THE CURL-CoFoR PROJECT
December 2002 – August 2004

FINAL REPORT
of the Project Management Team

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

BASEES British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies
CCM   collaborative collection management
COCOREES   Collaborative Collection Management Project for Russian and East European Studies (RSLP, 1999-2002)
CoFoR Collaboration For Research project (2002-2004)
COSEELIS Council for Slavonic and East European Libraries and Information Services
CURL Consortium of University Research Libraries
REES Russian and East European Studies
RSLG   Research Support Libraries Group (2001-2003)
RSLP Research Support Libraries Programme (1998-2002)

1. Project Background

The CoFoR (Collaboration For Research) project was set up by the CURL Board in 2002, on the recommendation of CURL's Resource Management Task Force, as part of its strategy to take forward work on collaborative collection management (CCM) among UK research libraries which would build on the experience of the Research Support Libraries Programme (RSLP, 1999-2002). CURL took particular account of the views of the Research Support Libraries Group, which followed up the RSLP findings by recommending the formation of a Research Libraries Network (RLN) to give policy direction to library provision for research in the UK[1]; and of the RSLP-funded study on barriers to resource sharing in libraries[2].

The project was conceived as a platform for testing – beyond the pilot stage – the practicability of a CCM scheme as applied to libraries supporting a specific field of research; and as a means of generating from this experience (if successful) a set of tools that could be used to extend CCM to other subjects. The RSLP's COCOREES project for CCM in Russian and East European Studies was seen as a successful initiative which could offer a suitable foundation for these purposes. In consultation with the Res Man Task Force, the COCOREES Management Team prepared a proposal for this successor project which was accepted by the CURL Board in October 2002. This *Final Report* covers the work of the project as originally funded by CURL from December 2002 to August 2004, but reference is also made to the Transition Period which has followed it (*see 18 below*).

2. Deliverables

The agreed deliverables were as follows:

1. Tested and agreed procedures and tools (templates, policy guidelines, procedural recommendations, etc.) to facilitate:
   - Collaborative acquisition, with the aims of expanding the range of research resources available in the UK and making more effective use of resources currently held.
   - Collaborative retention, with the aim of ensuring that research resources in the UK are preserved and kept accessible.
   - Deduplication of serials (with special reference to the treatment of lesser-used backruns, and to digitisation and other forms of surrogacy), in the interests of ensuring suitable coverage while freeing funding for other acquisitions.
2. Methodologies for:
   - Mapping relationships between research activity and library provision, to improve linkage between research planning and the library resources that underpin it.
   - Ascertaining the costs, potential savings and other benefits of CCM activity.
   - Identifying the effects of CCM initiatives, in terms of improvements in the availability of research resources and access to them.
3. Maintenance and expansion of the COCOREES database service of collection descriptions, serials listings and other information, to underpin and inform 1 and 2 above, and to continue the service offered to REES researchers.

All deliverables were to have REES materials as their subject matter, and academic REES research as their primary object of support; but it was fundamental to the project that the outcomes should be delivered in forms that allowed wider subject applicability.

Issues and Comments. In the course of the project, the deliverables coalesced around three main foci of activity:

1. Negotiating and setting up a ten-year agreement with partner libraries on retention, transfer and acquisition for REES (*see 9*).

2. Producing a Toolkit of model documents and guidance notes, derived from CoFoR's experience, to facilitate the extension of CCM to other subjects (*see 10*).
3. Turning the serial holdings data inherited from COCOREES into a workable vehicle for the deduplication, retention and transfer of serials (*see 11*).

On the delivery of other commitments, *see* sections 16 on consortial acquisition, 12 on research mapping, and 13 on monitoring costs and benefits.

3. The COCOREES Inheritance

CURL-CoFoR was not conceived as a mere extension of the COCOREES project, but it did incorporate the further development of several COCOREES initiatives. The principal products of COCOREES were:

- A searchable set of descriptions for research collections in REES in 80 UK libraries.
- A searchable location list of REES serials held in 52 UK libraries, recording holdings of c.35,000 titles.
- Standard-format collection policy statements for partner libraries.
- A National Desiderata List of major research resources for REES to act as a basis for consortial acquisition.
- An IT infrastructure for the above, all of which were accessible on the project website at http://www.cocorees.ac.uk
- Accessions and expenditure data for REES from partner libraries.
- Four interim reports[3-6], and the *Final Report*[7].

