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Challenges to Cooperation

About 20 years ago, when I was a fairly young librarian working for the Research Libraries Group (RLG), a consortium of academic and research libraries, the four principles of RLG were shared collection development, shared cataloging, shared resources, and shared preservation. The RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) database, a union catalog of the holdings of members, served as the vehicle for achieving and documenting the consortium’s objectives. As an RLG Library Coordinator, one of my responsibilities was to train the staff of member libraries in the features of RLIN. I still remember vividly the comment of an Interlibrary Loan librarian at a major university who declared: “But if we put our records in RLIN, then someone from another university might borrow our books, and then they won’t be available for our students and faculty.” The tension between local needs and service to a broader community has not relaxed in the ensuing two decades despite quantum leaps in information technology that might have been expected to address some of the concerns about resource sharing.

The Association of Research Libraries, to which Cornell belongs, supports a program known as Global Resources, which promotes access to the publications of countries outside North America. In one of the Global Resources programs, the Latin Americanist Research Resources Project, participants have divided up collecting responsibilities for coverage of individual countries and have agreed to spend more resources on acquiring more items for a country in which they will specialize. Cornell, for example, collects Peruvian literature extensively, while Princeton University has agreed to collect Mexican material in greater depth. Twenty-six participating libraries have reallocated $170,000 through this process to expand resources that are collectively available. (http://www.arl.org/collect/grp) With effective resource sharing procedures, libraries should be able to borrow items they need from an enriched pool of Latin American publications. That is, the total number of Latin American publications in North America should be greater as a result of this coordinated program, and the sharing of resources is possible because of the union catalogs of OCLC and RLIN which enjoy almost universal participation in the U.S. research library community. Yet a senior collection development librarian at Cornell consistently shocks me by describing the Global Resources Program in this way: “Cornell spends money on books it doesn’t want and has less to spend on things it does want, so that we can borrow those titles from another university. How can I explain that to a faculty member researching economic conditions in Mexico?” Although I remind my colleague that the goal of the Global Resources Program is to expand the collective reach of North American research libraries and to depend on union catalogs and resource sharing to counterbalance any local deficiencies, the plain truth is that many people are uncomfortable with collaborative
enterprises because they invariably require the sacrifice and compromise. They are reluctant to cede any local authority and autonomy.

Today I’d like to examine some of the barriers to cooperation, discuss some personal experience with cooperative undertaking, and analyze the attributes of successful enterprises.

There are many factors which inhibit cooperation. These can be attitudinal, organizational, technical, or economical. Reasons for not cooperating in a group activity or buying into a basic premise for the existence of union catalogs which I have heard are:

"Our cataloging is better than Library X’s."  
(This becomes a reason not to accept “inferior” quality cataloging for copy. Not accepting copy leads to increased costs and a time lag between accession and availability.

"Our users have unique needs."  
(A reason not to standardize on a communal agreed upon standard or classification because the library fears a loss of access)

"It takes too long."  
(The process of achieving group consensus tries the patience of some.)

"It costs too much>"  
(to adhere to standards that appear to increase workload, such as a requirement that all headings are under authority control)

"It’s ok for big institutions like Cornell with a lot of resources, but our library is too small to invest in collaboration. The benefits to our small, special library are too slight."  
(You're rich, I'm poor.)

"Our library has a rich set of resources (collections, staff expertise) we’ll be sucked dry by request from all those poor little libraries."  
(I'm rich, you're poor.)

"We belong to too many consortia as it is. We’re fragmenting our capacity and building up complexity by having too many cooperative agreements."

"We’ll have more flexibility with a local system."

"Won’t I lose my job if we do this?"  
(Efficiencies resulting from collaboration threaten some librarians)

_Growth of Support for Union Catalogs in the United States_

The United States has a long (relative to the age of our nation) history of interest and support for union catalogs, and to the extent to which we have from time to time or even enduringly overcome or circumvented the objections voiced above, there has been
successful development of a union catalog. As early as 1850, the Assistant Secretary in Charge of the Library for the Smithsonian Institution proposed that a union catalog of the nation’s great libraries be created. Although this effort did not materialize, shared cataloging, one of the benefits obtained through a union catalog, was one of the fundamental underpinnings at the inception of the American Library Association in 1876. In 1901 the ability to produce multiple printed copies of the catalog card of the Library of Congress advanced the cause of shared cataloging, and the vision of Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, resulted in the creation of a union catalog of the holdings of Washington-area libraries and a second union catalog of institutions outside the US Capital. Although the primary motivation seems to have been to have access to high quality cataloging which could be reused and reduce the cost of cataloging, resource sharing, or the ability to locate a title for consultation increased in importance.

