

## 2005 Private Law Library / Corporate law Library SIG Operational Survey

by Joan Rataic-Lang and Anna Holetton

### Introduction

Since the 2002 PLL/CLL survey the pace of change seems to have increased, and the goal of continually providing outstanding client service become even more challenging. With our changing work environments, only the need to be well informed on technological issues remains constant.

As the 2005 Survey preamble explained, most answers reflect data for the twelve-month period ending 31 December 2005, unless stated otherwise. While this report highlights trends over the years and provides commentary pointing out interesting facts, in many cases the tables tell the whole story. Please read the self-explanatory tables in conjunction with the commentary. Some analysis, provided by our statistical service – UBC’s Applied Research and Evaluation Services (ARES) - was included to show correlations.

Many survey questions have been changed, added and dropped since the previous survey conducted in 2003. The 2003 survey also included many new questions, but many older questions were retained for comparative purposes although they had lost relevance. In 2006, it is time for the survey to address only issues of current concern and to discard irrelevant questions. This survey was also shortened (from 90 to 56 questions) in the hope that a shorter survey might encourage more responses. It will be interesting to see whether this survey’s 56 questions will remain pertinent or will have lost their significance in two or three year’s time. We hope our crystal ball was clear and enabled us to design questions that will remain usable, so that trends can be determined.

Comparing our situation to that of our American colleagues is interesting. Although AALL conducts no equivalent survey, AALL’s Salary Survey<sup>1</sup> includes a few tables which provide information on Budgets and Staffing. Unfortunately, this information is only available to AALL members, so details cannot be included here. If you are an AALL member you may wish to take a quick look.

Many U.S. librarians also look to American Lawyer Media’s *Library Survey* -- published annually in the July *AmLaw Tech*, the *American Lawyer’s Technology* supplement -- for information. The 2006 *AmLaw Tech* survey subtitled “*Beyond the Books*” is available online.<sup>2</sup> It is essential to remember that *AmLaw Tech* surveys only libraries of the top 100 law firms in the United States. Nonetheless the trends it has identified are interesting.

---

<sup>1</sup> AALL Biennial Salary Survey is available by password access only to AALL members at: [http://www.aallnet.org/products/pub\\_salary\\_survey.asp](http://www.aallnet.org/products/pub_salary_survey.asp)

<sup>2</sup> American Lawyer Media’s *Library Survey*, “*Beyond the Books*” July 1, 2006 is available at: <http://www.law.com/jsp/tal/PubArticleTAL.jsp?hubtype=Inside&id=1151325325607>

### **Return Rate**

In late June 2006, Elizabeth Hooper of CALL/ACBD headquarters mailed 184 surveys to CALL members listed as interested in Private or Corporate law libraries. Envelopes containing the survey were addressed to the Library Manager rather than to specific individuals. The cover letter accompanying the *CALL PLL/Corporate Law Libraries Operations Survey* stated that the Survey was to be completed by the “Library Manager, Director or the person in your organisation responsible for the Law Library.” Despite several postings to CALL-L Listserv alerting members to the distribution and arrival of the survey, it is likely many copies of the Survey failed to reach intended respondents.

Once again the rate of return was disappointing. . Of the 184 surveys distributed, only 73 were returned. Only 70 could be used – because three were not from private or corporate law libraries. This means the response rate was only 40%. Considering the survey was significantly shortened to focus on important issues and survey respondents were eligible to win cash prizes, it is most perplexing to know how to increase the response rate.

Some respondents commented that they were not answering questions due to confidentiality concerns and some indicated they were more comfortable indicating spending in ranges, rather than actual numbers. However, surveys requesting spending be reported in ranges causes imprecise data collection, particularly where the response rate is small. Although our statisticians worked with precise numbers for accuracy, for ease of reporting results are reported in ranges.

Perhaps this Survey’s 40% return rate is due to the fact it was addressed to the “Library Manager” rather than to specific individuals. However, both the 2003 and 1998 surveys were addressed to specific individuals, and their return rates were 54% and 33%, respectively. Timing the conduct of this Survey between June 27 and August 25, 2006 may also have contributed to the low return rate for two reasons. Many potential respondents may have been on vacation. Second, the survey period partially overlapped two other surveys: *CALL/ACBD 2006 Compensation Survey* and the annual *Toronto Association of Law Libraries (TALL) Salary Survey*. .

Perhaps CALL members are growing weary of surveys? **Given the effort exerted and expense incurred in conducting CALL surveys it is time to seriously question whether we should continue to do so – given that members often conduct their own small surveys via the CALL-L listserv as questions arise. This committee is interested in your thoughts on this.**

### **Library Clients**

Some libraries have moved beyond our traditional client base of Legal Professionals, and are now providing research services to Human Resources, Marketing, Professional Development and others. Interestingly, while 51.4% occasionally provide research for Marketing, 25.7% now do it on a regular basis. Colleagues at the top 100 US law firms indicate they spend 15% of their time supporting Marketing and 7% on “developing competitive intelligence” according to the *AmLaw Tech* Library Survey “Beyond Books” July 2006.<sup>3</sup>

### **Library Staffing Complement**

Curiously only 62 of 70 respondents answered this question. While library staff numbers have remained the same for the majority (74.3%), libraries experiencing staff loss (7%) indicated

---

<sup>3</sup> Supra, footnote 1.

fairly small numbers of staff were lost; the percentage of staff lost is unknown. In contrast, some library staffs have actually grown -- 11% indicated an increase in staff size. However, 42% of *AmLaw* top 100 firms surveyed indicated library staff growth in the last 2 years.<sup>4</sup>

***What is the ratio of library staff to client numbers?***

Sixty-six of the 70 libraries responded to questions on both clients and library staff.

Of those answering, in total, there were 166.5 library staff FTEs and 11,768 clients, giving an average ratio of 1 library staff FTE to 75.0 clients.<sup>5</sup> This table shows the mean (average) ratio of clients to library staff for the last three surveys:

<b>Year</b>		<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
2005	Ratio	75.0 <sup>6</sup>	52.0	100.9	14.0	803.8
2002	Ratio	49.37	41.50			
1998	Ratio	40.27	38			

These numbers are disturbing. In 2002 the ratio of users (lawyers, legal assistants & students) to FTE library staff for the 87 libraries responding was between 42:1 and 49:1. This was an increase the 1998 ratio of between 38:1 and 40:1 FTE for the 55 libraries responding. Our organisations are growing faster and library staffing is not keeping up. *Quaere* whether the misperception that the internet is sufficient research support for many law firms means library staff is not being increased?