Issues and Comments. CURL-CoFoR benefitted greatly from this legacy of data about the UK library resources with which it was engaged, as well as from the experience of area/subject-specialised IT development work. There has also been the advantage of continuity in personnel. All four members of the COCOREES Management Team, including the Project Manager, joined the new Management Team, and both Project Officers also transferred to CURL-CoFoR. Very importantly, all twelve libraries participating in COCOREES agreed to become CoFoR partners.

4. Supervision, Consultation and Reporting

The project was carried out under the supervision of CURL's Resource Management Task Force, through which the CoFoR Management Team reported to the CURL Board. Progress reports were provided in advance of every Task Force and Board meeting, and a presentation was given to the CURL Members' Meeting in Dublin in March 2004. Liaison with partner libraries was maintained through designated staff contacts, and a meeting of partner representatives was held at Birmingham in July 2003. The Committee of BASEES (the principal academic association in REES) acted as academic consultants to the project, and the Committee of COSEELIS as professional consultants. Both received reports from the Management Team and took an active part in the project.

Issues and Comments. The project's status, and its acceptability to partners and potential partners (quite apart from its financial viability), were crucially dependent on CURL's sponsorship and on its explicit endorsement of the project as an expression of CURL's determination to lead from the front in developing CCM for the benefit of HE research. The CoFoR experience indicates that a more casual or self-determined agreement between partners will not work, and that it is important to involve an authoritative supervisory agency. Similarly, the early and continuing involvement of relevant scholarly associations, such as BASEES, not only lend

academic credibility to a CCM scheme but also offer opportunities for dialogue with researchers and cooperation over data collection.

5. Management Team

The CoFoR Management Team consisted of:

- *Project Director*: Jill Russell, Academic Support Team Manager, University of Birmingham Information Services (for CURL Res Man Task Force).
- *Project Manager*: Gregory Walker, formerly Head of Collection Development, Bodleian Library, and former Project Head, COCOREES.
- Marie-Pierre Détraz, CURL Executive Secretary.
- Ron Hogg, Head of Slavonic, Eastern & Central European Acquisitions, British Library, Boston Spa.
- Tania Konn-Roberts, Head of Russian and East European Collections, Glasgow University Library.
- Lesley Pitman, Librarian and Director of Information Services, SSEES (UCL) and Chair of COSEELIS.
- Christine Thomas, Head of Slavonic and East European Collections, British Library, and former Chair of COSEELIS.

Issues and Comments. It proved possible to conduct much of the Management Team's business by email and telephone, but four full Team meetings were held over the 21 months, primarily to settle policy on major issues.

6. Project Staff

The project staff consisted of a part-time Project Manager (Gregory Walker, based in Oxford) and two part-time posts of Project Officer:

- At SSEES Library (UCL), dealing with the development and maintenance of the project's IT infrastructure. Held by Alex Kovalenko throughout.
- At Glasgow University Library, dealing principally with data collection and input, and the development of relational databases. Held by Katia Rogatchevskaia December 2002 to March 2003, then by Vera MacKay April 2003 to February 2004.

Issues and Comments. The Project Manager maintained contact with both Project Officers, but it was essential for their effective deployment that a member of the Management Team located on the same premises – and closely familiar with their mission and priorities – should act as their line manager and directly supervise their work. This function was assumed by Lesley Pitman and Tania Konn-Roberts respectively.

7. Partner Libraries and Associates

All twelve libraries taking part in the COCOREES project agreed to become partners in CoFoR. Eight further libraries joined by invitation. Two other libraries (non-HEFCE-funded), which were unable to give the undertakings expected of full partners, accepted associate status.

Partners in the earlier RSLP COCOREES project are marked with an asterisk.

