each use case.

6.1 User experience prioritised over money saving

Based on the interviews improving the user experience would be the primary driver for adopting any new service in this area, with saving money a secondary issue.

Comments during the interviews included (with direct quotes in inverted commas):

- “For us, it is all about the user experience”
- “We’d rather the users came to our services, rather than SciHub/Google - but to do this you have to make the service very good”
- Immediate availability of content meets users expectations more
- While the need to support for OA and free up funding is important, the first priority is for students to have a good experience
- Solutions need to be seamless and user friendly, and build on existing investment in institutions to provide a high quality user experience across library services

One institution noted the amount of money spent on ILL was small enough that even significantly reducing the number of requests would not lead to any substantial saving when considered against the overall library budget. Another institution reported that the ILL budget was protected and so there was no particular driver to reduce costs in this area. While for other institutions saving money in the ILL area was still an important aim, only one institution clearly prioritised this above the potential improvements to the user experience and this was on the basis that they felt the user experience in this area was already very good within their institution.

In terms of the use cases listed in 5.0 institutions regarded use cases 2 and 3 as the ones most likely to deliver the improvements to the user experience. That these approaches avoided the user having to decide to make an ILL request in order to get access to the material was seen as very positive. In all cases use case 1 was seen as the lower priority in terms of service development.
6.2 Library Discovery Layer vs User Environment

As outlined in 6.1, use cases 2 and 3 were seen as the priority use cases, and to offer the best opportunity to improve the user experience. However, institutions had different views on the desirability and practicality of each of these use cases as the basis for a service in this area.

6.2.1 Use case 3

Use case 3 created most interest and excitement in interviews and also at the advisory group meeting. In interviews use case 3 was described as:

- A “Brilliant concept”
- Addressing “the issue that library tool no longer the starting point for the researcher”
- The “Holy grail”

For some institutions use case 3 reflected the need to move away from traditional library discovery services, and to embed library services into a user’s workflow and working environment. Some saw this approach as opening up other opportunities such as improving the authentication/authorisation steps for users when they needed to access resources with a login, especially when working off-campus.

However, several concerns were raised in relation to this approach. These included:

- Any solution integrated into the user’s environment would have to be easy to install and “Just work”
- Any solution would need to work across all browser platforms
- One institution had a ‘must work on mobile’ policy and reported that approximately 10% of the use of their library discovery service is carried out from mobile devices
- One institution raised a concern that this approach broadly just replicates the existing OAB functionality, and didn’t add enough extra value above this

6.2.2 Use case 2

While use case 2 did not create the same excitement, some institutions saw it as the more appropriate approach. Some of the reasons given for this were:

- Integrating with existing library services meant that this would be in line with existing messaging to library users which was to use library systems/services.
- Libraries have a degree of control over the discovery environment so integrating into this environment is more straightforward than supporting software which the user downloads and installs
- Despite knowing that some users do not use the library discovery services, integration into library systems is still the most effective way of reaching the most users in a short timescale
The major reason for preferring use case 3 over use case 2 was that there are many users who use alternative discovery mechanisms (e.g. Google, Google Scholar) rather than the discovery service provided by the library.

However, even those institutions who were interested in the approach described by use case 3 were also interested in use case 2. Across the interviews there seemed to be agreement that to reach and support the maximum number of users would require the approaches described in both use cases 2 and 3.

6.3 Other relevant work

During the interviews with institutions, and other research during the project, a number of other work, mostly in the form of systems or services related to the concept of improving access to open access content, were identified. These included:

- CanaryHaz: [https://canaryhaz.com/](https://canaryhaz.com/)
  - CanaryHaz is a browser plugin for the Chrome web browser that aims to help users access PDFs of journal articles through “university library subscriptions, pre-print servers, institutional repositories, private blogs….” Alongside this CanaryHaz also offers the ability to store a copy of each PDF for ease of future access.

