

---

---

## IIM Library Consortium: do we have a success story to tell?

Mallikarjun Dora\* and H. Anil Kumar\*\*

### Abstract

*Consortium is a group of libraries that cooperate with each other for mutual benefit. The paper analyzes the different types of consortium in India. The main objective of the paper is to review the IIM consortium, which was formed in the year 2000, to benefit the IIM libraries in developing their collection and enhancing the services provided to their users. The paper describes the IIM Library Consortium Model, cost benefit analysis and discusses the future direction of the same*

### Introduction

Consortia formation is an important outcome of library cooperation and play a major role in negotiation and licensing of electronic resources providing the participant institutions a great relief in saving the cost of the acquisition of resources which otherwise seems unaffordable in light of budget constraints. They also contribute to sharing of resources on ILL, cross linking OPAC and collaboration in different projects by sharing of expertise. In recent times consortia has become important as many institutions are impacted by budget cuts or limited budgets.

According to Busby(2011) the positive outcome of group acquisition include:

- Lower cost of goods and services
- Increased access to existing and new resources
- More quantity of resources
- Reduced/shared risk to gain common/shared rewards
- Shared negotiations, the ability to draw on expertise not available in one's own library

Wade (1999) studied 11 different consortia of academic libraries from five countries and found that "many of the consortia surveyed undertake a limited range of activities of the type that can exist within an informal arrangement. These include reciprocal borrowing, interlibrary loan agreements, negotiating database licenses and seminars."

While studying different models of consortia in academic library segment, Allen and Hirshon(1998) found that "there is no specific model for consortia, they are highly decentralized one to highly centralized consortia. Each Model promises upon different values, objectives, and political realities of its membership. Consortia can also be evolving from one model to another as their members become more comfortable with each other to develop a collective agenda."

There are a number of consortia working in various countries working on different models. The research by Reinhardt and Boekhorst (2001) on Germany, Jokic(2001) on Croatia, Hormia-poutanen

---

\* Mr.Mallikarjun Dora, Professional Assistant \*\*Dr. H. Anil Kumar, Librarian  
Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, email: [anilkumar@iimahd.ernet.in](mailto:anilkumar@iimahd.ernet.in),  
[dora.mallikarjun@gmail.com](mailto:dora.mallikarjun@gmail.com)

---

(2006) on four different European countries of Greece, Russia, United Kingdom and Finland, Borm and Dujardin (2001) on Belgium , Ossai (2010) on Nigeria, Xu (2010) on China and Bostick(2001) on USA study different library consortia and their models.

It can be said that consortia models vary across nations and contexts and are mainly need based. The main character of a consortium is determined by the participating members and evolves to serve the changing needs of the member institutions.

### **Consortia in India**

In India there have been studies that have been undertaken on different library consortia and their models. Arora and Trivedi (2010) discuss the governing structure, participating institutions, subscribed resources and negotiation on licensing terms and conditions in INDEST and UGC INFONET consortia. Ghosh, Biswas and Jeevan(2006) discuss different models and methods available in Indian consortia. Singh and Rao (2008) have provided an overview of list of consortia in India. The table 1 below lists the various consortia that exist in India and their governing model.

**Table 1: Consortia in India**

| <b>Consortia Name</b>   | <b>Established on</b>     | <b>Sources of Fund</b>                        | <b>E Resources covered</b> | <b>Members</b>  |
|---|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| INDEST-AICTE Consortium   | 2003                      | Ministry of Human Resource Development, India | 34                         | 57 Core member<br>60 AICTE supported<br>1245 Self supported |
| UGC- INFONET consortium   | 2004                      | University Grant Commission, India            | 29                         | 320   |
| National knowledge Resource Consortia (earlier CSIR consortium) | 2001 (named NKRC in 2009) | Govt. Funded                                  | 33                         | 39 CSIR<br>24 DST   |
| Forum for Resource Sharing in Astronomy (FORSA)                 | 1981                      | Voluntary                                     | 10                         | 12 members  |
| Consortium for e-Resources in Agriculture                       | 2007                      | NAIP Project                                  | 9                          | 126 members   |
| Health Science Library and Information Network                  | 2003                      | Shared funding                                | 11                         | 666 members   |

|  |      |                                       |   |             |
|--|------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|
| Electronic Resources<br>in Medicine<br>(ERMED)<br>Consortium | 2008 | Director General<br>of Health Service | 9 | 98 Members  |
| IIM Library Consortia  | 2001 | Shared funding                        | 3 | 6 Old 7 new |