Birmingham University Information Services*
Bodleian Library, University of Oxford*
Bradford University Library
Bristol University Library
British Library*
Brotherton Library, University of Leeds*
Cambridge University Library*
Durham University Library
Edinburgh University Library
Essex University Library*
Glasgow University Library*
John Rylands University Library of Manchester
London School of Economics Library*
National Library of Scotland*
Nottingham University Library*
The Polish Library, London*
Royal Institute of International Affairs
School of Slavonic & East European Studies Library (University College London)*
Scott Polar Research Institute Library, University of Cambridge
Taylor Institution Library, University of Oxford

Associated Institutions
Russian and Eurasian Studies Centre, St Antony's College, Oxford
Society for Cooperation in Russian and Soviet Studies, London

Issues and Comments. The twenty libraries created a partnership that brought together the majority of substantial REES research collections in the UK. This was more than adequate as a 'critical mass' (even allowing for the possibility of one or more withdrawals – *see 9*) to serve as a basis for setting up a ten-year Agreement which provided a satisfactory degree of subject and country coverage for retention and transfers. It also appeared to carry enough weight to conduct negotiations on consortial acquisition, but experience may have proved otherwise (*see 16*).

In addition, the serials deduplication project encompassed many libraries outside the partnership. The partnership deliberately included several libraries which had important REES collections but which were not members of CURL and/or fell outside the HE or national library sectors. Experience suggests that this has been beneficial. It has underlined the value of specialist independent libraries to research, and has enabled the five non-CURL partners to contribute records of their research holdings to COPAC (*see 15*).

8. Funding, Resources and Expenditure
CURL provided funding of £66,954 to cover fees and salaries for the Project Manager and the two Project Officers; additional and replacement computer hardware; and travel and meeting costs. The British Library provided staff resources and other facilities for the serials deduplication subproject. The School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library (UCL) hosted the project web server as well as providing accommodation and facilities for one Project Officer; Glasgow University Library did the same for the second Project Officer, and Oxford University Library Services for the Project Manager. The CURL Secretariat supplied administrative and accounting services. The BL, UCL, Glasgow UL Birmingham UL all allowed members of their staff to give time to the work of the Management Team.

At 31st August 2004 an estimated unspent balance of £11,691 remained. This was due primarily to spending on fees and salaries being lower than projected (*see Appendix*). This balance was included in costings for the subsequent Transition period (*see 18*).

Issues and Comments. A project on this scale, combining several distinct approaches to the development of CCM, would have been impossible without the very substantial contributions in kind which several partner libraries added to CURL's sponsorship. One of the main concerns of the Transition Period will be the assessment of CCM costs (including these 'hidden' contributions in kind) in the longer term, in the light of the use made of funding to date (*see 18*).

9. The Ten-Year Partnership Agreement and Allocation Scheme

Following a period of consultations with individual partners and the circulation of four discussion papers, partner representatives met in July 2003 to consider the draft of a ten-year commitment. Detailed planning for a scheme of allocated responsibilities – an essential component to the Agreement – was carried out between September 2003 and January 2004. In February 2004 the final text of the Agreement, together with a draft version of the full allocation scheme, was sent to all partner libraries with an invitation from the Chair of the CURL Board to join the ten-year partnership. By 31st August 2004 all but three of the twenty partner libraries had signed the Agreement. Discussions were still in progress with Durham and Edinburgh ULs, and with Oxford University Library Services regarding the Taylor Institution Library.

It was clear from the outset that a properly-targeted scheme of commitments for CCM would be impossible without reliable and up-to-date information about libraries' holdings and collecting, and about the research activities that they were supporting. In designing the scheme, the principle of working with the grain of libraries' existing policies and commitments was strictly followed, taking full account of the strong points in existing holdings, current policies on acquisition and retention, present levels of expenditure, and the character of the research being supported. Partners were not asked to increase the existing scale of their acquisitions, nor to extend their acquisition into subjects or areas not covered by their current collecting policies, but to target an element of their existing resources into areas covered by the scheme, and to use the scheme as an enabling framework for making local decisions. The scheme made use of the following factual and quantitative data:

- The subject/country coverage of partner libraries' existing REES stock, including special strengths, updated from the COCOREES collection descriptions.
- The subject/country coverage of partners' current collecting policies for REES, updated from the COCOREES statements, including specialisations and academic levels catered for.
- The volume of current and recent REES acquisitions, including the number of current REES serial titles, as supplied by partner libraries.
- Expenditure on current and recent REES acquisitions, as supplied by partner libraries.
- Libraries' policy statements on retention of stock.
- The profiles of academic research in REES at each partner library's home institution, derived from CoFoR's research mapping exercise (*see 12*).
- Commitments may be reviewed in the light of data from the serials deduplication exercise when available (*see 11*).