- Increasing number of open access sources in discovery layers
  - While ensuring users were aware of open access versions of content was still seen as a challenge, several libraries noted that their discovery systems were increasingly indexing open access sources and so improving the availability of open access content. Two of the major library discovery services used in UK HE have a list of which open access sources are included:
    - Primo: [https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/@api/deki/files/53344/Primo_Central_Index_Open_Access_Collection_List_%5BApr_2017%5D.pdf](https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/@api/deki/files/53344/Primo_Central_Index_Open_Access_Collection_List_%5BApr_2017%5D.pdf)
    - 360 Link: [https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/360_Services/360_Link/0Product_Documentation/Overview/360_Link_with_IEDL%3A_Open_Access_Lookup_Service_Integration](https://knowledge.exlibrisgroup.com/360_Services/360_Link/0Product_Documentation/Overview/360_Link_with_IEDL%3A_Open_Access_Lookup_Service_Integration)

- Lean Library: [https://www.leanlibrary.com](https://www.leanlibrary.com)
  - This is a browser extension that seeks to bring the library into the user’s environment (as in use case 3). It originated through work at the Univerity of Utrecht which developed UU Easy Access Browser extension. The extension includes, but does not have a specific focus on providing access to open access content. The extension also includes functionality such as directing users to subscribed resources and to proxied URLs for content to avoid authentication challenges.

- Project Magellan, British Library

---

13 [https://www.leanlibrary.com](https://www.leanlibrary.com)
- Project Magellan’s aim is to discover and serve users OA content wherever possible. It will do this by combining the OAB and other tools and approaches with federated search.
- Torsten Reimer, Head of Research Services at the British Library has described the potential outcome of Project Magellan to "embed OA content in document supply and discovery systems – potentially as service offer for other libraries.”

**Unpaywall and the oadoi:** [http://unpaywall.org/](http://unpaywall.org/) and [https://oadoi.org](https://oadoi.org)

- Unpaywall is a browser extension for Chrome and Firefox which seeks to provide access to published items that are available through open access. The database of open access content underlying the Unpaywall browser extension is 'oadoi'.
- Alongside the Unpaywall browser extension oadoi also offers an integration with the SFX Link Resolver which provides integration into the library discovery environment for those libraries using SFX.

**Sci-Hub**

- Sci-Hub is a controversial service which provides access to tens of millions of papers (not restricted to open access content) without charge. Sci-Hub has been the subject of legal complaints from multiple publishers alleging copyright infringement. On 21st June 2017 Elsevier were awarded US$15 million in damages for copyright infringement by Sci-Hub (and related sites).
- Sci-Hub claims to use donated library credentials of contributors to circumvent publishers’ paywalls and thus download large amounts of content.
- Despite reports of the widespread use of Sci-Hub, a paper given at the Association of College & Research Libraries 2017 conference reported on the potential impact of Sci-Hub on Inter-library loans and found "Using the limited data we were able to obtain from cooperating university libraries, we failed to find an effect of Sci-Hub downloads on interlibrary loan demand in the United States and Canada".

---

14 [https://www.slideshare.net/TorstenReimer/everything-available-the-strategy-for-the-british-librarys-research-services](https://www.slideshare.net/TorstenReimer/everything-available-the-strategy-for-the-british-librarys-research-services)

15 oadoi is also used by the OAB (in conjunction with other databases of open access content)


17 SFX, sold by Ex Libris, is commonly used in conjunction with Primo, although it can be used with other library discovery services and one library interviewed used SFX with their EBSCO Discovery Service solution


6.4 Other concerns

During the interviews institutions raised some concerns that apply across the various use cases. The concerns raised by more than one institution related to users’ appreciation of the mechanisms they were able to access content. There were two key points in relation to these concerns:

- Users’ understanding of different versions of papers, and whether they would understand (or care) that they might be accessing a version of a paper that was not the final published version
- Users’ understand that access to items was being provided by the library/institution (this concern was raised both in the context of providing access to subscribed resources and open access versions)

There were no clear solutions proposed to these issues by the institutions interviewed. In general there was some uncertainty expressed as to whether the right approach was to simply provide access as seamlessly as possible, or whether it was better to insert into the users' view information about what they were accessing (in terms of version) and how that access was being provided. Workpackage 2 will consider these issues in the detailed case studies.