Fast forward in time to the **National Union Catalog** (NUC), a publication issued by the Library of Congress beginning in 1956. The NUC contained catalog card images and locations of hundreds of contributing libraries who mailed copies of their cataloging to Washington, where a small army of civil servants of the U.S. government inspected the cataloging, selected the best examples, performed authority control and other normalization, and published compilations of catalog holdings. The NUC became the definitive tool for catalogers seeking copy or clues on how to establish a name heading. Interlibrary Loan specialists also consulted it when searching for elusive titles.

Following the development of the MARC format in 1967, we experienced a migration from the paper union catalog represented either through interfaced cards or through card images captured in book form to online databases. OCLC exploited the MARC format in the 1970’s to achieve a transformation of libraries, building, through the contributions of its members, a database that today numbers 38 million records. OCLC's WorldCat is surely the mega union catalog of the world, with 2,000,000 new records added annually. It has enabled thousands of libraries to improve services to users, to reallocate funds from technical services to new priorities, and to serve as the basis for 87 million interlibrary loan transactions.

Participation in a consortial arrangement in which multiple organizations contribute their bibliographic records for the benefit of the larger community of users and for their own local advantage is a library "best practice" in the United States. Cornell University, for example, uses both OCLC and RLIN to locate cataloging copy, and creates original cataloging records on its local system which are added to both OCLC and RLIN for others to use as cataloging copy and for resource sharing. These contributions are not based on altruism, but rather on an economic calculation that cooperation reduces costs and improves services. It is cheaper to catalog using copy than to catalog an item originally, and a database reflecting the holdings of many institutions with reciprocal resource-sharing agreements allows libraries to invest their scarce collection development funds on more unique titles, while simultaneously delivering a wide range of materials to scholars and researchers by using a network of partners and technological tools.

*The Program for Cooperative Cataloging*

---

1 Tillett, Barbara B. "Catalog It Once for All: A History of Cooperative Cataloging in the United States Prior to 1967 (Before MARC)" in *Cooperative Cataloging: Past, Present, and Future. (Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, v. 17, no.3/4)* p. 3-38
Although contribution to and use of a union catalog database is now accepted practice, we continue to refine all aspects of our relationships and procedures. One important cooperative venture which offers insights into the nature of collaborative organizations is the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). The PCC's goal is not to create a union catalog, but to provide "more, better, faster, cheaper" cataloging. As such, it facilitates contributions to union catalogs and improves the overall effectiveness of member organizations.

To understand the PCC, you'll need a bit of history in American cooperative cataloging. I'm going to give you my personal assessment of the precursors to the PCC. Almost 30 years ago, in 1968, the Library of Congress created the CONSER program, initially a cooperative program to coordinate retrospective conversion of serial titles. Following substantial gains in the creation of a large database of serial titles and institutional holdings from approximately two dozen large research libraries, CONSER turned its attention to current and prospective titles. CONSER had the following characteristics in the early 1990's: it had a limited membership, focussed on a single format, had received significant underwriting from foundations in its early days, enjoyed financial support from OCLC in the form of credits for CONSER records added or maintained in the OCLC database and in direct support for travel by participants to annual meetings, and had sustained leadership from the Library of Congress for administrative and policy matters. Each institution had a high-level representative, often the head of technical services, on the CONSER Policy Committee and another representative often the head of serials cataloging, on the operations committee. The CONSER Policy Committee elected a chair from the membership, and this individual also chaired the CONSER Executive Committee, which was comprised of the Policy Committee representatives from the three national libraries (The Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine). OCLC, as the sponsoring organization, also belonged to the Executive Committee. This governance ensured that the Library of Congress didn't overpower member concerns. By and large, CONSER functioned extremely well, with a five-year strategic planning cycle, a full agenda of fairly meaty issues, and a clear focus on its objectives.