**Physical Library Space**

This new “area” was investigated for the first time this year. When the next survey is done we will be able to detect a trend. Growth in both square feet (physical space) and in linear feet (shelf space) in some libraries is balanced by other libraries (27.1%) indicating fewer square feet and less shelf space than they had 3 years ago.

Satellite libraries in the same physical location remain a popular feature (52.9%) because lawyers still like having their books close at hand.

**Library Products & Services**

Is providing after hours and on call service a new trend? We will need to wait to the next survey to see any significant trends. While nearly one-third (30.0%) provide service on call, less than ten percent (8.6%) provide service after 6 pm, and even fewer (2.9%) provide Saturday service. Interestingly, while private law libraries are progressive in providing reference and research to more clientele, most libraries (82.9%) continue to use traditional sign-out and inventory control because their collections are not bar-coded. Although the question was not asked, it is unlikely anyone has yet used Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags in their library.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, footnote 1.

<sup>5</sup> If you do the arithmetic, you get 70.2 clients per FTE. However, our statistician arrived at a mean of 75.0 by using variable frequencies and calculating on the basis of those sums by hand; a couple of libraries had not responded completely.

<sup>6</sup> *Supra.*, footnote 5.

***Is a larger firm’s library more likely to provide additional hours of service?***

Regardless of size, all 70 libraries indicated they were open traditional hours. The numbers of libraries indicating they were open after 6pm (6) and on Saturday (2) were too small to correlate hours with firm size. However, 21 libraries indicated they were on call outside traditional hours while 49 libraries were not. The answers re “on call” service (Q17), were correlated with firm size -- indicated by permanent library staff expressed as Full Time Equivalents (FTE) (Q09). No particular relationship was found between library size and provision of “on call” service.<sup>7</sup>

This question was reconsidered in another way. Libraries were categorized as small, medium, and large. Libraries with 1.2 FTEs or less were considered small (S), those with between 1.2 to 2.0 FTEs were considered medium (M), and those with more than 2.0 FTE were considered large (L). This analysis resulted in three roughly equal groups (S = 23, M = 22, L = 23) as shown in the following table. When looking at a library’s provision of “on call” service (Q17) according to these categories the answer was the same. **Larger libraries are no more likely to provide “on call” service than smaller libraries.**

Q17 Are you on call outside traditional hours?

Firm		1 Yes	2 No	Total
1.00 small	#	6.0	17	23
	%	26.1	73.9	100.0
2.00 medium	#	6.0	16	22
	%	27.3	72.7	100.0
3.00 large	#	9.0	14	23
	%	39.1	60.9	100.0
All	#	21.0	47	68
	%	30.9	69.1	100.0

**Billing**

Regional differences probably account for some of the variation in hourly rates found in Q19 and Q20. Unfortunately our sample size is too small to draw any correlation.

**Budget/Financial Planning**

This survey has always asked for the average “Cost per lawyer” based on expenditures for print publications, binding, lawyers’ copies, and CD-ROMs – while excluding costs for online, supplies, capital costs, and library staff salaries. With so much money now being spent on electronic information sources, we decided to include an average cost for on-line expenditures.

***What is the cost per lawyer?***

First “cost” has to be defined by looking at the responses to questions regarding print expenditures (Q25), online expenditures (Q28) and the number of lawyers (Q3).

Only 49 of 70 respondents completed both questions; thus, only 49 responses could be used to calculate the cost per lawyer. Using those values, these totals were found: 4,814 lawyers (Q3);

---

<sup>7</sup> Pearson’s product-moment correlation between these variables shows no particular relationship between the two measures. The correlation is 0.10 (p = .429) and does not reach normally accepted levels of statistical significance.

\$180,867.70 spent on print publications (Q25); \$107,589.67 spent for on-line expenditures (Q28); and a total of \$288,457.33 across both types of expenditure. Thus, per lawyer, the average cost for print expenditures was \$1,840.99, the average cost for on-line expenditures was \$1,095.12, and the average combined cost for both types was \$2,936.10.

In 2002 when only print expenditures were considered, over forty percent of libraries [42.5%] spent between \$1,001-\$2,500 per lawyer, while over half [56.3%] spent between \$1,501-\$3,000 per lawyer. The 2006 average cost per lawyer (\$2,936) is comparable to the high end of 2002's \$1,501-\$3,000 range. However, this years cost per lawyer result from combined print and online expenditures; this is further evidence of our collections increasing reliance on electronic resources.

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that, although cancellations were reported in various types of print resources, those most frequently cut were loose-leaf services (78.6%) and Canadian law reports (67.1%).

### Online Services

The 2002 survey had 30 replies indicating more than \$70,000 spent for all online databases.

For this survey questions regarding online services were limited to three services (Lexis, Quicklaw and WestlaweCarswell) to ensure the same online services were being compared. Only time will tell if this tactic has worked in establishing a benchmark. We have provided a much higher range as the previous ranges were dated. As a result no direct comparison can be done.

Only 5.7% indicated that they were spending less for online services in 2005 as compared to 2004. Nearly seventy percent (67.1%) indicated an increase, with the mean increase being 12.4%. Reassuringly, those who reported a decrease reported a small one ranging from 1% to 13% with the mean being 6.1%

### *Are all private law libraries cutting their budgets -- or are smaller/bigger firms cutting more?*

In answering this, we must look at two pairs of questions on changes in spending, one associated with print (Q25, Q26) and one associated with online platform expenditures (Q28, Q29). Once again this data was considered in light of library size categories small, medium and large defined above.

PRINT Q26 How did this amount compare to the 2004 print expenditures?