7.0 Author Request functionality

As noted in 2.0 above, the option to make a request for an author to deposit an open access version of a publication (where one is not already available) is part of the current Open Access Button functionality. Alongside the discussion of the potential integration of the OAB into the Discovery to Delivery process, 7 of the interviewed institutions were also asked their views on the potential of integrating this ‘author request’ functionality into institutional workflows, with the request mentioning that a researcher from a particular institution wanted to access the item.

Views on this idea were broadly the same across all 7 institutions who expressed a view:

- This would make most sense integrated with the ILL request process
- Any request for an author to deposit an open access version should happen in parallel with the normal ILL process, as the outcome of a request to an author would always be uncertain
- By only making requests to authors where a user had already decided to make an ILL request the number of requests going to authors would be kept to a reasonable level and would reflect a definite and considered need for the user to access the item
- There were no particular concerns expressed in terms of the institution’s name being included in any request to the author to deposit an open access version of an item, although one institution felt that it might be better if such requests came from a centralised service working across all UK universities
- Some institutions noted that there was an overlap with the ‘request a copy’ functionality which some institutions already have embedded into their institutional repository solutions
8.0 ILL Statistics

The following table includes confidential statistics, and should not be shared outside the immediate project team.

Interviewed institutions were asked to supply the following data:

- Number of ILL requests processed August 2015-July 2016, split into:
  - Number of requests for articles
  - Number of requests for monographs
  - Number of requests for other materials
  - Number of FTE employed to process ILL during the same period
  - Cost of making ILL requests (i.e. just the cost of the requests, not staff time or other related costs) during the same period

Where no cost data was provided an estimated figure has been entered using costs quoted by the British Library for 2015/2016 (see 10.0 below) using the "Standard Service scanned-from-print electronic delivery" for articles and "Standard Service loan" for books. This estimate is likely to represent a maximum cost, as any use of the "Standard Service electronic source and supply" for articles or "Standard Service mail delivery" for books, would lead to a lower cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of ILL requests</th>
<th>FTE involved in ILL</th>
<th>ILL request costs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution 1</td>
<td>01/08/2015</td>
<td>31/07/2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution 2</td>
<td>01/08/2015</td>
<td>31/07/2016</td>
<td>3727</td>
<td>4912</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution 3</td>
<td>01/08/2015</td>
<td>31/07/2016</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>2903</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution 4</td>
<td>01/08/2015</td>
<td>31/07/2016</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Article figure includes book chapters. Costs estimated based on BL supply costs.
N.B. Imperial College London provided statistics in their role as a case study in Workpackage 2, but were not interviewed for this report. Also note that the number of requests explicitly includes items that were made by users but not sent off as ILL requests (e.g. due to local availability). These 'cancelled' requests have not been included in the cost estimates in this case.

9.0 List of participating institutions and advisory board

The following institutions were interviewed for this project. We would like to acknowledge their input and thank them for the time they offered to help with this project.

The institutions marked ‘*’ were asked about their views on the 'author request' aspect of OAB.

- Cardiff Metropolitan University*
- Cranfield University
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine*
- Queens University Belfast*
- University of Bath*
- University of Bristol
- University of East Anglia*
- University of East London
- University of Glasgow
The following people were members of the project advisory board. We would like to acknowledge their input and thank them for the time they offered to help with this project.

- Frances Boyle (Imperial College, London)
- Ann Rossiter (SCONUL)
- Robert Atkinson (Birkbeck, University of London / SCONUL)
- Graham Stone (Jisc)
- Torsten Reimer (British Library)
- Arthur Smith (University of Cambridge / UKCoRR)
- Christina Kamposiori (RLUK)

10.0 ILL Charges by the British Library 2015/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015/16 UK Public Good tariff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Service electronic source and supply</td>
<td>£6.00 (inc. VAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Service scanned-from-print electronic delivery</td>
<td>£9.90 (inc. VAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Service mail delivery</td>
<td>£9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Service loan</td>
<td>£13.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>