### **IIM Library Consortia: History**

The idea of IIM Library Consortium was initiated in 2000 by the librarians of IIMs with the objective of resource sharing of CD-ROM/Digital databases that were being regularly subscribed by IIM Libraries. The formal approval for the same came from the All IIM Directors meeting held at Indian Institute of Management, Kozhikode. August 2001. For further strengthening the consortium arrangement, the second meeting of IIM librarians was held at Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore during September 2001. In the same meeting 15 vendors/publishers/agents of databases and e-journals were invited for presentation of their products along with special consortia pricing offer. The IIM librarians held detailed discussion and based on the consensus derived, the following outcomes were arrived at:

1. It was found that, it is of utmost importance that all IIMs reach a consensus on:
  - Retaining the current journals subscription for the respective publishers
  - Bearing equally the additional costs for taking the advantage cross sharing
  - Exploring the other possibilities of cooperative acquisition of journals, e.g., subscription to multiple copies of same journals at a discounted price.
2. This meeting also provided the scope for examining various repackaged information services on India. As such information was not readily available on foreign industry information sources and therefore it was recommended that, in addition to the existing subscribed Indian sources, the following could also be subscribed to by all six IIMs at Consortia rates:
  - CAPITALINE
  - EQUITY RESEARCH STATION
  - INDIA INFORMER
  - CRISIL
3. It was also realized that during the initial stages of the consortia formation, it was possible to increase the information resource base by spending the same money or maybe marginally more. This is mainly because of the high costs of databases and a very small number of participating members in the consortia.
4. Some of the databases, which were currently being subscribed to by one or more IIMs, and hence proved the relevance to the IIM community, were negotiated for consortia offering. The negotiations yielded good results with the prices being drastically reduced for the same resources. For example

the discounts offered were up to 40 to 45% in some cases. The following databases were offered on discounted prices:

- ABI/INFORM Global Fulltext
- Business Sources Premier
- Gale Products (business and company resource center) suite
- Global Marketing Information Database (Euromonitor)

Though the meeting enabled the IIM Librarians to elicit better pricing offers for the databases, it actually turned out to be that the e-journals subscription which gave the consortium the real look. Under the IIM Library Consortium, shared access to Taylor and Francis, Kluwer online journals and John Wiley online journals was possible and the participating libraries paid marginal additional costs (Jambhekar, etal, 2003) for the additional access.

### **IIM Library Consortia: Current status**

**Table 2: IIM Library Consortia Model**

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Organizer            | All IIMs  |
| Sources of Funds     | No source funds                                 |
| Consortia Model      | Voluntary (restricted to IIMs only)             |
| Consortia structure  | Decentralized                                   |
| Electronic Resources | Wiley, Springer and Taylor and Francis Journals |

**Table 3: List of Old IIMs in the Consortia**

| <b>Sr. No</b> | <b>Name</b>                              | <b>Short Name</b> | <b>Established</b> | <b>City /Town</b> | <b>State /UT</b> | <b>Website</b>  |
|---------------|--|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1             | Indian Institute of Management Calcutta  | IIM-C             | 1961               | Kolkata           | West Bengal      | iimcal.ac.in    |
| 2             | Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad | IIM-A             | 1961               | Ahmedabad         | Gujarat          | iimahd.ernet.in |
| 3             | Indian Institute of Management Bangalore | IIMB              | 1973               | Bengaluru         | Karnataka        | iimb.ernet.in   |
| 4             | Indian Institute of Management Lucknow   | IIML              | 1984               | Lucknow           | Uttar Pradesh    | iiml.ac.in      |

|   |   |      |      |           |                |              |
|---|---|------|------|-----------|----------------|--------------|
| 5 | Indian Institute of Management<br>Kozhikode | IIMK | 1996 | Kozhikode | Kerala         | iimk.ac.in   |
| 6 | Indian Institute of Management<br>Indore    | IIMI | 1998 | Indore    | Madhya Pradesh | iimidr.ac.in |