Issues and Comments. This Agreement, and its associated scheme of commitments, are the first example in the UK of long-term planning for CCM which embraces the great majority of leading research collections in a given field and draws them into a

set of common undertakings. All the partner libraries signing the Agreement have given undertakings on the retention or planned transfer of REES research materials for the full ten-year period; and all except one have committed themselves to accepting for the same period (subject to agreed safeguards) appropriate research materials in designated fields which other partners may wish to pass on. Six partners have identified one or more fields of research for the targeted buildup of support by transfers.

On the other hand, while commitments on the maintenance of REES serial subscriptions still await the findings of the deduplication exercise (*see 11*), only twelve partners have so far been prepared to give any formal undertaking to maintain acquisition levels in specified subjects or areas, even for a period shorter than ten years. Given the rapid changes in research direction and uncertainties about longer-term funding, it is not surprising that many libraries are unwilling to risk any apparent rigidities in acquisition that might stand in the way of their responding to the immediate requirements of their home institution; and the future planning of CCM will have to come to terms with partners' priorities in this respect (*see also the General Comments in 19*).

The Agreement itself provides no additional funding for partner libraries' acquisitions. Each partner library is expected to meet the costs arising from its own commitments to the scheme as an integral part of responsible collection management, and to refer to the scheme when making difficult local decisions about, e.g., cancellations and disposals. Partners will retain in their own budgets any savings made by the operation of the scheme. However, the partnership offers the opportunity, and a large body of data, to identify libraries' needs for special funding in REES, and a platform from which to present cases and support applications to fundholders.

During the Transition Period the Management Team will consider inviting a further limited number of libraries – identified as holding REES material complementary to the collections of existing partners – to join the Agreement.

10. **Toolkit for Collaborative Collection Management**

The Toolkit, which drew extensively on experience with all aspects of the project, was prepared on the following assumptions:

- That it should lend itself to endorsement by CURL as a standard set of model documents and procedures, subject to consideration and possible amendment by the Resource Management Task Force and the CURL Board.
- That it should give those groups and libraries considering a collaborative collection management scheme a grasp of the principles and policy issues underlying a CCM operation, as well as practical guidance and examples for setting up and running a scheme.
- That it should be designed for dissemination as part of a wider initiative, whether by CURL or RLN, to promote CCM for the support of academic research in the UK.

The Toolkit was submitted for the consideration of the Res Man Task Force on 14th September 2004. It is 69 pages long and consists of an Implementation Guide, five model documents (partnership agreement, allocation scheme, collection policy statement, transfer procedures, and terms of reference and job descriptions), and seven sets of Guidance Notes (finance and assessment, research mapping, serials listing and deduplication, collection description, data collection, retention policy, and consortial acquisition). The notes on retention policy draw heavily on the work of the CURL-BL Working Party on Retention (1998-99).

Issues and Comments. So far as is known, the Toolkit is the first example of an interrelated set of documents designed to initiate and support CCM schemes in research libraries, based on practical experience involving a large number of institutions. There has been a high degree of consensus within the Management Team over the Toolkit's content and presentation, but it will be important for any future use to be monitored and for feedback to be provided. Decisions on any revision, and on the future use of the Toolkit, will of course rest with the Task Force and the CURL Board.

11. Serials Listing and Deduplication

This subproject, managed by Ron Hogg at BL Boston Spa, began by examining mechanisms for identifying duplicates from the REES serials location database compiled by COCOREES[8]. The total number of sets listed in the database is 58,779, representing c. 35,000 titles in 52 UK libraries. Work then turned to producing matching lists for any two (or more) libraries which showed duplication with each other. With 52 contributing libraries, the massive amount of sorting required proved by November 2003 to be very slow and showed up some software problems. By March 2004 an initial listing of unique title holdings was produced, as well as a draft document on deduplication methodology. However, in May 2004 a problem of 'false uniqueness' was identified, caused by duplication within institutions, necessitating manual intervention to eliminate it. This work showed a 'uniqueness level' of 59.85%, meaning that almost 60% of the sets held by the contributing libraries are unique to that library. In September 2004 adequately user-friendly lists of unique holdings were produced. Plans for the Transition Period to July 2005 include the practical application of deduplication methodology on the basis of these listings.