Firm		Increase	Decrease	Same	Total
<b>1.00 small</b>	#	15	6	1	22
	%	68.2	27.3	4.5	100.0
<b>2.00 medium</b>	#	10	5	5	20
	%	50.0	25	25	100.0
<b>3.00 large</b>	#	10	8	0	18
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	100.0
<b>All</b>	#	35	19	6	60
	%	<b>58.3</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>10.0</b>	100.0

No statistical significance was found between firm size and increased print expenditures.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> A chi-square is used to test if the relationships between variables in tables is statistically significant. That is, whether or not the relationship is just by chance or not. Chi-square for the Q26 table is 8.92 (df = 4, p = 0.063), which is not a large enough value to show significance.

However, the majority (58.3%) experienced an increase in print expenditures, one-third (31.7%) experienced decreased print expenditures, and 10.0% spent the same amount. While libraries are spending more on print in 2005 than in 2004, there were no particular differences between libraries according to firm size.

ON-LINE Q29 How did this amount compare to the 2004 on-line expenditures?

Firm		Increase	Decrease	Same	Total
1.00 small	#	16	1	5	22
	%	72.7	4.5	22.7	100.0
2.00 medium	#	16	0	2	18
	%	88.9	0.0	11.1	100.0
3.00 large	#	13	3	2	18
	%	72.2	16.7	11.1	100.0
All	#	45	4	9	58
	%	77.6	6.9	15.5	100.0

Similarly there was no significant correlation between firm size and online expenditures.<sup>9</sup> More than three-quarters (77.6%) experienced an increase in online expenditures, less than ten percent (6.9%) experienced a decrease, and 15.5% spend the same amount. While libraries are spending more on on-line costs in 2005 than in 2004, but there are no particular differences among large, medium, and small firms.

**Nearly sixty percent (58.3%) of libraries spent more on print resources in 2005 than in 2004. But over three-quarters (77.6%) of libraries spent more on online resources in 2005 than in 2004.**

### Firm Intranet & Website

*Is there a relationship between firm size and having an intranet?*

Whether a firm currently has an Intranet (Q38) was analyzed in relation to firm size according to the categories defined above.

Firm Size		Does the firm have an Intranet?			Total
		1 Yes	2 No	3 Not as yet, but the firm is working on one	
1.00 small	#	12	11	0	23
	%	52.2	47.8	0.0	100.0
2.00 medium	#	18	2	2	22
	%	81.8	9.1	9.1	100.0

<sup>9</sup> A chi-square is used to test if the relationships between variables in tables is statistically significant. That is, whether or not the relationship is just by chance or not. Chi-square for this table is 5.52 (df = 4, p = 0.237), which is not a large enough value to show significance.

<b>3.00 large</b>	#	22	1	0	23
	%	<b>95.7</b>	4.3	0.0	100.0
<b>All</b>	#	52	14	2	68
	%	76.5	20.6	2.9	100.0

Sixty-eight of the 70 libraries responding answered both questions. Statistical analysis<sup>10</sup> showed a strong correlation between firm size and having an intranet, with large firms being most likely to have one. Virtually all large firms (95.7%), and over three-quarters (81.8%) medium firms had an intranet, while just over half (52.2%) of the small firms have an intranet.

Regardless of size, in 2006 three out of four libraries (76.5%) have an intranet, an increase from 63.2% in 2002 and 53.6% in 1998.

### **Library Catalogue**

With the growth of intranets, firm wide access to the library catalogue has also grown. More than half (54.3%) of libraries responding indicate their catalogue is available on the firm Intranet, up from 40.2% in 2002 and a modest 13.8% in 1998.

### **Multi-Office Firms**

We apologize for the confusion here. While the heading used was “multi-office,” the questions referred to national firms. However, not all multi-office firms are national -- some are better described as regional. Next time, we will have to ensure consistency.

In any event, 41 respondents indicated their firm was multi-office. Unfortunately, there is no way of determining which replies were from the same firm in different locations. Although we cannot determine any trends here or with any of the other questions, it is interesting to note that library administration in multi-office firms can be hierarchical, peer-to-peer or hybrid.

---

<sup>10</sup> A chi-square is used to test if the relationships between variables in tables is statistically significant. That is, whether or not the relationship is just by chance or not. Chi-square for this table is 19.79 (df = 4, p = 0.000)

**THE BASICS**

**1. Type of Library:**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Law Firm	65	92.5
Corporation	5	7.1
Not Answered	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**2. Jurisdiction**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
British Columbia	16	22.9
Alberta	13	18.6
Saskatchewan	1	1.4
Manitoba	4	5.7
Ontario	24	34.3
Quebec	7	10.0
Nova Scotia	4	5.7
New Brunswick	1	1.4
Newfoundland	0	0.0
Prince Edward Island	0	0.0
Yukon or NWT or Nunavut	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**LIBRARY CLIENTS**

**3. Lawyers**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Fewer than 25	11	15.7
25-49	11	15.7
50-74	14	20.0
75-99	11	15.7
100-124	5	7.1
125-149	5	7.1
150-174	3	4.3
175-199	0	0.0
200 or more	10	14.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**4. Articling students/ Stagiaires:**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
0	5	7.1
1-5	32	45.7
6-10	16	22.9
11-15	11	15.7
16-20	2	2.9
21 or more	4	5.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**5. Summer students/ Co-op students:**

	N	%
0	13	18.6
1-5	30	42.9
6-10	10	14.3
11-15	5	7.1
16-20	5	7.1
21 or more	5	7.1
Not answered	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

**6. Paralegals / Legal Assistants / Law Clerks:**

	N	%
0	3	4.3
1-5	23	32.9
6-10	13	18.6
11-15	6	8.6
16-20	8	11.4
21 or more	17	24.3
Total	70	100.0

**7. Does the library provide research to other departments within the organization? If yes, which departments?**

**a. Human Resources**

	N	%
Never	12	17.1
Occasionally	51	72.9
Regularly	2	2.9
Sub Total	65	92.9
Not Answered	5	7.1
Total	70	100.0

**b. Marketing**

	N	%
Never	10	14.3
Occasionally	36	51.4
Regularly	18	25.7
Sub Total	64	91.4
Not Answered	6	8.6
Total	70	100.0

**c. Professional Development**

	N	%
Never	12	17.1
Occasionally	38	54.3
Regularly	14	20.0
Sub Total	64	91.4
Not Answered	6	8.6
Total	70	100.0

**d. Other**

	N	%
Never	11	15.7
Occasionally	23	32.9
Regularly	6	8.6
Sub Total	40	57.1
Not Answered	30	42.9
Total	70	100.0