Not long after CONSER was established, the Library of Congress formed an organization known as NACO, the Name-Authority Co-operative. As its name reveals, NACO concentrated on the creation of personal and corporate name headings. The goal was to train libraries outside the Library of Congress to produce name authorities consistent with those established at LC. Since authority work often constituted one-third of the expense of monographic cataloging, LC administrators reasoned that the more names entered into a common database, the less work LC catalogers would have to do, resulting in savings for LC. Overall, consistency in cataloging would result, with more reliable retrieval from other databases which used NACO headings. In contrast to CONSER, NACO was a LC-controlled endeavor, with training provided by LC, exacting standards, and constant quality review. In 1992 64 libraries contributed 66,000 authority headings to the NACO file, which was mirrored at OCLC, LC, RLIN, and WLN. LC catalogers created about 120,000 headings that year. The program was subsidized by grants from the Council on Library Resources. Semi-annual meetings to update program participants on changes in practice, new members, and statistical milestones were held in conjunction with the American Library Association annual and midwinter conferences.
In 1988, the Library of Congress invited eight research libraries to be part of the National Coordinated Cataloging Program. This select group, chosen for the size and complexity of their collections and cataloging expertise, was to catalog exactly as a cataloger at the Library of Congress would catalog. Local practice was entirely subjegated to LC practice; if there were a deviation, the university librarian would create a record in one form for his or her local catalog, and then prepare a separate record for LC. From the perspective of the university partner, this routine added a layer of complexity and cost. The costs were addressed by subvention from the Council on Library Resources. University catalogers, however, chafed because LC practices were often bureaucratic and cumbersome, dictated by LC’s increasingly outdated technology. The quantity of records produced was small, although LC, an extremely modest consumer of cataloging created by other libraries, found the bibliographic records useful. LC proved the obvious: accepting catalog records created by catalogers from outside LC to exacting LC standards resulted in significant savings to LC.

When I became director for cataloging at the Library of Congress in 1992, the NCCP participants were conspiring for revolt. No one wanted to break with the motherlode of cataloging, but in hallway conversations, they railed at the restrictions placed on the, the onerous requirements and review, the lack of autonomy. Dorothy Gregor and Carol Mandel, two cataloging experts and library administrators, had published in April 1990 Library Journal an article with the imperative title: "Cataloging Must Change." They called for catalogers to exercise judgment based on principles, rather than to follow prescriptive guidelines, such as those laid out in the LC Rule Interpretations. They exhorted catalogers to trust one another and to stop redoing one another’s work. They urged the adoption of technological innovations to expedite the processing of records. Mandel addressed the Cataloging Forum of the Library of Congress in 1992 and made a case for LC to begin copy cataloging in earnest. Over the objections of many long-time catalogers, the unions, and some reference librarians, who felt the quality of LC records would be compromised by using copy from other libraries, the Cataloging Directorate began to plan for wide-spread adoption of copy cataloging. By using cataloging from other libraries in an efficient fashion, the Library of Congress was able to absorb a 15% decrease in staff and at the same time increase its cataloging output by 15%.

In November of 1992 the Library of Congress held a meeting of CONSER Policy Committee members and current and prospective NCCP participants to assess the future of NCCP. The CONSER governance structure was a possible model for the national Coordinated Cataloging Program because it was viewed as more flexible for participants and less LC-centric. I fully anticipated the demise of NCCP, but to my surprise, despite its deficiencies, those present believed strongly in the potential of cooperation for improvement in the crisis facing catalog departments across the land. Instead, we laboriously fashioned a mission statement3, and recommended that a small group be


\[\text{3 PCC Mission Statement: "In support of the need to provide access to materials in libraries' collections, the program will seek to increase the availability of unique records created under mutually acceptable standards, to facilitate the creation and use of these records, and to provide leadership in the information community."}\]
constituted to reshape the existing programs into something viable. Thus was born the Cooperative Cataloging Council (CCC), a small group comprised of representatives from the Library of Congress, OCLC, RLG, CONSER, NCCP, and a public library. The CCC developed a broad outline of what it wanted to accomplish, and established six working groups to analyze specific areas and recommend what was needed to achieve the CCC’s goals. We picked the brightest, most motivated, knowledgeable, “can-do” attitude people from around the country, told them to get themselves some other task force members, and have a report back to us in six months. They did! We simply asked them to recommend solutions to all the problems that had vexed cataloging for decades. Looking back on what we did, I can see that our fervor and our will to cooperate overcame obstacles. What we did was totally non-traditional, non-bureaucratic. If we had worked within a large organization such as the American Library Association, we might never have come to such sweeping conclusions. Instead the CCC built up momentum, and it evolved into the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. Since 1992 membership in NACO, one of the 4 programs of the PCC, has grown from 64 to 339 institutions, and the number of headings contributed to the internationally supported database has risen from 66,000 to 160,000 in five years.

