

## 2010 UK Libraries RFID Usage Survey - First Results

### Existing Users (Users)

Location	
England	102
Wales	5
Scotland	9

Type	Deployment	
	Full	Partial
University	21	26
Public	7	55
College	3	2
School	0	2

	Partial implementations						Planned for 2010					
	Less than 10%	10 and 25%	25 and 50%	50 and 75%	Over 75%	DNA	Less than 10%	10 and 25%	25 and 50%	50 and 75%	Over 75%	DNA
University	5	4	7	4	4	2	6	3	5	3	5	4
Public	23	13	8	7	4		7	11	14	10	12	1
College				2						1	1	
School		1				1		1				1

### Existing and planned users (Planners)

Use RFID for:	Users		Planners	
	Total	% of responses	Total	% of responses
S/S Loans	111	97%	58	100%
S/S Returns (no sorter)	97	85%	53	91%
S/S Renewals	91	80%	48	83%
Fines/Fees Cash	62	54%	33	57%
Borrower Management	59	52%	12	21%
Finding items	44	39%	31	53%
Inventory	31	27%	20	34%
Automated Returns	21	18%	8	14%
Automated Book Drop	14	12%	15	26%
Smart Card	10	9%	13	22%
Fines/Fees Credit Card	6	5%	8	14%
Smart Shelf	4	4%	21	36%
Fines/Fees Other	2	2%	21	36%
Automated Accessions	1	1%	9	16%

Opinions:	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Totals	
	U	P	U	P	U	P	U	P	Strongly agree / Agree	Strongly disagree / Disagree
U=Users P=Planners										
Only useful for self service	0	0	8	1	88	39	35	0	9	162
Book security is poor	3	1	30	7	77	44	17	0	41	138
CD/DVD security is poor	17	3	54	23	51	26	6	0	97	83
Privacy is an issue	0	0	8	7	98	43	22	0	15	163
Standards don't matter	0	3	8	2	69	27	51	0	13	147
Won't use UK data model	0	1	7	0	80	30	27	0	8	137

## Why use RFID?

Answers were on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 = no importance, 5 = very important

All respondents	Reduce staff costs		Introduce self service		Improve stock control		Improve security		Other libraries already using it	
	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
1	34	21%	12	8%	10	7%	42	26%	36	23%
2	43	27%	8	6%	26	19%	47	29%	49	32%
3	39	24%	18	12%	32	23%	48	30%	55	35%
4	21	13%	30	21%	40	29%	17	11%	13	8%
5	25	15%	77	53%	31	22%	7	4%	2	1%
<b>Total number of answers</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Users</b>										
	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
1	26	20%	8	6%	9	7%	31	25%	32	27%
2	29	23%	6	5%	23	18%	35	28%	36	30%
3	26	20%	11	8%	24	19%	34	27%	37	31%
4	21	17%	30	23%	40	31%	17	14%	13	11%
5	25	20%	77	58%	31	24%	7	6%	2	2%
<b>Total number of answers</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Planners</b>										
	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
1	8	23%	4	31%	1	8%	11	30%	4	11%
2	14	40%	2	15%	3	25%	12	32%	13	37%
3	13	37%	7	54%	8	67%	14	38%	18	51%
4	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Total number of answers</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Other reasons given:**

Free staff for other duties	17
Improve customer experience	7
Extend opening hours	6
Improve existing self-service	5
Replacing existing security system	1
Staff restructuring	1
Support minimal staffing levels in new library	1

**Who are the suppliers?**

RFID	Main	Other
2CQR	6	2
3M	37	
Axiell	6	
Bibliotheca	1	4*
DTech	7	
Intellident	45	
Intrepid	1	
Plescon	1	
Telepen/Codeco	3	
DNA	9	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>6</b>