Issues and Comments. Experience with this subproject (including the work done previously under COCOREES) has demonstrated the high level of resources needed to prepare an entirely new national serials listing for a major field of study. The editing of data supplied by libraries was deliberately light, but the clearing up of mismatches caused by differences in transliteration schemes and choice of headings necessitated a great deal of manual intervention. While REES may prove to be a fairly extreme case in this respect, it may still be the case that the cost of comparable serial listings for other subjects (which should include the cost of regular updating) will prove to be prohibitive unless they can be sponsored as separate projects or carried out as contributions to a larger national serials record.

12. Research Mapping

The scheme of commitments gave first priority to the strengthening of REES collections directly supporting research in partner libraries' home institutions, especially where special strengths of potential national significance were being developed to underpin local academic initiatives. This approach was intended to gain maximum credibility with researchers as well as approval, support and input from our academic advisors in BASEES. It required a detailed awareness of universities' current research activity as well as of libraries' holdings and collecting policies. The project therefore included a research mapping exercise to gather information on REES research throughout the UK, and to report on the value of the findings and the effectiveness of the techniques used.

The exercise had the enthusiastic support of BASEES, which arranged an e-mailed questionnaire to their members (who include most academic REES researchers in the UK) in February 2003. This was supplemented by a thorough trawl of university and department websites as well as of published reference works, most of it carried out by the Project Officer in Glasgow, Vera MacKay. The result is thought to be the most comprehensive survey of British research in REES ever produced, with information from nearly 100 institutions on research projects, departmental structures, staffing and postgraduate programmes. Besides proving to be a vital input to CoFoR's CCM scheme, the survey's findings helped to support BASEES' successful application to the Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB) for ring-fenced doctoral funding for REES. BASEES has invited CoFoR to submit proposals for further collaboration on research mapping (*See 18*). The project's experience has been extensively drawn on in producing a detailed Guidance Note for the Toolkit.

Issues and Comments. The project has again been first in the field with a research mapping exercise set up to inform a CCM scheme of commitments. The highly varied subject-matter and wide distribution of REES research in the UK made data collection a time-consuming process, generating a database recording over 800 distinct research topics in nearly 100 institutions. Mapping research in all relevant UK institutions, rather than in those of partner libraries only, secured a much fuller picture of the national research effort and identified further potential partner libraries. The information enabled libraries' CCM commitments to be selected and adjusted with a much greater degree of precision and confidence than would otherwise have been possible.

Experimental work was done during 2003 by VMcK and AK, under GW's direction, on the feasibility of showing the effectiveness of library support for research by relating the research mapping findings to the existing COCOREES collection descriptions within a single database. This proved unproductive, principally because the level of detail in collection descriptions was too broad, and the range of subject headings too limited, to be linked accurately to the research map.

13. Monitoring, Costs and Benefits

An essential component of CURL-CoFoR has been the development of procedures to monitor the effects of the Partnership Agreement in terms of costs, savings and other benefits, in a form applicable to other CCM schemes. A range of cost and benefit elements has been identified, and the Agreement commits partner libraries and the scheme management to providing the necessary data in a standard format, covering:

- ***Costs:*** startup planning and implementation; administration, monitoring and review over life of scheme; planning, creation and maintenance of supporting databases; costs of transferring material under the scheme.
- ***Savings and other benefits:*** savings from purchases no longer made; reduction in cost of purchases achieved by consortial negotiation; reduction in overheads due to giving up collection and/or retention responsibilities; protection against loss of unique research material from the UK; new purchases made possible by savings achieved; access to new resources gained through consortial negotiation; improved awareness of location and nature of research resources.

The monitoring procedures will be implemented during the Transition Period, as the Agreement comes into effect, and will be reported on at the end of that period. The project's work on this to date has been incorporated into Toolkit Item 7, Finance and Assessment Guidance Notes.

Issues and Comments. The findings from these procedures will be crucial in evaluating the viability of CCM in the longer term and in judging the applicability of the procedures developed by CoFoR to other subjects. Implementation is central to the work planned for the Transition Period (*see 18*).

14. IT Infrastructure and Website

The project was committed to maintaining the former COCOREES website as a service for REES researchers as well as a communication and reference tool for partner libraries and the Management Team. Design changes were made to reflect the new name and sponsor, and project news and a document archive were added to the existing databases (collection descriptions, serial locations and the National Desiderata List). Slow search times caused concern, and by June 2004 Alex Kovalenko had successfully migrated the databases to new MYSQL relational database software using PHP programming language, making searching much faster and allowing easier updating. A new web server, included in the project budget, was acquired and installed in September 2004.