What were the elements that led to success? There was a real need, almost a crisis, that galvanized us to action. All the partners were willing to compromise. The Library of Congress was undergoing a sea change in leadership, with an increasing focus on production. The definition of quality cataloging was changing to include timeliness and cost as values as well as fullness and accuracy. There were strong leaders who worked together collaboratively, rather than competitively. In most collaborative ventures, you will find a torchbearer who takes on the role of kindling support and getting endorsements. There were several champions for the PCC. We emphasized grass roots involvement, rather than a top-down, autocratic structure. For example, trainers for the Program came not only from the Library of Congress, but from member libraries as well, giving participant staff a sense of ownership in the Program and an opportunity for professional growth as well. We streamlined dramatically, paring down the Rule Interpretations at the Library of Congress and introduced the core bibliographic record, a cataloging record that was reengineered to be more economical, but still usable and authoritative. We developed technological support to automate various processes. We shared our ambitious program publicly, and we set milestones for our accomplishments, tracking them assiduously. The PCC strategic plan was mounted on the Internet for all to consult. Outreach and publicity were critical components in expanding the membership and in validating the tenets of the Program for the unconverted. Certainly it was essential to have a stable base at the Library of Congress to coordinate the activity of the PCC, but the LC staff were facilitators and coordinators, rather than controllers. The PCC made decisions in a highly consultative manner, striving for a rapid turnaround. Communication, whether among members of the Executive Committee or with operational staff, was highly valued, and email surely helped disseminate ideas and collect feedback. Another characteristic of the PCC was a simple governance structure. Financial support was extremely modest, and we wanted to avoid membership fees that might inhibit participation. The Program for Cooperative Cataloging is based on the belief, and demonstrated through objective data, that shared cataloging reduces costs as
well as improves both the quality and timeliness of access. It is, therefore, an enterprise that people can endorse because they and their users will have a definite payback in terms of service enhancements and economic benefits.

The Digital Library Federation

The Digital Library Federation (DLF) is another example of a collaborative enterprise. The DLF, originally known as the Laguardia 8, named because the idea for a group of libraries interested in working together on digital library initiatives came to life in New York's Laguardia airport, was founded to "establish the conditions for creating, maintaining, expanding, and preserving a distributed collection of digital materials accessible to scholars, students, and a wider public. The Federation is a leadership organization operating under the umbrella of the Council on Library and Information Resources. It is composed of participants who manage and operate digital libraries."  

When the DLF formally came into being in 1995, there were a dozen major university research libraries backing it, as well as support from the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, and the Commission on Preservation and Access. Eight libraries have since joined DLF, and the Research Libraries Group and OCLC are strategic allies. Federation participants each contribute a substantial sum ($25,000) to a capital fund, which is used to pay for programmatic investments, such as the commissioning of papers examining technical issues or research on particular topics, such as digital library architecture or archiving. In addition, DLF members commit funds annually ($19,000) to support the administration of the Federation. Full members have a vote on the Steering Committee, which meets three times a year, while allies have a voice, but no vote. Not only does the DLF involve a significant financial obligation for partners, but each participant also pledges to contribute staff expertise and to engage in digital library research and projects.

As a young organization, the DLF has undergone a number of changes in its short lifetime. It began as a manifesto from a group of library directors who wanted to assert that the national digital library was a distributed, open library, and who believed that collaboration on practical activities would best advance learning and scholarship and have benefits on the economics and organization of libraries. In its early stages, it had a Policy Group comprised chiefly of library directors and a Planning Task Force consisting of library staff at the deputy or associate university librarian level, often with expertise in systems. The Planning Task Force, which engaged some formidable minds, outlined key issues such as the establishment of best practices for discovery and retrieval, rights management and economic modeling, and the preservation and archiving of digital information. As the Planning Task Force grappled with these complex matters, it became apparent that it was impossible for these key individuals, who had very demanding responsibilities in their home institutions, to continue to bear the full weight of the DLF planning on their shoulders. In 1998, the DLF moved to a new model, in which a Steering Committee replaced the Policy Committee, and a permanent director was hired. The director and his staff coordinate the implementation of the DLF Strategic Plan, assist

4 http://www.clir.org/diglib/dlfhomepage.htm
the chair of the Steering Committee in setting the agenda for the organization's quarterly meetings, publicize the work of the DLF, and facilitate communication among members. As new members join, the Steering Committee becomes more unwieldy, and we are experimenting with ways to ensure that the Federation remains valuable for its partners.