**Table 4: List of New IIMs, the potential group can be added to the consortia**

| Sr. No | Name  | Short Name | Established | City /Town | State /UT    | Website           |
|--------|---|------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 1      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Shillong        | IIMS       | 2007        | Shillong   | Meghalaya    | iimshillong.in    |
| 2      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Rohtak          | IIM-R      | 2010        | Rohtak     | Haryana      | iimrohtak.ac.in   |
| 3      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Raipur          | IIM-Rp     | 2010        | Raipur     | Chhattisgarh | iimraipur.ac.in   |
| 4      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Ranchi          | IIM-Ra     | 2010        | Ranchi     | Jharkhand    | iimranchi.ac.in   |
| 5      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Tiruchirappalli | IIMT       | 2011        | Trichy     | Tamil Nadu   | iimtrichy.ac.in   |
| 6      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Udaipur         | IIMU       | 2011        | Udaipur    | Rajasthan    | iimu.ac.in        |
| 7      | Indian Institute of Management<br>Kashipur        | IIM-Kp     | 2011        | Kashipur   | Uttarakhand  | iimkashipur.ac.in |

### Licensing Policy

License agreement which include terms and conditions is an important document in electronic resource acquisition. The consortium considers issues like walk-in users access to the content; provision of generating copies of interlibrary loan, perpetual access and archival rights to the subscribed content, campus wide/ IP based unlimited access, remote log in access, permission to include subscribed resources into course packs, price rise, price cap, and so on.

---

---

With regard to ILL sharing, few publishers do have restrictions and for example, Taylor and Francis clearly states in their license restricting provision of content to other libraries on ILL. Some of the publishers permit the provision of hard copy of the papers on ILL and restrict the use of soft copy for ILL. In case walk-in users, some publishers clearly mention in their terms and conditions that walk-in users cannot be allowed to access the subscribed resource. The members need to thoroughly understand the license agreement and negotiate with the publishers to make provisions to protect the participating libraries interests and also to avoid breaking the terms mentioned in the agreements.

### **Negotiation**

There is no one-size fit-all model that can be adopted while negotiating with vendors or publishers. The IIM Library consortium always negotiated with each vendor or publisher separately as the needs were different for each resource. Negotiation was done on different aspects like price, content, access, service and above all license agreement terms and conditions. License agreements were discussed and deliberated as already mentioned in the licensing policy section above. IIM Library consortium has presently subscriptions from Wiley, Springer and Taylor and Francis. The procedure that was decided in IIM librarians meeting of all participating libraries was to list out all the journals (of these three publishers) subscribed by each IIM. It was also decided to go with e-only subscriptions to all the journals and this plays an important role in standardizing the model for negotiation with publisher. Some participating libraries insisted in retaining print subscriptions and it was left to the individual libraries to decide. However the additional pricing for print was negotiated by the consortium.

The listing that was compiled became the basis for the proposal which was discussed with the publisher. The proposal was to seek access to all unique titles from the list to all members of the consortium. This implied that the consortia resources would be shared by all the IIM libraries by paying an additional cross sharing access fee for the online access. In the early years, negotiation was mainly for cross sharing and was based on the principle of retaining the print subscriptions by the member libraries. The problem with this model was that members who had large subscriptions had to pay more for the same access, this was in a sense inequitable.

There was a need to improve the efficiency of the model and the issues to be addressed were:

1. Equal cost for equal content principle to be adopted.
2. Perpetual rights to subscribed content to be provided.
3. As more members join the consortium, benefits should accrue to both the publisher and the members.

In the coming years negotiations yielded better results. Firstly perpetual access right to the content (subscribed year) was pursued with the publishers and this was adopted in the model. Later on the perpetual access right from 1997 onwards to the subscribed content was negotiated and this was accepted by one publisher. Negotiations also bore fruit in issues that included price rise and price cap, switching titles and adding more journals in the same price band. It can be said that the negotiation process evolved over the years and centred round the simple principle of equal access and equal cost to all members for each publisher and benefit to both the members and publishers with increase in membership to the consortium. One more issue was addressed in this model where-in new members were not burdened with high costs of accessing resources that were decided by the

---

---

older members. Therefore the model provided for almost no cost in the first year to gradually increasing the individual member cost to equal the older members cost over 2 to 3 years. It gave time for the institution also to grow to the level of older IIMs in terms of programmes, faculty and students. The publishers also gracefully accepted this to help new IIM libraries to develop.

