

MORE FUD FROM SIRSI/DYNIX

MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 2010

Two Visits

After we notified [SirsiDynix](#) that we planned on migrating to a new system, we had a visit on July 6 from David Noll, our SirsiDynix Field Sales Consultant. Dave wanted to know why we intended on leaving Symphony. We discussed our current issues ... and the main problem was the cost of the product and how frustrated we are that the prices continue to climb. Dave informed us that 30% of the libraries that left SirsiDynix for open source software ended up with SirsiDynix again. He wanted us to know that they would welcome us back again if our project didn't work out. He said that they would try to help us if we had any concerns.

[Source: koha4arcadialibrary.blogspot.com]

On Aug 25, 2010 at 12:48pm, Lori Bowen Ayre wrote:

Dear SirsiDynix,

I was reading from the new blog set up by one of your clients, Arcadia Library and they quote one of your employees as saying something I found quite surprising. Here's what they said:

"After we notified SirsiDynix that we planned on migrating to a new system, we had a visit on July 6 from David Noll, our SirsiDynix Field Sales Consultant. Dave wanted to know why we intended on leaving Symphony. We discussed our current issues ... and the main problem was the cost of the product and how frustrated we are that the prices continue to climb. Dave informed us that 30% of the libraries that left SirsiDynix for open source software ended up with SirsiDynix again."

Please substantiate this remark with some verifiable facts. I suspect this is one more instance of the FUD that your company has been connected to before....but I thought I'd first give you an opportunity to explain how you have come to such a conclusion before I publicly raise a fuss.

Lori Ayre

On Aug 25, 2010 at 1:01PM Jualianne Hancock wrote:

Hi Lori -

Thanks for your email. Let me loop back with our folks and get you an answer. Thanks much!
JA

On Mon, Aug 30, 2010 at 12:14 PM, Julianne Hancock wrote:

Hi Lori -

I hope you had a good weekend and I apologize for not getting this to you sooner. Below is a response. If you have anything else you need from me, please don't hesitate to contact me immediately.

The industry has heard accusations in the past that propriety vendors instill fear, uncertainty and doubt in the open source/proprietary solution debate. Speaking for SirsiDynix, our company's leadership has stated many times that we believe that competition is good. It challenges all vendors who are invested in the success of libraries to continuously improve our products and services, and fuels innovation that make libraries better for users around the world. Open source solutions, either independently or commercially developed and maintained, can be the right solution for a library for a number of reasons. As with any other technology solution, libraries evaluate their specific needs to find the best solution that fits their budget and resource availability.

While we do have a number of customers who have left SirsiDynix solutions for an open source solution and have since returned to SirsiDynix, I want to be clear that we have not stated it was 30 percent. However, when a customer is considering open source in order to reduce their costs, we share the experiences of our other customers who abandoned their projects.

Many open source proponents declare that two of the biggest benefits to an open source solution are lowered costs and improved system capabilities. However, representatives from libraries using open source solutions have stated publicly that open source does not automatically translate to lower costs and increased functionality. The inverse relationship between cost and functionality is the predominant reason libraries who have returned to SirsiDynix decided to abandon their open source solution - they simply could not afford to get the system to where it needed to be, especially with recent budget and subsequent staffing challenges in the library industry.

At the Evergreen International Conference this year, presenters discussed working through limited functionality (which directly translated to significant costs for one presenting library), and it was consistently stated that libraries considering open source should not make the move if they are looking to save money.

In a panel discussion held at this year's PLA conference, you participated in the program "Open Source Works!" The session intended to "de-mystify open-source library systems," and included presenters from three library systems. You may recall that of those three library systems represented, one library had not gone live with their solution because it did not yet have the needed functionality that their proprietary system had, and the presenter specifically noted the significant costs they incurred to develop the required functionality. Another presenter noted that their open source solution was not saving the library money compared to their proprietary solution.

Specific to SirsiDynix customers who have left to implement open source solutions, most have contracted with a commercial agency for consulting and ongoing system support. Due to public disclosure laws, it is publicly documented that many of these libraries are now paying commercial companies more than they paid for their SirsiDynix maintenance agreements.

Again, there are libraries that have found open source to be a positive fit for their LMS needs. But most of our library customers have not found a compelling argument in open source if they are looking to save costs, especially provided the evidence about the costs and feature challenges. We don't believe that educating customers is instilling fear, uncertainty or doubt.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Julianne

JULIANNE HANCOCK | Global Marketing & Communications Manager | SirsiDynix

P: [801.223.5273](tel:801.223.5273) | M: 801.819.3763 | julianne.hancock@sirsidynix.com

www.sirsidynix.com

On Aug 30, 2010, at 1:25 PM, Lori Bowen Ayre wrote:

Thanks for the response but you didn't respond to my question.

You say "While we do have a number of customers who have left SirsiDynix solutions for an open source solution and have since returned to SirsiDynix, I want to be clear that we have not stated it was 30 percent. " What is that number then? (And have you told your sales rep that this isn't true and that he shouldn't say that?)

Lori

On Tue, Aug 31, 2010 at 2:11 AM, Julianne Hancock wrote:

Again, we believe that the 30 percent number was taken out of context. David stated that he did not give that number, and we have not discussed data of this type with our sales team.

Of the customers who have left SirsiDynix for open source solutions, a number have returned - all of which came back because the investment they didn't realize they would have to make to ensure their solution was fully functional and supported. We issued a joint press release with McMaster University, however, due to non-disclosure agreements we have with our other customers, we are unable to provide specific numbers.

Thanks, Julianne

On Aug 31, 2010 at 8:51 AM, Lori Bowen Ayre wrote:

You could provide numbers without disclosing who the specific libraries are. It's as easy to [state] "a number" as it is "5" or "15" or "3". I suspect it is less than 1% of your customers to which this statement applies. But it would be useful to know. If it really was 30%, I suspect the nondisclosure issue would be moot.

On Aug 31, 2010 at 9:39AM, Lori Bowen Ayre wrote:

Julianne,

I find your response to be disingenuous. You evidently told a reporter that "most" of your customers who migrated to open-source returned to SirsiDynix." That's even more than the 30% David Noll claimed and which you have disavowed.

Here's the article: <http://www.kitsapsun.com/news/2010/aug/30/kitsap-regional-library-catalog-system-ailing/#ixzz0yCak6E6c>

Here's what the article states: "That said, Hancock added, most of their customers who migrated to open-source software have since returned because they found managing the systems a drain on scarce resources."