**d. Other - Text**

	N	%
Accounting	1	1.4
Accounting (proceeds of crime)	1	1.4
Accounting, administration	1	1.4
Administration	2	2.9
Administration, IT	1	1.4
BCE subsidiaries - various regulatory departments and partner companies.	1	1.4
Capital Markets	1	1.4
Corp. records, accounting	1	1.4
Corporate Records	1	1.4
Corporate Service	1	1.4
Corporate services	1	1.4
Finance, systems	1	1.4
Financial services, Executive Committee	1	1.4
Firm Admin (COO), KM	1	1.4
General admin	1	1.4
Information services/collections	1	1.4
Investments, Canadian Div.	1	1.4
IS	1	1.4

KM	1	1.4
Management	1	1.4
Records Management	1	1.4
Risk Management	1	1.4
Senior management, IT	1	1.4
Systems	1	1.4
Translation	1	1.4
Sub Total	26	37.1
Not Answered	44	62.9
Total	70	100.0

**8. Does the library provide direct service to the clients?**

	N	%
No	44	62.9
Yes	26	37.1
Total	70	100.0

*Comments:*

- A few institutional clients contact me directly and research is billed to the General Advising file.
- A small number of clients deal directly with the library
- All clients contact the library for service. As well many services are provided to clients on a pro-active basis
- Clipping/awareness services, Research - direct and assistance. Access to Library
- Current awareness for specific topics
- Document delivery, library services, legislative monitoring
- However, the library does prepare monthly newsletters for 1 specific client that are emailed to the client by the senior lawyer responsible for that client
- ILL
- ILL, reference, current awareness, web services
- Just a couple of clients who contact me directly
- Legislation tracking, on-off news tracking
- Monthly legislation charts in specific areas
- News, legislation, case law
- Occasionally for specific topical research

- and case law
- Occasionally through extranets
- Occasionally we are asked to supply information directly to the client.
- Occasionally well-known major clients will contact us
- Occasionally when referred by lawyer
- One client has a services agreement for the library. A few clients have lawyers who used to work for us and they contact the library directly.
- Pre-approved on a client by client basis
- Research help for their files that they want to do
- Send email updates on leg. changes
- Varies depending on lawyer
- Where prior approval set up for service by billing lawyer and client

**LIBRARY STAFFING COMPLEMENT**

**9. Permanent library staff expressed as Full Time Equivalents (FTE).**

*Note: 62 libraries of 70 responded to this question. Totals were calculated by adding indicated number and assuming zero for blanks when there was any response to any of the variables, so interpretation should be cautious.*

	Mean	SD
MLS &LLB	0.1	0.4
MLS	0.9	1.2
Library Technician	1.0	1.1
Library Assistant/ Clerk	0.3	0.6
Other	0.2	0.6
All	2.5	2.3

**MLS & LLB**

N FTEs	N	%
0	58	82.9
0.3	1	1.4
0.9	1	1.4
1	5	7.1
2	1	1.4
Sub Total	66	94.3
Not Answered	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**MLS**

N FTEs	N	%
0	30	42.9
0.1	1	1.4
0.2	2	2.9
0.4	1	1.4
0.5	1	1.4
0.7	1	1.4
1	13	18.6
1.4	1	1.4
2	12	17.1
3	1	1.4
4	2	2.9
6	1	1.4
Sub Total	66	94.3
Not Answered	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**Library Technicians**

N FTEs	N	%
0	23	32.9
0.1	1	1.4
0.5	1	1.4
0.6	3	4.3
0.75	1	1.4
1	20	28.6
1.5	1	1.4
1.6	1	1.4
2	8	11.4
3	5	7.1
4	1	1.4
4.5	1	1.4
Sub Total	66	94.3
Not Answered	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**Library Assistant/ Clerks**

N FTEs	N	%
0	40	57.1
0.1	1	1.4
0.2	2	2.9
0.4	3	4.3
0.5	6	8.6
0.75	1	1.4
0.8	2	2.9
1	8	11.4
1.5	1	1.4
2	1	1.4
3	1	1.4
Sub Total	66	94.3
Not Answered	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**Other**

N FTEs	N	%
0	56	80.0
1	7	10.0
2	2	2.9
3	1	1.4
Sub Total	66	94.3
Not Answered	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**10. How has the number of library staff changed in the last 3 years?**

	N	%
Increased	11	15.7
Decreased	7	10.0
Stayed the same.	52	74.3
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**Total**

N FTEs	N	%
0.1	1	1.4
0.2	1	1.4
0.3	1	1.4
0.4	2	2.9
0.5	1	1.4
0.6	1	1.4
1	15	21.4
1.2	1	1.4
1.35	1	1.4
1.5	4	5.7
1.75	1	1.4
1.8	1	1.4
2	15	21.4
2.5	1	1.4
2.6	2	2.9
3	1	1.4
3.1	1	1.4
3.5	1	1.4
4	6	8.6
4.2	1	1.4
4.4	1	1.4
6	2	2.9
7	1	1.4
7.5	1	1.4
8	1	1.4
11	1	1.4
11.5	1	1.4
Sub Total	66	94.3
Not Answered	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**10. How has the number of library staff changed in the last 3 years?**

**Of the 11 indicating "Increased"**

	N	%
0.2	1	9.1
0.5	6	54.5
0.6	1	9.1
1	2	18.2
2	1	9.1
Sub Total	11	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	11	100.0

**10. How has the number of library staff changed in the last 3 years?**

**Of the 7 indicating "Decreased"**

	N	%
0.1	1	14.3
0.5	2	28.6
1	2	28.6
4	1	14.3
4.6	1	14.3
Sub Total	7	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	7	100.0

**11. To whom does the head of the library report?**

	N	%
Q11a IT/IS Director or equivalent	2	2.9
Q11b CFO or Finance Director	3	4.3
Q11c COO or Dir of Admin, Exec Director	26	37.1
Q11d Chief Information Officer	2	2.9
Q11e KM Director	2	2.9
Q11f Managing Partner	10	14.3
Q11g Library Committee/Partner	29	41.4
Q11h other	3	4.3
Total (some indicated more than 1)	77	110.1