### **Salient features of IIM Library Consortia**

- Presently there are three publishers in current consortia that include Wiley, Springer and Taylor and Francis.
- The start point of the negotiations was the existing print subscriptions and negotiations were done with each publisher individually and in some cases with their representatives.
- Cross sharing of existing all journal subscriptions across IIM libraries.
- Invoicing was through vendors who represented the publishers.
- Negotiation could be beyond price and extend to enhanced access, archival access, perpetual rights and license agreements.
- Consortium adopted a flexible model wherein there was no restriction on adding or removing titles from the core subscription but could be done at the start of the year or when the consortium agreement is renewed. This was mainly because addition or deletion had implications on the total value.
- With the increase in number of members, the offer should benefit existing members in addition to providing new customers to the publisher.
- In addition to negotiation on procurement of e-resources the members shared:
  - Issues, concerns and solutions to managing IIM Libraries
  - Best practices
  - IT application experiences
  - Strengthening of ILL processes
  - Extending access to students and faculty of various IIMs to other IIM Libraries
  - Exchange of working papers
  - Cross connecting staff of IIM libraries in an informal manner.
  - Discuss the larger INDEST consortium interests of IIM libraries
  - Compiling union catalogue of e-resources across IIM libraries

### **Conclusion**

Allen and Hirshon (1998) suggest that though consortia members may come together to reduce common costs (such as purchase of databases), these new consortia are not simply purchasing clubs. The most successful consortia develop institutional strategic alliances in which a heightened level of resource sharing binds the member institution together. The very idea of the above is that consortia should evolve from its usual role of not only bargaining for better price but come out with different strategies for collaboration in higher level like sharing on ILL, interchanging staff, creating a repository of institutional knowledge, etc.

---

---

IIM library consortium is growing with more members being added with the formation of new IIMs across the country. The consortium is evolving into an effective facilitator to enhance library services in various IIM libraries. To a large extent, the success of IIM library consortium depends on the role of the directors and library committee chairpersons of the IIMs. There seems to be a great potential to take the IIM library consortium to the next level with the larger objective of promoting research and enhance learning experience of the IIM academic community.

## References

1. Wade, R. (1999). The very model of a modern library consortium. *Library Consortium Management: An International Journal*, 1(1/2), 5–18. doi:10.1108/14662769910284230
2. Jambhekar, A., Pandian, P., Gupta, Dinesh K.(2003). *Partnership for success : A case of IIMs Libraries Consortia Model*. Retrieved from <http://www.tifr.res.in/~libws/paul-paper1.htm>
3. Allen, B. M., & Hirshon, A. (1998). Hanging Together To Avoid Hanging Separately: Opportunities for Academic Libraries and Consortia. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 17(1), 36–44.
4. Reinhardt, W., & Boekhorst, P. te. (2001). Library consortia in Germany. *Liber Quarterly*; 11 [1], 2001. Retrieved from <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/DARLIN/2005-0520-200052/UUindex.html>
5. Jokic, M. (2001). Library consortia in Croatia. *Liber Quarterly*; 11[1], 2001. Retrieved from <http://liber.library.uu.nl/publish/articles/000407/article.pdf>
6. Hormia-Poutanen, K., Xenidou-Dervou, C., Kupryte, R., Stange, K., Kuznetsov, A. V., & Woodward, H. M. (2006). Consortia in Europe: Describing the Various Solutions through Four Country Examples. *Library Trends*, 54(3), 359–381.
7. Borm, J. van, & Dujardin, M. (Marianne). (2001). Consortia for Electronic Library Provision in Belgium. *LIBER Quarterly; Volume 11 (2001) / No 1*. Retrieved from <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/DARLIN/2005-0511-200119/UUindex.html>
8. Ossai, N. B. (2010). Consortia Building among Libraries in Africa, and the Nigerian Experience. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 2(2), 74–85.
9. Xu, D. (2010). CALIS, CASHL and Library Consortium Trend in China. *Library Management*, 31(8/9), 690–701. doi:10.1108/01435121011093450
10. Bostick, S. L. (2001). Academic Library Consortia in the United States: an introduction. *Liber Quarterly*; 11[1], 200. Retrieved from <http://cdigital.uv.mx/handle/123456789/5931>
11. Arora, J., & Trivedi, K. (2010). INDEST-AICTE Consortium: Present Services and Future Endeavours. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 30(2), 79–91.
12. Arora, J., & Trivedi, K. (2010). UGC-INFONET Digital Library Consortium: Present Services and Future Endeavours. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 30(2), 15–25.
13. Ghosh, M., Biswas, S.C., Jeevan, V.K.J. (2006). Strategic cooperation and consortia building for Indian libraries: models and methods. *Library Review*, Vol. 55 Iss: 9 pp. 608 – 620
14. Kumar, B. V., & Murthy, A. O. (2008, November 6). Consortium for Medical Libraries in India and Abroad: A Study. Article. Retrieved July 6, 2012, from <http://ir.inflibnet.ac.in/dxml/handle/1944/1119>