

Consortia Profiles

The following chart is intended to provide a fuller understanding of the various existing consortia configurations and services for those libraries and consortia interested in FOLIO. Quantification of this information will lead to a better understanding of the Consortia SIG priorities and next steps.

For each interested Consortia, please indicate what resources or services the consortia share, and which resources or services are not shared. Also please indicate if you are exploring other options in the future.

Consortia	Participate in other consortia?	Resource sharing: Users/Patrons (not necessarily in one database)	Resource sharing: Circulation	Resource sharing: Metadata (ie Union catalog)	Resource sharing: Collection Management	Resource Sharing: Electronic Resources	Buying club Consortia negotiate licensing terms and costs on behalf of member libraries. (primarily e-resources)	Acquisition and Fund Management	Workflows Consortia staff or staff at member libraries perform certain tasks on behalf of other member libraries.
Ivy Plus (AKA BorrowDirect)	Yes; all members of BorrowDirect are also members of other consortia.	No; there is no shared patron database. There is onsite borrowing, but onsite borrowers would be added as visitors to the location's database.	There's borrowing among members done through ILL. Individual institutions control the collections available for IvyPlus borrowing. There is also onsite borrowing services.	No, but a shared index is planned.	This is an active area of exploration - they want this to grow - but we're not sure of current scope.	Not that we are aware of.	Not that we are aware of.	Not shared	No
Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN)	Yes; members of TRLN also participate in other consortia	No; there is no shared patron database	There's a shared index and borrowing among members done through ILL. Individual institutions control the collections available for borrowing. There are also onsite borrowing services.	Yes; a shared index is currently up called TRLN Discovery. Each school has their own interface. Software is Blacklight.	Some subject areas have collection agreements (each school focuses on a particular area.) There is also shared collection in offsite storage.	Yes; small subset of eBooks through OUP agreement.	Yes; some eResource shared licensing.	Not shared	No
FLO		Yes. All patron information is sharable among all consortia members	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Not shared. The majority of electronic resources are not shared among the consortia but are library specific.	Yes. The majority of electronic resources are purchased in packages.	Not shared. Acquisition and fund management is library specific. In fact, this information must not be shared.	Not shared. With the exception of bulk patron, bib and authority record loads, libraries perform their own work.
USMAI	Whole consortium: Maryland Digital Library (a statewide "buying club") University of Maryland, College Park: Big Ten Academic Alliance	Yes. Shared patron database	Yes	Yes	Partial. A subset of our libraries participate in a consortial collection retention program.	Not shared. We had a shared DDA collection but that was sunset on 2019-06-30.	Yes. All-group licensing only; no subgroup licensing at this point.	Not shared.	Partial. Consortia staff do some tasks (system configuration, batch loads, batch data updates, staff account creation) on behalf of member libraries.