*Comments:*

- Firm and Administrator re: budget matters
- It depends. Budget to CFO and regional managers
- Office Manager

**13. How have the linear feet of library shelving changed in the last 3 years?**

	N	%
Increased	12	17.1
Decreased	19	27.1
Stayed the same.	39	55.7
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**14. Has the library either started using movable/compact shelving or increased the amount of movable/compact shelving in the last 3 years?**

	N	%
Yes	10	14.3
No	60	85.7
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**PHYSICAL LIBRARY SPACE**

**12. How has the library space (square feet) changed in the last 3 years?**

	N	%
Increased	6	8.6
Decreased	19	27.1
Stayed the same.	45	64.3
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**15. Do you have satellite libraries in the same physical location?**

	N	%
Yes	37	52.9
No	33	47.1
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**LIBRARY PRODUCTS & SERVICES**

**16. When do you provide library services?**

	N	%
Traditional working hours (anywhere between 8 am to 6 pm)	70	100.0
After 6 pm	6	8.6
Saturday	2	2.9
Not Answered	0	0.0

**17. Are you on call outside traditional hours?**

	N	%
Yes	21	30.0
No	49	70.0
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**18. If you have bar-coded your collection, indicate how the bar-codes are used:**

	N	%
Not applicable, collection not bar-coded	58	82.9
Electronic checkout	3	4.3
Inventory control	3	4.3
Usage statistics	2	2.9
Other	0	0.0

**BILLING**

**19. Are hours billed by the Head or Reference Librarian to client files or to other departments?**

	N	%
1 Yes, the rate is \$___/hr	52	74.3
2 No, time is not billed	16	22.9
3 Not applicable	2	2.9
Sub Total	70	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0

**19. Are hours billed by the Head or Reference Librarian to client files or to other departments? \$ per hour.**

\$/ hr.	N	%
50	3	4.3
55	1	1.4
65	1	1.4
70	1	1.4
75	2	2.9
80	1	1.4
85	1	1.4
90	2	2.9
95	1	1.4
100	4	5.7
105	2	2.9
110	3	4.3
115	2	2.9
120	3	4.3
125	5	7.1
130	1	1.4
135	1	1.4
140	3	4.3
145	2	2.9
150	4	5.7
160	2	2.9
175	3	4.3
189	1	1.4
195	1	1.4
200	1	1.4
Sub Total	51 <sup>11</sup>	72.9
Not Answered	19	27.1
Total	70	100.0

**Mean \$119.39**  
**Std. Deviation \$37.87**

<sup>11</sup> This number does not agree with the "Yes" number in the first part of the question because one respondent failed to answer this part.. The same applies to questions 23 and 26.

**20. Do other library staff bill for time?**

	N	%
Yes, at the Reference Librarian's rate	15	21.4
Yes, below the Reference Librarian's rate	18	25.7
No, their time is not billed	22	31.4
Not applicable	19	27.1
Not Answered	0	0
Total (some answered more than one)	74	105.6

**21. In many firms, not all of the time recorded as billable is actually billed to clients.**

**If known, what percentage of recorded time was actually billed to clients in 2005?**  
\_\_\_\_\_ %.

%	N	%
0	2	1.8
2	1	1.4
25	1	1.4
45	1	1.4
50	2	2.9
52	1	1.4
60	2	2.9
80	1	1.4
87.5	1	1.4
90	3	4.3
96	1	1.4
100	3	4.3
Sub Total	19	27.1
Not Answered	51	72.9
Total	70	100.0

**Mean** 62.0%  
**Std. Deviation** 35.1%

**22. If not known, what is the estimated percentage billed in 2005?**

%	N	%
1 zero -25%	10	14.3
2 26 – 50%	5	7.1
3 51 – 75%	9	12.9
4 76 – 100%	10	14.3
Sub Total	34	48.6
Not Answered	36	51.4
Total	70	100.0

**BUDGET/ FINANCIAL PLANNING**

**23. What was the 2006 Library budget amount?**

	N	%
1 Less than 2005, by ____ %	15	21.4
2 More than 2005, by ____ %	43	61.4
3 Same as 2005	9	12.9
Sub Total	67	95.7
Not Answered	3	4.3
Total	70	100.0

**23. What was the 2006 Library budget amount?**

**1 Less than 2005, by \_\_\_\_ %**

%	N	%
1.0	1	7.1
3.0	1	7.1
3.7	1	7.1
4.0	1	7.1
5.0	1	7.1
8.5	1	7.1
9.0	3	21.4
10.0	1	7.1
10.6	1	7.1
16.8	2	14.3
25.0	1	7.1
50.0		
Total	14	100.0

**Mean** 12.7  
**Std. Deviation** 12.6

**23. What was the 2006 Library budget amount?**

**2 More than 2005, by \_\_\_\_ %**

%	N	%
0.01	1	2.3
1.0	1	2.3
4.0	2	4.7
4.3	1	2.3
5.0	3	7.0
6.0	3	7.0
7.0	3	7.0
8.0	3	7.0
8.3	1	2.3
9.0	1	2.3
9.5	1	2.3
10.0	12	27.9
10.9	1	2.3
11.0	2	4.7
12.0	2	4.7
15.0	1	2.3
17.0	1	2.3
19.0	1	2.3
20.0	1	2.3
33.0	1	2.3
Sub Total	42	97.7
Not Answered	1	2.3
Total	43	100

**Mean 9.5**  
**Std. Deviation 5.6**

**24. To calculate the 2005 amount spent on a cost per lawyer basis, we need the actual 2005 total Library expenditures for print publications, binding, lawyers' copies, CD-ROMs, and electronic alerts**  
**What is the total amount spent for the above listed items? \$ \_\_\_\_\_**

\$	N	%
0 to 50k	6	8.6
51 to 100k	13	18.6
101 to 150k	4	5.7
151 to 200k	12	17.1
201 to 250k	7	10.0
251 to 300k	4	5.7
301 to 350k	2	2.9
351 to 400k	2	2.9
401 to 450k	1	1.4
over 450k	5	7.1
Sub Total	56	80.0
Not Answered	14	20.0
Total	70	100.0

**Mean \$251,228.20**  
**Std. Deviation \$408,753.20**

**PRINT RESOURCES**

**25. What were your 2005 expenditures for print publications, including new books and CLEs, law reports, annual print subscriptions, and lawyers' copies?**

