

## **Royal Library: Summary of comments by respondents**

### **Main digital catalogue for descriptions**

- Not user friendly (unclear lay-out, complicated structure, difficult to use ...). (15)
- Incomplete. (12)
- Old. (5)
- Mistakes in descriptions. (5)
- Descriptions for books that have gotten lost stay present in the catalogue. (4)
- Not clear what is and what is not available in the digital catalogue. (3)
- Incomplete descriptions. (2)
- Incorrect shelf numbers. (2)
- No ranking system. (2)
- Lack of older publications. (2)
- Search engine is not flexible.
- Not possible to export bibliographical data to applications such as Zotero.
- Instruction manual is not specific enough to aid users in their search for items of heritage collections.
- No adequate filters.
- Not enough digital sources available online.
- Retro cataloguing has not been done in an accurate manner.
- Lack of uniformity in descriptions, authorities and spelling (e.g. u/v in Latin).
- When you click on 'New search' on a results page, you are sent back to the front page and you have to redo all the selections/deselections for the next search.
- Server is slow.
- Link between entered search terms and received results is not always clear.
- Creation of a 'thematic shelf' (list of works that have the same theme) would be appreciated.
- Search engine is very sensitive with regard to spelling errors.
- Authority records are not adequately used and there is no good index.

### **Main digital catalogue for digital sources**

- Not enough materials. (17)
- Not user friendly (unclear lay-out, complicated structure, difficult to use ...). (11)
- Server is slow. (3)
- Metadata is not always complete. (2)
- It is not possible to make 'chance discoveries' by browsing through the collection. (2)
- Too much emphasis on the newspapers and not on other contents.
- Some links do not work or lead to the wrong content. (2)
- Images should immediately be visualised when opening a description and not only after clicking on the URL, as it is not clear one has to click on the URL.
- Not enough computers available in the KBR.
- Quality of scans is sometimes lacking.
- Not all sources are available online.
- Some sources are hard to find.
- Complicated system to access the newspapers.
- Not clear what is available online and what is not, and the reason for this.
- No indexation of the data.
- 'Noise' in the search results.

### **Suggestions for main digital catalogue**

- All works should be catalogued (manuscripts especially are missing from the catalogue). (6)
- Possibility of reserving physical sources online. (3)
- Possibility of exporting bibliographical information to Zotero, EndNote, .... (2)
- Possibility of downloading digital sources. (2)
- Adding RAMEAU indexation.
- Everything listed in UNICAT should also appear in the main digital catalogue.
- Better references to Belgica (search engines and own website).
- Link back to description from digital document (if one receives a link to a document, it is not possible to see the metadata associated with it).
- Integrate the contents in a larger discovery portal.
- Ensure all links work.
- Possibility of using Boolean operators as well as 'broader' and 'narrower' terms.
- Possibility of requesting multiple works simultaneously online.
- Integration of digital library in main digital catalogue.
- Digitising all special collections.
- Possibility of copying descriptions and mailing them to a friend.
- Better search possibilities.
- Possibility of ordering reproductions from within the digital catalogue.
- Better integration of special collections in the digital catalogue.
- Possibility of searching by collection.
- Better indexation.
- Consistently making use of the authorities 'author', 'editor', 'title', ...
- A suggestions system ('You have consulted X so you might be interested in Y').
- Providing next to a digital source also its contents (OCR'ed) as 'raw text'.
- Links to digital catalogues of other institutions.
- Better integration with V-Link.
- Better OCR.
- Possibility of informing the KBR of a work that should be part of the legal depot but which does not appear in the catalogue.
- Possibility of suggesting works to digitise that would benefit a large group of people (e.g. works that are needed by students for specific assignments)
- Researching the dates of documents that have not been dated.
- Computers used to consult BelgicaPress should not be turned off without warning the users.
- Bring back the 'Common catalogue of the federal libraries'.
- Access to digital sources from the homepage of the KBR.
- Info sessions for university students.

### **BelgicaPress**

- Not enough materials (12)
- Not all sources are available online. (11)
- Not user friendly (unclear lay-out, complicated structure, difficult to use ...). (4)
- Server is slow. (4)
- Technical difficulties (e.g. website not available). (3)
- Not possible to print sources. (3)
- Newspapers all belong to a limited time period. (2)
- When performing a search online the whole collection is searched, but only a very small part is accessible online.
- Not enough computers available in the KBR.
- Imperfect OCR.

- Hard to navigate from one edition of a newspaper to the next/previous one.
- Zoom function is limited.
- Not possible to download sources in pdf.
- Not possible to use copy/paste for text or images.
- Multiple search engines to access the same contents.
- Ranking of results is imperfect.
- Words are not always highlighted in newspapers.

#### **Suggestions for BelgicaPress**

- Add more search options/functionalities available in Delpher and Gallica. (2)
- Add word count for sources.
- Make sources available in text format (i.e. make it possible to display an OCR'ed version of a document).

#### **Reservation procedure for the consultation of physical sources**

- Long waiting times for obtaining works. (18)
- Procedure is cumbersome. (16)
- Paper system is inefficient/archaic. (14)
- Too time consuming. (14)
- Books often cannot be found by staff. (12)
- Staff sometimes unfriendly/difficult to contact or talk to. (5)
- Too bureaucratic. (3)
- Moments at which works can be requested are too limited/strict (e.g. too much time between them, no requests after 3:45 pm) (3)
- Not enough works can be requested at the same time. (2)
- Staff members sometimes bring the wrong works. (2)
- Online reservations cannot be made for the day itself and the day after. (2)
- Staff members do not speak Dutch.
- Online users can only request one work per half hour.
- No open shelves, all works have to be requested.
- Works are often in another department than the one indicated in the catalogue.
- Certain departments close for lunch.
- Contradictory information provided by different staff members.
- Online description of the procedure should be available in English.

#### **Procedure to order reproductions**

- Cumbersome (5)
- Takes a lot of time. (4)
- No online form available. (3)
- No response to mailed forms.
- Wrong reproductions delivered.

#### **Procedure to pay for reproductions**

- Cumbersome. (3)
- Expensive. (3)
- Archaic system/no online payment possible. (2)
- Slow.

**Why do you not consult physical sources? (Answers other than 'I feel the Royal Library is located too far away.' and 'All sources I wish to consult exist in digital format.')**

- No need for physical sources of the Royal Library. (15)
- Lack of time. (10)
- Limited opening hours. (5)
- Having to travel is problematic (e.g. due to personal situation, cost of travelling). (5)
- The sources can be found elsewhere. (4)
- Too bureaucratic. (3)
- Inter library loan system is used instead. (3)
- Respondent does not know which sources can be found at the Royal Library. (2)
- Quality of the digital catalogue is too low.