LMS	
Axiell (DS)	21
Bibliomondo	1
Civica	4
Endeavor	1
Ex Libris	10
Infor	3
Innovative	13
IS (Oxford)	1
OLIB	1
SirsiDynix	16
TALIS	34
DNA	11
<b>Totals</b>	<b>116</b>

\* also counted in D Tech figures

**...and who has implemented with whom?**

LMS/RFID Matrix**	2CQR	3M	Axiell	Biblio- theca	DTech	Intellident	Intrepid	Plescon	Telepen / Codeco
Axiell (DS)	2	3	5	3	2	8			
Bibliomondo						1			
Civica		3	1			1			
Endeavor		1							
Ex Libris	1	5				4			
Infor						2	1		
Innovative	1	11		1	1				
IS (Oxford)								1	
OLIB	1								
SirsiDynix		5		1	2	9			
TALIS	2	9			2	19			3

\*\* Some respondents did not identify both RFID and LMS supplier

**Most versatile suppliers?**

RFID	No. of LMS
3M/Intellident	7
2CQR	5
Dtech	4
Bibliotheca	3
Axiell	2
Intrepid / Plescon / Telepen/Codeco	1

LMS	No. of RFID
Axiell (DS)	6
TALIS	5
Innovative	4
SirsiDynix	4
Civica	3
Ex Libris	3
Infor	2
Bibliomondo	1
Endeavor	1
IS (Oxford)	1
OLIB	1

Other providers using RFID	
SmartSM	8
Envisionware	1

## How reliable?

(All responses from existing users)

	Unusable	Poor	Adequate	Very reliable	Not applicable	DNA
Self-service kiosks	0	4	34	85	5	26
Automated book dispenser	0	1	4	0	106	43
Automated returns sorter	0	1	18	5	93	37
Automated drop	1	2	8	4	0	139
Gates - EM/RFID books	2	7	18	5	0	122
Gates - EM/RFID CD/DVDs	2	8	45	3	0	96
Gates - RFID only - books	2	4	40	37	0	71
Gates - RFID only - CD/DVDs	8	15	28	22	0	81
SM device	11	13	33	14	47	36
Smart shelf	0	0	0	1	0	153
Accessions unit	0	1	40	3	0	110
Smart display	0	2	0	0	0	152
Cash payment	0	11	37	19	0	87
Red Tag	0	0	0	1	0	0
Tagging unit	0	0	0	1	0	0
Staff workstation	0	0	2	0	0	0
Smartgate manager	0	0	1	0	0	0

## Who tagged the stock?

	No.	%
Staff	87	75%
Students	15	13%
Volunteers	7	6%
Commercial company	27	23%

Some libraries used these resources in combination

## CD/DVD Management

	No.	%
Discs are tagged	30	26%
Book tags used on jewel cases	46	40%
Disc matches cases	8	7%
Special packaging	6	5%
Safers	28	24%
"Set" data is used	16	14%
Lockable boxes	30	26%
Dispensers	0	0%
No security	12	10.3%

## ...and what was tagged?

	No.	%
Books	104	89.7%
DVDs	87	75.0%
CDs	78	67.2%
Other AV	55	47.4%
Musical scores	25	21.6%
Pamphlets	22	19.0%
Antiquarian	6	5.2%
Journals	4	3.4%
Artefacts	3	2.6%
Manuscripts	1	0.9%

## Still using EM?

Yes	30
No	66
Did not answer	20

## Who helps?

	No help at all	Not very helpful	Adequate	Very Helpful	DNA
LMS	3	53	77	29	82
RFID	1	11	89	79	64
CILIP	6	24	104	41	69
BIC	11	19	68	52	94
LIB-RFID	4	6	49	107	78
Trade Literature	6	20	95	18	105
Library Literature	2	20	111	32	79
Internet Blogs	7	16	77	54	90
Internet resources	3	15	91	34	101
Colleagues	2	2	42	128	70

## Other sources of assistance:

CILIP Conference	2
Martin Palmer's book	1
Intelligent customer forums	1
NAG Conference	1