\$	N	%
0 to 50K	6	8.6
51 to 100k	13	18.6
101 to 150k	9	12.9
151 to 200k	11	15.7
201 to 250k	8	11.4
251 to 300k	0	0.0
301 to 350K	3	4.3
351 to 400k	2	2.9
401K and over	5	7.1
Sub Total	57	81.4
Not Answered	13	18.6
Total	70	100.0

**Mean \$187,292.50**  
**Std. Deviation \$155,340.40**

**26. How did this amount compare to the 2004 print expenditures?**

	N	%
1 Less than 2005, by ____ %	36	51.4
2 More than 2005, by ____ %	19	27.1
3 Same as 2005	7	10.0
Sub Total	62	88.6
Not Answered	8	11.4
Total	70	100.0

**26. How did this amount compare to the 2004 print expenditures? 1 Less than 2005, by \_\_\_\_ %**

%	N	%
1.0	3	8.3
1.8	1	2.8
3.7	1	2.8
4.0	2	5.6
5.0	2	5.6
5.3	1	2.8
6.0	2	5.6
7.0	1	2.8
7.0	3	8.3
7.5	1	2.8
8.0	2	5.6
9.0	1	2.8
10.0	4	11.1
12.0	2	5.6
13.5	1	2.8
15.0	1	2.8
17.0	2	5.6
17.5	1	2.8
36.0	1	2.8
100.0	1	2.8
Sub Total	33	91.7
Not Answered	3	8.3
Total	36	100.0

**Mean 11.6%**  
**Std. Deviation 17.2%**

**26. How did this amount compare to the 2004 print expenditures? 2 More than 2005, by \_\_\_\_ %**

%	N	%
0.5	1	5.3
1.0	1	5.3
2.0	2	10.5
3.0	1	5.3
4.5	1	5.3
5.0	1	5.3
6.0	2	10.5
6.6	1	5.3
7.3	1	5.3
10.0	2	10.5
11.0	1	5.3
15.0	1	5.3
16.0	1	5.3
25.0	2	10.5
39.0	1	5.3
Sub Total	1	5.3
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	18	100.0

**Mean 10.3%**  
**Std. Deviation 10.2%**

**27. Have you cancelled any of the following print subscriptions in the last 3 years?**

	N	%
Canadian Abridgment	26	37.1
Canadian Encyclopaedic Digest	12	17.1
Journals or periodicals	35	50.0
Canadian law reports	47	67.1
Law reports, international	13	18.6
Legislation	13	18.6
The Digest	5	7.1
Halsbury's	14	20.0
Loose-leaf services	55	78.6

**ON-LINE SERVICES**

The following questions apply only to Lexis, Quicklaw and WestlaweCarswell.

**28. Total spent for on-line platform expenditures for 2005:**

\$	N	%
0 to 50K	14	20.0
51 to 100k	18	25.7
101 to 150k	12	17.1
151 to 200k	3	4.3
201 to 250k	1	1.4
251 to 300k	2	2.9
300K+	3	4.3
Sub Total	53	75.7
Not Answered	17	24.3
Total	70	100.0

**Mean** \$105,372.50  
**Std. Deviation** \$102,525.60

**29. Was the 2005 amount an increase or decrease from the 2004 amount?**

	N	%
1 Increase of ____ %	47	67.1
2 Decrease of ____ %	4	5.7
3 Same	9	12.9
Sub Total	60	85.7
Not Answered	10	14.3
Total	70	100.0

**29. Was the 2005 amount an increase or decrease from the 2004 amount? 1 Increase of \_\_\_\_ %**

%	N	%
0.0	1	2.1
0.1	1	2.1
0.5	1	2.1
1.2	1	2.1
1.5	1	2.1
2.0	2	4.3
2.1	1	2.1

2.7	1	2.1
3.0	1	2.1
4.0	1	2.1
5.0	2	4.3
6.0	1	2.1
7.8	1	2.1
8.0	3	6.4
10.0	7	14.9
11.0	1	2.1
12.0	1	2.1
13.0	1	2.1
14.0	1	2.1
15.0	2	4.3
16.0	1	2.1
18.0	1	2.1
20.0	4	8.5
25.0	1	2.1
40.0	1	2.1
100.0	1	2.1
Sub Total	40	85.1
Not Answered	7	14.9
Total	47	100.0

**Mean** 12.4%  
**Std. Deviation** 16.3%

**29. Was the 2005 amount an increase or decrease from the 2004 amount? 2 Decrease of \_\_\_\_ %**

%	N	%
1.0	1	25.0
5.0	1	25.0
5.3	1	25.0
13.0	1	25.0
Total	4	100.0

**Mean** 6.1%  
**Std. Deviation** 5.0%

**30. What were the on-line platform charges submitted for disbursement in 2005?**

	N	%
1 None	4	5.7
2 Less than 50%	13	18.6
3 51 - 60%	4	5.7
4 61 - 70%	4	5.7
5 71 - 80%	11	15.7

6 81 - 90%	5	7.1
7 91 - 100%	13	18.6
8 More than 100%	2	2.9
Sub Total	56	80.0
Not Answered	14	20.0
Total	70	100.0

**31. If your firm has a Quicklaw flat rate contract, at what rate are clients charged for QL searches?**

	N	%
1 Quicklaw 's effective rate	12	17.1
2 Quicklaw's regular hourly rate	19	27.1
3 Another rate	26	37.1
4 Not applicable	10	14.3
Sub Total	67	95.7
Not Answered	3	4.3
Total	70	100.0

**32. If your firm has a Lexis flat rate contract, at what rate are clients charged for Lexis searches?**

	N	%
1 Lexis prorated rate	5	7.1
2 Lexis regular hourly rate	17	24.3
3 Another rate	15	21.4
4 Not applicable	30	42.9
Sub Total	67	95.7
Not Answered	3	4.3
Total	70	100.0

**33. If your firm has a WestlawCarswell contract, at what rate are clients charged for these searches?**

	N	%
1 WestlawCarswell suggested chargeback rates	14	20.0
2 A percentage of Welch suggested chargeback	18	25.7
3 Another rate, e.g., a standard 'per search' charge	13	18.6
4 Not applicable	20	28.6
Sub Total	65	92.9
Not Answered	5	7.1
Total	70	100.0