The site was made available for other relevant resources, and in June 2004 it became host to the BL's new listings of its Russian and Polish 'alternative' and independent press holdings, a total of 3,169 titles. Data for other partner libraries, notably SSEES and the Bodleian, will follow.

Issues and Comments. The project confirmed that it is essential for CCM software to conform to common standards in order to allow interoperability with other systems and the export of data in multiple formats.

Throughout the project the site was serving two distinct constituencies – academic researchers concerned with data on collections and holdings; and librarians looking for documentation on CoFoR and CCM generally. The Management Team will be consulting COSEELIS and BASEES during the Transition Period to consider the possible separation of these functions (perhaps through utilisation of the COSEELIS website), and to prepare recommendations on the future of the site.

15. COPAC Access

The project represented specialist libraries' concerns, as well as researchers' interests, in raising the question of opening COPAC to the research holdings of non-CURL member libraries. After the CURL Board agreed to this in principle early in 2004, all five non-CURL partners in CoFoR expressed an interest in contributing records to COPAC. MIMAS has agreed to upload the data, with the costs to be covered by CURL.

Issues and Comments. This action illustrates the utility of a subject- or area-specialised CCM scheme as a channel for articulating its partners' common interests and as a platform from which action can be taken to pursue them.

16. National Desiderata List and Consortial Acquisition

After consultation with partner libraries, and drawing on the findings of the research mapping email shot (*see 12*), a shortlist of nine high-priority research resources was compiled from the 59 products on the COCOREES National Desiderata List.

Exploratory negotiations were begun with ProQuest and Thomson Gale in April 2003, and resulted in proposals which were put to partners but found no response; nor did a revised proposal from Thomson Gale in December 2003. Proposals from East View were circulated and discussed with their representative in June 2004, and some of these are now being taken up by individual partner libraries.

Issues and Comments. The limited takeup of suppliers' proposals is probably due to a combination of factors, of which the principal are:

- Only a minority of partners can – in present financial circumstances – afford to participate in the acquisition of major research resources, even at discounted prices.
- In some cases at least, suppliers' offers have translated into prices no lower than individual libraries are already paying.
- The administrative costs of switching suppliers may outweigh any savings made on subscription rates.

The National Desiderata List will be updated during the Transition Period, and partners will be consulted over a revised shortlist as a basis for further approaches to suppliers. It should be noted that such approaches are not intended as substitutes for JISC's negotiations with e-publishers under its Collections programme, but as a specialised complement to it. JISC has confirmed its willingness to consider recommendations from CoFoR for products to be included in the programme.

17. Publicity
Accounts of the project have been published as follows:

- Gregory Walker, 'CURL-CoFoR: Tooling up for Collaborative Collection Management', *ASSIGNation*, 20(4), July 2003, pp. 41-43.
- Gregory Walker and Jan Wilkinson, 'A Toolkit for Collaborative Collection Management', *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 9, 2003, pp. 59-69.
- Gregory Walker, 'Give Us the Tools', *Against the Grain*, 16(3), June 2004, pp. 18-24.
- Ron Hogg, article on CoFoR for the Russian journal *Bibliografiia*, forthcoming 2005.

Reports on progress have also been placed in the newsletters of BASEES and COSEELIS.

18. Exit Strategy and Transition Period
In July 2004 the Management Team, with the support of the Res Man Task Force, recommended an exit strategy to the CURL Board. This envisaged a level of ongoing support to maintain the momentum of work on CCM, pending the emergence of a clearer picture of the roles of the RLN and CURL in national provision and collaboration. The Board agreed continue its support of CCM activity in the following areas for a further 11 months to 31st July 2005:

1. Administration and monitoring of the CoFoR-REES partnership agreement to ensure its effective implementation;
2. Establishment of recurrent costs and longer-term assessment of benefits;
3. Technical support and maintenance for the server hosting the serials and collection description databases, collection management information, research mapping data and project documents;
4. Administration and maintenance of the REES serials listings which underpin CoFoR's retention, de-duplication and transfer operations;
5. Updating the research mapping data to allow adaptation of the scheme's coverage to changes in the subject-matter and location of research. BASEES has invited proposals from CoFoR for collaboration on this.