With all the organizations of which Cornell University is a member, why is there a need for the Digital Library Federation? A partial list of Cornell memberships includes:

- The American Library Association
- The Association of Research Libraries
- The Center for Research Libraries
- The Coalition for Networked Information
- IFLA
- The New York State Comprehensive Research Libraries
- OCLC
- The Research Libraries Group

All of these organizations are important for Cornell University, but the DLF partners, many of whom have similar local, regional, national, and international affiliations, sought to come together as a group of institutions who shared a common interest in leading in the digital library environment. They were willing to make a significant commitment of time and money to accomplish their objectives, and they all were engaged in digital library projects on a level of depth and sophistication that would mean that they could both contribute to the understanding of issues and learn from their peers. Through the format of the DLF organization and its strategic plan, achieving these objectives seems more feasible than in the other groups to which the partners belong. Through the collaborative work of the DLF partners, DLF seeks to provide leadership for others and to connect with the segments of the other bodies to which its members belong so that we can build a distributed, interoperable, well-organized, and easily accessible collection of enduring digital works that can serve as the basis for digital libraries.

*The Cornell Library Gateway*

Collaboration does not always entail cooperation with external partners. Sometimes it can be challenging enough for different parts of a university to work together. Such was the case of the Cornell University Library in 1996. Although the name of the system of 19 libraries is the Cornell University Library, singular, the libraries have traditionally acted as a very loose federation. As one staff member summed up the relationship, a library cooperated with other units when it was to its advantage; when it did not see any benefit for its local needs or it didn't support a policy, it exercised local autonomy and followed its own course. The result was, on the positive side, opportunities for mobility, flexibility, and creativity, and on the negative side, redundancy, ineffective utilization of resources, competition, and conflict.

When I arrived at Cornell in August 1996, the senior managers of the Library had endorsed the concept of a "Single Point of Entry" to electronic resources available through the Cornell University Library. At that time there were three competing approaches, making it difficult for the library's clients to be confident that he or she was finding the Library's full array of networked databases, full text resources, or numeric
files. In the libraries supporting teaching and research in humanities and social sciences, and area studies, users accessed electronic resources through a set of launch pads and buttons that categorized materials by genre (abstract/index, electronic journal, catalog) or related the material in a complex hierarchy. This was a Cornell-developed application called "Bear Access." The Mann Library, which supports research in agricultural and the biological sciences, had developed a tool called the Mann Gateway, which was a search engine which allowed users to access networked resources by title or by keyword. A third approach, employed by some unit libraries, was to provide access through the unit library web page.

CUL's librarians, perhaps even more than our patrons, realized how ineffective and confusing this situation was. There was consensus that a common entryway to a catalog incorporating records for networked resources with embedded URL's was needed, but no agreement on the best route to achieve it. To change, even to achieve something that ultimately would offer superior service to our users, meant that all libraries would have to give up the familiar and embrace the new. It meant that we would have to do substantial reprogramming, taking valuable staff time away from other pressing system projects. It meant that staff would have to be retrained, and that we would have to update instructional routines for training users. Faculty and current students would have to learn new searching techniques. We would need to develop an extensive public relations campaign to alert library users to the changing landscape. For about a year or more, we didn't seem to be able to overcome the inertia and outright opposition to change that was manifest in the Library. In meeting after meeting of the senior managers, we encountered a stalemate, with strong advocates for one approach countered by equally strong proponents the alternative.

We proposed that classic solution: set up a committee to study and recommend a strategy for implementation of a common entryway. Although such committees can often bog down and simply become deadlocked or delay action, this group was structured to avoid these pitfalls. The ingredients for success were a small committee comprised not of representative stakeholders, but rather of trusted, respected, action-oriented librarians and a tight timetable with clear milestones. The Common Entry Committee recommended that the Cornell University Library adapt the Mann Library Gateway as the common entry to the Library's electronic resources. This was a very significant decision, because it was a tacit acknowledgment of the superiority of the Gateway over Bear Access (launch pads and buttons). What was still uncertain at the time was whether the developers of the Mann Gateway would allow modifications to their system that would make it more universal.