**ELECTRONIC RESOURCES**

**34. Change in number of CD titles in the last 3 years:**

	N	%
1 Increase	4	5.7
2 Decrease	45	64.3
3 Same	19	27.1
Sub Total	68	97.1
Not Answered	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

**35. Number of CDs cancelled & replaced by internet subscriptions in the last year**

#	N	%
0	21	30.0
1	12	17.1
2	13	18.6
3	4	5.7
4	2	2.9
5	3	4.3
6	1	1.4
8	1	1.4
12	1	1.4
14	1	1.4
15	1	1.4
16	1	1.4
20	1	1.4
Sub Total	62	88.6
Not Answered	8	11.4
Total	70	100.0

**Mean** 2.7%  
**Std. Deviation** 4.2%

**36. Number of electronic products subscribed to in both CD and internet format:**

#	N	%
0	24	34.3
1	4	5.7
2	11	15.7
3	4	5.7
4	4	5.7
5	3	4.3
6	1	1.4
7	2	2.9
10	2	2.9
11	1	1.4
12	1	1.4
14	2	2.9
15	1	1.4
16	2	2.9
20	1	1.4
25	1	1.4

62	1	1.4
Sub Total	65	92.9
Not Answered	5	7.1
Total	70	100.0

**Mean** 4.8  
**Std. Deviation** 9.1

**LIBRARY MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE**

**37. If your firm has more than one location with more than one library, how is the library catalogue handled?**

	N	%
1 Separate for each location	15	21.4
2 A union catalogue including holdings from every office	17	24.3
3 Separate catalogues, but searchable from each location	8	11.4
Sub Total	27	38.6
Not Answered	67	95.7
Total	70	100.0

**FIRM INTRANET & WEBSITE**

**38. Does the firm currently have an Intranet?**

	N	%
1 Yes	54	77.1
2 No	14	20.0
3 Not as yet, but the firm is working on one	2	2.9
Sub Total	54	77.1
Not Answered	0	0
Total	70	100.0

**39. If your firm has an intranet, it can be described as:**

	N	%
1 Under construction / Primitive	4	5.7
2 Completed, but first generation	13	18.6
3 Second generation [completed or underway]	19	27.1
4 Third generation or later	17	24.3
Sub Total	53	75.7
Not Answered	17	24.3
Total	70	100.0

**40. What is the librarian's responsibility re the firm's Intranet?**

	N	%
Webmaster	6	8.6
Prepares firm intranet content	15	21.4
Prepares & updates Library webpages	29	41.4
Prepares Library webpage content (no HTML)	19	27.1
Other	10	14.3
Total (some answered more than one)	79	112.8

*Comments:*

- Assists in preparation of firm intranet content
- Creates team sites, updates various non-library pages; trains users
- Linux support, some software updates
- No responsibility
- None
- On Intranet development and implementation team
- Recommends links for intranet
- Updates judgment database

**41. Is the Library catalogue available on the firm's Intranet?**

	N	%
1 Yes	38	54.3
2 No	18	25.7
Sub Total	56	80.0
Not Answered	14	20.0

Total	70	100.0
-------	----	-------

**42. Are any other Library-created databases available on the firm's Intranet?**

	N	%
1 No	27	38.6
2 Yes-please name	28	40.0
Sub Total	55	78.6
Not Answered	15	21.4
Total	70	100.0

*Comments:*

- Archives of Electronic Bulletin and Digests
- Closing books
- Current awareness
- Directors' database, experts' registry, research memos database. Note: These are prepared by librarians in other of our offices, so these will probably be identified in their survey responses too
- ERIK, Electronic Regulatory Information Kiosk
- Judgments, court notices, public notices
- Legislation Bills
- Legislation index; Status of Bills
- list of articles & seminars available
- Memobank
- Memobank, Status of Legislation
- Memofile
- Memos
- Memos, books, experts
- News
- Online collections, research links, precedents, research database
- Practice research collections, expertise DBs, internet links, precedents, current awareness
- Precedent cases and research memos
- Publications of the organization
- Record Books
- Research memos, experts
- Some general pathfinders
- Status of bills, routing, closing books
- There are 10 . . . (memos, precedent, directory, RFP/Mkting, Referrals/Mktg, PDC)

**43. Is the Librarian a member of firm's Intranet committee?**

	N	%
1 Yes	17	24.3
2 No, Librarian not a member	11	15.7
3 Firm has no Intranet committee	29	41.4
Sub Total	57	81.4
Not Answered	13	18.6
Total	70	100.0

**44. Does the Library play a role in creating/updating the firm's INTERNET WEBSITE?**

	N	%
1 No Website	46	65.7
2 There is a website, but the library is not involved.	14	20.0
3 Yes, and the library's role is:	60	85.7
Sub Total	10	14.3
Not Answered	46	65.7
Total	70	100.0

*Comments:*

- assist in keeping information & links current
- Committee involvement
- Committee Member
- Committee Member, Content - some, Administration and updating of website
- Creates and publishes final online product. Operates as a gatekeeper for published public web content. Online marketing and search engine optimization.
- editing website
- Inclusion of some current awareness info and some web resources
- Library context
- Library Manager is on the new version Website Committee and has a say in the content development and design as it is currently being revamped for a new launch

- Monitoring
- Peripheral at the moment but increasing
- Prepared updates
- Updates lawyers case list and articles; updates "What's New" section
- Updates News and Publications component of website. Represented on website committee.
- updating some pages

**KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT (KM)**

**45. Does the Library maintain a database of legal memoranda?**

	N	%
1 No	21	30.0
2 Yes, maintained by the firm	31	44.3
3 Yes, maintained by:	17	24.3
Sub Total	69	98.6
Not Answered	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**45. Does the Library maintain a database of legal memoranda? Yes, maintained by:**

*Comments:*

	N
• Corp. clerk	1
• Director of Knowledge Management (National Head Office)	1
• KM	1
• Librarian	5
• Library	5
• Library and research lawyers	1
• Library staff member and lawyer	1
• Research department	1
• The firm has a legal memo DB, but not maintained by library.	1
• Webmaster	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>