The CoFoR staff for this period has been reduced to a part-time Administrator (Gregory Walker in Oxford) and a part-time Technical Support Officer (Alex

Kovalenko at UCL). The Management Team and the existing professional and academic advisory bodies remain in being. Support from the BL, SSEES(UCL), Glasgow, Birmingham and Oxford, has been generously extended for this period.

19. General Comments

The RSLP report on barriers to resource sharing[2] defines 'deep resource sharing' as joint working in which institutional autonomy in provision is to some extent surrendered, and which involves some degree of risk – 'risk' being understood as the extent of one library's dependence on one or more other libraries to provide resources for which it would otherwise have to take responsibility itself.

The CoFoR-REES Agreement enables, but does not impose, deep resource sharing in this sense. On the strength of other partners' undertakings and subject to its own assigned commitments, a library can decide, but is not obliged, to transfer or discard material, to cancel subscriptions or to stop collecting in fields of its choice. The Agreement does not claim primacy over a library's obligations towards the research effort of its home institution; but CoFoR is the first CCM scheme systematically to tap into and correlate multiple sources of hard data, so that commitments match and reinforce individual libraries' strengths and collecting policies.

The project's experience to date shows that it is possible to construct a subject- or area-based CCM scheme and present it in a form that convinces the largest research libraries in the country to sign up to it for the long term. Further, in devising the Toolkit, CoFoR has looked beyond the specifics of a single field of study to a more general application of CCM practices as national policy on library support for research takes on a more definite form.

20. Acknowledgements

The project owes much of its success to the work of its staff: Gregory Walker, Alex Kovalenko, Vera MacKay and Katia Rogatchevskaia. The Management Team gratefully acknowledges the support and advice given by CURL's Board, its Resource Management Task Force and its Secretariat; and the staff time and other resources in kind contributed by partner libraries. Our thanks are also due to Ann Chapman at Collection Description Focus (UKOLN) for help over collection description standards; to the British Library's Contracts Section for advice on the wording of the Partnership Agreement; and to BASEES's Information Officer, Dr Birgit Beumers, for her work on the research mapping exercise.

References

1. Research Support Libraries Group, *Final Report.* 2003. (The report mentions CURL's initiative in setting up CoFoR on pp. 37-38.)
2. *Barriers to Resource Sharing among Higher Education Libraries. A Report to the RSLP.* 2002.
3. Gregory Walker, *Collection-Level Resource Guidance for Research in Russian and East European Studies.* February 2000.
4. Ron Hogg, *Specialised Listings of Research Material in Russian and East European Studies.* March 2000.
5. Lesley Pitman, Tania Konn, Roman Hobler, Katia Rogatchevskaia, *A Unified Search Interface for Research Resources in Russian and East European Studies.* September 2000.
6. Gregory Walker, *Collaborative Collection Management Initiatives for Russian and East European Studies.* July 2001.
7. Collaborative Collection Management Project for Russian and East European Studies

(COCOREES), *Final Report.* December 2002.

8. Ron Hogg, 'COCOREES – a Web-based Union Catalogue as a Means of Library Cooperation and as a Collection Development Tool', in: *9th International Conference "Crimea 2002" Libraries and Associations in the Transient World: New technologies and New Forms of Cooperation. Conference Proceedings*, vol. 1 (Moscow: GPNTB, 2002). Also published electronically at: http://www.gpntb.ru/win/inter-events/crimea2002/eng/confer1.htm

APPENDIX: Summary of CoFoR Accounts, December 2002 to August 2004

Amounts are to nearest £

	Allocated	Spent to 31.8.04	Unspent 31.8.04	Notes
Project Manager	29,421	24,248	5,173	
Project Officer (SSEES)	20,962	17,778*	3,184*	*SSEES estimate
Project Officer (Glasgow)	9,346	7,564	1,782	PO on maternity leave from 02.04
Travel and meetings	2,625	2,673	(48)	
Server replacement	3,000	3,000 held over	Held over	Replaced 09.04 @ £2,200
Laptop	1,600	----	1,600	Will not be bought
TOTALS	**66,954**	**55,293**	**11,691**	

All unspent amounts have been carried over into the budget for the Transition Period to 31.07.05