Although many of the Bear Access proponents were dubious that a search engine designed for scientists would work for the humanities and social sciences, we proceeded with determination that a unified and identifiable presence for the Cornell University Library was good customer service, and that we would have to overcome or supress these political and philosophical differences among the libraries. Now we created three committees: a Steering Committee, a Public Services Design Committee, and a technical Services Implementation Committee. The Public Services Design Committee was charged with designing the Gateway front and associated pages. The Technical Services Implementation Committee's charge was to provide an approach for browsing networked
resources by subject, to develop procedures for creating records for Gateway resources and for the maintenance of these records, and finally, to create the actual Gateway database.

Again, we set an ambitious schedule of only 17 weeks to accomplish our objectives:
1. Create a unified and identifiable online presence for the Cornell University Library
2. Create a single point of entry (a common entryway to CUL's networked resources and services for our staff and patrons)
3. Develop and elicit the use of a common set of processes and procedures for cataloging networked resources
4. Develop and elect the use of a common set of processes for user training and support
5. Establish a more effective working relationship and greater coordination between the Library Technology Department (Central Administration) and Mann Library's Information Technology Section

The Gateway went live on schedule in January 1998, and has been a continuing success, both for the patrons the Cornell University Library serves and as a hallmark of an improved organization. What were the characteristics of the transformative, collaborative initiative? Edward Weissman, Karen Calhoun, and Zsuzsa Koltay, the three principals in the Library Gateway Steering Committee have written an article that will appear in a 1999 issue of Library Resources and Technical Services. In it, they identify four keys to success in innovation for large, diverse organizations with many stakeholders:
1. Start with a well-developed, clearly defined concept, and make sure that management and stakeholders buy into the concept.
2. Undertake a new product development in a set of simultaneous, overlapping activities. Gateway interface design occurred concurrently with database development, technical development, staff training and "marketing." (gaining awareness and CUL staff support). The simultaneous operations allowed us to deliver the Gateway to users quickly.
3. Break down organizational barriers by using a cross-functional team of interdependent members, and make them accountable for the project. Give the team sufficient autonomy and adequate resources to do its work.

4. Seek continual feedback from stakeholders, be responsive to their concerns, and build organizational consensus as the project progresses. The Gateway team did its work in the open, presenting many demonstrations as the Gateway developed. The Gateway prototype and later iterations of it were valuable communication tools for CUL staff with a stake in the outcome of the project.

Collaboration and Union Catalogs

In the United States there is a longstanding appreciation for the benefits of union catalogs, which are seen as having the following strategic, enabling features:
1. ability to share cataloging
2. ability to share resources
3. ability to coordinate collection development

---


6 Ibid., p. 6-7.
4. ability to preserve collections in an organized, non-duplicative manner
5. ability to reduce costs
6. ability to improve user service
7. ability to further knowledge and understanding by supporting the information
seeking behavior of scholars and researchers.

Librarians have developed standards to facilitate their generation and have seized
on technological innovations to advance their functionality and to make them
economically feasible. In the development of union catalogs and in almost every
collaborative venture, we can find certain characteristics which lead to their success:
1. There is a "torchbearer" who leads the way.
2. A small group of action-oriented individuals supports the leader.
3. They set clear objectives.
4. They act and refuse to get entangled in bylaws and bureaucracy.
5. They articulate the benefits of cooperation.
6. They establish milestones and meet targets.
7. They consult widely at all levels of operations and administration.
8. They demonstrate that they have heard user needs by incorporating suggestions into
the design of the catalog or organization.
9. They don't try to be all things to all people, but instead focus on key issues. They don't
get bogged down in details or seek perfection.
10. They break down institutional barriers by sharing staff for cross-fertilization
11. They seek solutions that are economical and elegant, sometimes simple.
12. They achieve strength by developing a network of individuals drawn from many
institutions, with each person understanding that his or her contribution (cataloging,
programming, teaching, etc.) is critical to the success of the enterprise.
13. They make a financial commitment to participate.
14. They adjust to changing environments, taking advantage of technological innovations
and cultural shifts.
15. They conduct objective studies and analysis.
16. They communicate constantly.
17. They are willing to compromise for the good of the whole.

In each of the examples I have cited--the establishment of the Program for
Cooperative Cataloging, the origins of the Digital Library Federation, and the evolution
of the Cornell Library Gateway--participants have been motivated to overcome their
differences and to work toward common goals. Through their collaboration the libraries
that contribute to the PCC, the DLF, and the Cornell Library Gateway realize that the
sum of their achievements is greater than the individual parts. Their leadership is the
path toward improved access and service not only for their immediate, local constituents,
but for the global community as well.