3. While the digitisation option is a costly resource intensive process, future users (i.e. universities) to assess the financial and non-financial impacts associated with the options. This analysis assumes a total of 586,000 volumes requiring off-site storage over a 10-year period.

Summary of the Storage Options Analysis

Options | Description | Financial Impact (total cost in Nominal Terms over a 10 year forecast) | Financial Impact (total cost in NPV over a 10 year forecast) | Overall Qualitative Impact | Risk Rating
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | Base Case – Do nothing and continue to acquire materials | $1,119 | $441 | Poor | Very High
2 | CARM 2 (No Capital Contribution) | $6,397 | $4,709 | Excellent | Low
3 | CARM 2 (Full Capital Contribution) | $8,227 | $4,931 | Excellent | Low
4 | Build new library building on campus | $16,828 | $19,081 | Good | Moderate
5 | Digitise collections | $18,316 | $20,480 | Excellent | Moderate - High
6 | Retrofit on-campus library buildings for medium to high density storage | $9,408 | $4,050 | Good | Moderate
7 | Retrofit existing off-campus university owned building for medium to high density storage | $8,217 | $6,296 | Good | Moderate - High
8 | Purpose build off-campus medium or high density storage facility | $5,233 | $5,315 | Good | Moderate - High
9 | Contract for storage with commercial provider | $1,086 | $1,856 | Poor | Very High

Conclusions

1. The CARM 2 option is a competitive option for the storage of low-use research materials because:
   - a lower initial capital outlay is required compared to the purpose built options,
   - and no additional library resources to monitor and catalogue research materials are needed;
   - the facility provides the qualitative needs for a user of a low-use storage facility; and
   - set-up and operational costs to the user minimised.

2. The purpose built and re-fit options are less attractive due to:
   - the relatively high cost of developing or refurbishing a purpose built facility for the sole use of a single University;
   - the need to source resources to process, catalogue and monitor low-use research materials by the Universities;
   - the opportunity costs associated with developing on campus; and
   - the risks to the Universities associated with the development period may be too high given the purpose of the facility is not a core tertiary service, but rather a key requirement of tertiary libraries.

3. While the digitisation option is a costly resource intensive process, future unidentified cost savings and additional services offered in a digital environment may make this option attractive. However the impact of permanent loss of print research volumes would also need to be identified.
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