Marmot Library Network	Yes. Some members participate in Prospector, some do not.	No. Patron database is scoped. It is still possible for staff to see patron records from other libraries' scopes. We would like to be able to make this impossible.	Mixed. Some members share materials, some don't. Some only share some materials.	Yes.	No.	Minimal. Only RBDigital and Overdrive are purchased as a consortium. All other resources are purchased by members directly. Most electronic resources are loaded directly into the discovery layer, not into the ILS at all.	Only RBDigital and Overdrive.	Not shared. Each library has a separate accounting unit.	Consortia loads updates from the authority vendor and bulk patron loads.
Five Colleges		Yes Shared patron database	Yes	Shared database with duplicate bib records. currently Moving to a single shared bib record.	Partial. Shared off-site storage where items owned by consortium. A consortial print approval plan for university press titles. Consortial retention program also in place.	Some shared purchases, mostly databases. A JSTOR ebook DDA program across the consortia	Yes- some purchases negotiated on behalf of the member, or a subset of members	Not shared- separate acquisition units. Some billing for consortial purchases centralized where central office pays vendor and bills individual units.	Partial. Consortial staff load for resource held in-common and automated loads of bibs, orders and invoices with GOBI. Shared cataloging workflow of off-site storage material. Shared position for CJK material. System administration centralized. Authority work done at consortial level.
GBV (Common Library Network, Headquarter Göttingen)	No, but there is a shared union catalogue with SWB Consortium.	No. Our structure: All LBS sites are working in one union catalogue. Each LBS site is one installation. On each installation each library (tenant) has its own patron database. In some sites there is a cooperation between these patron databases - (regional function of data exchange)	Yes (ILL)	Yes. Union catalogue also includes metadata from SWB Consortium, usage of other metadata (WorldCat, LoC, other sources)	Information sharing between member libraries: what is ordered, bought via union catalogue	Yes, shared portfolio of available e-resources in the whole network Data share with EZB (Electronic journals database) and ZDB (Zeitschriftendat enbank = journals database) Shared e-book pool GBV + SWB network	Inside GBV: buying club (Lower Saxony Consortium) Across GBV: buying club (Friedrich-Althoff-Konsortium)	Information sharing on item level in the union catalogue Organisational structure: All LBS sites are working in one union catalogue. Each LBS site is one installation. On each installation each library (tenant) has its own ACQ module. Inside the ACQ module cooperation is possible or strictly limited.	GBV: Loading and update of catalogue records; ILL administration; Buying Club: Head office for administrative work. ACQ: centralized acquisition for a tenant (with multiple libraries)
GALILEO (GIL)	Yes...we are technically a consortia of consortia. Only managing ILS for the University System libraries (GALILEO Interconnected Libraries - GIL)	Lookup ability across GIL libraries. No shared patron database.	Yes, unmediated consortial request across GIL libraries. ILL for others.	Yes, union catalog for GIL libraries. Links to look up materials in other statewide catalogs (e.g., PINES)	Active area of investigation. Some libraries have shared off-site storage. Some policies around last copy, etc.	Yes, many resources licensed centrally on behalf of entire state or specific stakeholder groups.	Yes. Opt-in licensing of resources available.	Not currently shared. Area of potential investigation.	Yes, both. Central office staff perform some duties on behalf of member libraries. Library volunteers on functional committees also perform tasks occasionally. Also investigating options such as centralized cataloging (one institution catalogs for others)

GWLA (Greater Western Library Alliance)	Yes, many members are also part of other consortia	No, but we have agreement that member library's patrons can go to the other member library to check out their books on site, we call "Onsite Reciprocal Circulation" However, as with ILL, the home library is ultimately responsible for any fines or other charges its patrons may owe to another institution.	Yes	No, but we use RapidR for behind the scene search. The system checks each member library's holding and availability and fill the request via RapidR. Patrons won't be able to see member libraries' catalogs.	Some libraries share off-site storage and claim resource in common for those items housed in the storage, so that their copies can be removed from their own collections	not shared	Yes, some packages are negotiated under the consortia price	Not shared	No
PALNI (Private Academic Library Network of Indiana)	Yes, PALNI institutions are also part of other consortia	Yes, patron database is shared	Yes	Yes, via discovery scoping	Yes in some areas - retention agreements in shared print, also some collection development workflows include this	Minimal when licenses allow	Very little, a couple of shared purchases exist	There are a couple of purchases done at the consortium level on behalf of supported institutions through membership fees , but these purchases are not done via traditional acquisitions module.	Yes, this happens both with consortium staff as well as particular library staff working on behalf of partner libraries remotely.
hbz (Northrhine-Westfalia Library Service Centre, Cologne)		No, there is no shared patron database	Yes - ILL	Yes, shared union catalog		Metadata shared with EZB (electronic journals database) and ZDB (serials database).	Yes, buying club: hbz consortium	Not shared	Yes, buying club, ILL, Discovery System Service, and other services
HeBIS (Hessian Library Information System) Frankfurt	Shared union catalogue								
BVB (Bavarian Library Network), Munich	Shared union catalogue	No.	Yes - ILL.	Yes.	Information sharing between member libraries: what is ordered, bought via union catalogue	Yes. ILL partially also for electronic resources.	Yes. Bayern-Konsortium.	No.	Yes. Catalog, ILL, Discovery, E-Resource-Management and -activation for link resolving.