**46. Who indexes the legal memoranda for the database?**

	N	%
Librarian/Library staff	20	28.6
Research Lawyer(s)	13	18.6
Authors of memoranda	8	11.4
No indexing; full text is searchable	16	22.9
Not applicable	13	18.6
Total	70	100.0

**47. Does your firm currently have a KM plan?**

	N	%
1 Yes	18	25.7
2 No	40	57.1
3 Not as yet, but the firm is working on one	10	14.3
Sub Total	68	97.1
Not Answered	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

**48. If your firm actively does KM, it can be described as:**

	N	%
1 Under construction / Primitive	13	18.6
2 Completed, but first generation	6	8.6
3 Second generation [completed or underway]	10	14.3
4 Third generation or later	3	4.3
Sub Total	32	45.7
Not Answered	38	54.3
Total	70	100.0

**49. What role does the Librarian play in the firm's KM initiatives?**

	N	%
Leadership role	10	14.3
Contributor	25	35.7
On KM committee	11	15.7

**50. What role does the Librarian play in the firm's PRECEDENTS database?**

	N	%
1 Leadership role	10	14.3
2 Consultant	15	21.4
3 No involvement in precedent bank development	36	51.4
Sub Total	61	87.1
Not Answered	9	12.9
Total	70	100.0

**MULTI-OFFICE FIRMS**

*NOTE: From the data there appear to be 41 Multi-office Firms. Calculations are based on that assumption.*

**51. What is the structure of library administration?**

	N	%
1 Hierarchical	17	41.5
2 Peer-to-peer (equals)	22	53.7
3 Hybrid	2	2.9
Sub Total	41	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	41	100.0

**52. Does the national firm have a union SERIALS list?**

	N	%
1 Yes	8	19.5
2 No	32	78.1
Sub Total	40	97.6
Not Answered	1	2.4
Total	41	100.0

**53. Does the national firm have a global MEMO bank?**

	N	%
1 Yes	22	53.7
2 No	19	46.3
Sub Total	41	100.0
Not Answered	0	0.0
Total	41	100.0

**54. The firm's INTRANET is:**

	N	%
1 Available nationally	29	70.7
2 Separate for each location	6	14.6
Sub Total	35	85.3
Not Answered	6	14.6
Total	41	100.0

**55. What library functions are centralized?**

	N	%
Collection development	8	19.5
Acquisitions [ordering & processing]	10	24.4
Cataloguing	11	26.8
Resource-sharing	13	31.7
Current awareness	14	34.1
Other	9	22.0

*Comments:*

- Archiving. KM, reference and research services
- Best practices
- Electronic product contracting

- Firm-wide licensing of online resources
- Negotiation of on-line contracts
- None
- Online licences, bulk orders only

**56. How is the library budget prepared?**

	N	%
1 Separately, by location	28	68.3
2 Nationally / centrally	5	12.2
3 Hybrid - combo of local & national preparation	4	9.8
Sub Total	37	90.2
Not Answered	4	9.8
Total	41	100.0

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

*General Comments:*

- 3. What is an NPL?  
18. Would like to barcode.  
30. Submitted to accounting by the Library, whether disbursed - who knows.  
37. Union catalogue for BC locations only. Not union nationally.  
47. Basic plan. There is a national committee.  
51. Regular library meetings. significant regional autonomy. For "national" issues, what head office does or needs is what happens.  
16. "Servile" means when lawyers etc. expect librarian to be available. Additional hours are actually worked.  
24/28. What about Factiva, FP Infomart?  
48. Platform exists, lots of "organized" content, still being developed, therefore not "completed"

- A suggestion for future survey question of great interest would be concerning pensions and RRSP firm contributions, i.e. *Does your firm offer any of the following benefits: Y/N, Details - RRSP savings plan and if yes, does the firm match contributions and provide details such as number of years services % increases firm contribution Y/N Details - Pensions Plans - is there one offered to staff and if so what % does firm contribute or is it all staff contributions Y/N - Life Insurance (details) Y/N - Dental (details) Y/N - Extended Health (details)* These are all obviously salary and benefits related so would be included in a different survey but wanted to pass this suggestion on to be forwarded perhaps to appropriate Committee.

Finally, THANK YOU for doing this most valuable Operations survey. The cost per lawyer is a key factor in my budget presentation every year.

- For a one person corporate library I had a few problems with the last few questions, "multi-office firms". Is this supposed to apply to corporate law departments or should I skip completely?  
It would be good to have a corporate law librarian on the survey committee.
- I did not answer some questions due to confidentiality.
- I was not sure what Q. 22 referred to. % of total staff time billed? or % of total librarian time billed? or % of total reference librarian time billed?
- I'd be more comfortable with ranges than actual dollar figures.
- It is impossible for me to provide accurate #s for question 28 and 29 as all of our licenses cover 4 offices and we do not attribute costs to the various offices. I did not want to skew results with my amounts.
- Online databases in Quebec are different than the one you asked. So even if we have them we rarely use them. We do charge more on Quebec database to our clients. I cannot answer on budget questions since our budget

is made by department not product. I have to change this method for our Toronto office is asking it by product, and there by dept. So starting this year I'll have 2 kinds of budgets to do.

- Our multi-office is Edmonton, Calgary, Yellowknife so national info is regional in scope.
- Q.30: 91-100% submitted but only 60% actually billed to clients.  
Q.45-50 Still no official KM committee or plan but Librarian will take lead role in this, once it gets underway
- Re: Q. 28-30: I don't have ready access to this info, as spending on these items is not part of the library budget
- Since client billings for QL, WleC and Lexis searches are subtracted from the cost of these services to the library, the totals of the amount I spent on print materials plus the amount I spent on online services exceed the final amount spent on print and online for 2005. I wouldn't want you to think I can't add!
- This library is fairly small. Use by lawyers is not very high in terms of research requests.
- This survey is very Toronto-centric in its wording. Under "multi-office firms" you specifically ask about "national" firms; what about "regional" firms elsewhere in the country?  
When asking about WleC chargeback, you did not consider that it is possible to have software acting as a gateway for all internet subscriptions that calculates an hourly online rate for chargeback to clients.  
Also, given the current state of technology, shouldn't the section on intranets also include reference to portals?

