



***“WHEN THE GOING GETS TOUGH,
THE TOUGH RENEGOTIATE THEIR
CONSORTIAL JOURNAL DEALS”***

Emma Cryer, Duke Medical Center Library

**Christie Degener, UNC-Chapel Hill Health Sciences
Library**

Karen Stanley Grigg, Duke Medical Center Library

TRIANGLE RESEARCH LIBRARIES NETWORK

- Collaborative organization of Duke University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina State University, and The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Licenses over 4.5 million dollars worth of content
- Electronic Resources Council- committee that oversees cooperative collections and license renegotiation
- ERC's priorities:
 - Shared content
 - Shared access
 - Principled licensing- ILL rights, SERU



EFFECTS OF GLOBAL ECONOMIC DOWNTURN

- Different levels of cuts for different schools
- Reducing total spend but wanting to maintain access to most content
- Wanting to keep consortial deals consortial, not separate by institution
- Challenges of consortial deals during harder times when base spend can't be guaranteed



NATURE

- Duke, NCSU and UNC subscribed to most Nature content via a TRLN deal
- The total cost was evenly split among the three universities although FTE counts varied widely
- Recent FTE recalculations had led to steep price increases in the previous year



NATURE

- TRLN's goal for 2010 negotiations:
 - Renew existing subscriptions (use was very high so we wanted to avoid cancellations)
 - Keep 2010 spend as close to 2009 as possible, having experienced a steep price increase for 2009
- NPG's goal for 2010 negotiations:
 - Move TRLN to a lower and more consistent consortial discount rate, e.g., 25% off list



SPRINGER

- Previous contract : Duke, NCSU and UNC had access to almost all Springer journals
- TRLN's goals for renegotiation:
 - Despite needed cuts, wanted to maintain access to as much content as possible
 - Keep annual percentage increases low and have room for some cancellations/swaps
 - To keep the deal consortial and not split off by institution
 - To simplify our license/contract with Springer



SPRINGER

- Springer's goals for 2010 negotiations :
 - While accepting our cancellations for 2010, to encourage us to keep our spend at a steady level with reasonable annual increases
 - To incentivize us to purchase more Springer products
- Three deal models, all of which offered different levels of content access and institutional collaboration



WILEY

- Previous 3-year contract : consortial shared access deal for UNC, NCSU and Duke
- Each school had their own title list but also had access to the subscribed content of the other schools, so we all had access to more than we paid for, but there was a great deal of overlap in subscribed titles



WILEY

- TRLN's goals for 2010 negotiations :
 - Since our overall cuts were not that deep (15% on average), desired ability to swap out titles while maintaining access to other schools' titles
 - Desire to keep the deal consortial and not split off by institution
 - To create a subscription model/deal that incorporated the best aspects from both the old Wiley and Blackwell models
- Wiley's goals for 2010 negotiations :
 - To see as small a drop in our base spend as possible



How successful were we with each deal?

○ Nature

- Overall, TRLN was able to keep 2010 costs about the same as 2009, without sacrificing any content
- Consortial deal changed from an aggregate FTE approach for Nature and Nature packages to individual campus FTE pricing
- The parent consortium changed from TRLN to NERL, as they had a better deal on offer
- Involved intensive effort lasting from early February through mid-October, longer than we had hoped



How successful were we with each deal?

○ Springer

- Allowed/encouraged to de-dupe our online collections by Springer and created a shared TRLN title list
- Able to maintain access to approximately 80% of Springer's total journal collection despite a significant cut in base spend
- Consortial management of the deal has not proved too onerous, but ERC approves each title add/drop
- Springer incentivized us to raise our base spend by lowering the annual percentage increase for extra money spent
- SERU agreement now used



How successful were we with each deal?

○ Wiley

- Wiley's priority was base spend, so we were allowed to dedupe the collections before we settled on our title lists
- Sadly, due to cuts and time constraints, we weren't really able to maintain a true consortial model with our Wiley deal
- We sacrificed perpetual access for access to more content with the Wiley Full Collection, similar to Elsevier's Freedom Collection
- This deal took over a year to negotiate, much longer than reasonable



Lessons Learned

- Start negotiating a little earlier. Allow plenty of time for negotiation. Perhaps a year and a half.
- The purchase order attached to the SERU agreement took just as much time/labor as a typical license, so don't necessarily view SERU as a time-saver for large package deals. Better for small publishers/packages.
- The super-collaborative model of shared collections is working well: will be piloting this model again.
- Might seek deals with other bigger consortia next time around.
- Low cancellation allowances create lack of flexibility and must negotiate for more flexibility during next round.
- Overall, TRLN was able to keep 2010 costs about the same as 2009, without sacrificing too much high-value content.
- De-duped/canceled based primarily on use, so titles that were used well by a particular school are curated by that school while other schools dropped them, based on disciplinary strengths and interests



For more information:

karen.grigg@duke.edu

<http://www.trln.org/eresource/index.htm>

