

DISCUSSION NOTES

Elena O'Malley (Emerson College) asked the Reporting SIG to discuss the following questions, and various institutions' responses are compiled below.

Elena O'Malley: In our Reporting meeting today (April 13, 2020), we were discussing requests for counts on ILL activity. We're trying to understand what ILL means, in the broader sense, to different institutions.

QUESTIONS:

Are we talking about intraconsortial borrowing - one set of institutions that are all using a single FOLIO implementation and lending within it (which seems like it would be covered by internal circulation activity reports), or one FOLIO instance to another using a FOLIO tool that hasn't been developed yet? If the latter, that may need to wait a bit. My understanding is that Consortia SIG is on hold til the end of April, waiting for development of ReShare, to see if it would be preferred to use that tool rather than develop an internal FOLIO tool. If that sounds like a mischaracterization of that situation, please speak up.

Or is ILL exclusively external lending and borrowing via a third-party system (OCLC, etc)? If we're talking about reporting on external interlibrary loan activity, how is that tracked within the ILS now?

We know some libraries have one or more "ILL borrower" user accounts that they use for checking out items before they send them out to other libraries. They can see how many items were checked out, and when, and what the status of those items are (overdue, lost, etc). In that case, is there

- a special patron group or other mechanism to identify these "ILL borrower" accounts
- a note or other field in that borrower record(s)

a handful of specific accounts that otherwise look like regular patron accounts (that only the institution would know how to identify)

Or, is it handled only on the level of the item's record

- a change in item status
- a change in item location
- some other method?

And I'm assuming that some institutions may create brief item records to check a received requested item out to their own patron, to track if that item becomes overdue, lost, etc. If so, how can we identify those brief records as "ILL" items

- created by a specific staff member
- a field in the bib record
- an item type
- assigned a special location in the holdings record

- some other method?

Please weigh in via email or Slack, and encourage others to do so as well. This is so we can figure out which fields to include in the requested reports, so it gets the data that people need.

Response from Erin Nettifee, Duke Univ:

Or is ILL exclusively external lending and borrowing via a third-party system (OCLC, etc)? If we're talking about reporting on external interlibrary loan activity, how is that tracked within the ILS now?

Can only speak for Duke, but it's generally external lending and borrowing, but the integrations can be pretty tightly intertwined. We have OCLC lending, which occurs within OCLC and lent within ILLiad, but we also have very active consortial lending with Relais D2D, where loans to patrons happen within the ILS.

We know some libraries have one or more "ILL borrower" user accounts that they use for checking out items before they send them out to other libraries. They can see how many items were checked out, and when, and what the status of those items are (overdue, lost, etc). In that case, is there

- *a special patron group or other mechanism to identify these "ILL borrower" accounts*
-
- *a note or other field in that borrower record(s)*

a handful of specific accounts that otherwise look like regular patron accounts (that only the institution would know how to identify?)

Or, is it handled only on the level of the item's record

- *a change in item status*
- *a change in item location*
- *some other method?*

You're getting at the need for dummy users, which the Workflow engine was hopefully going to get rid of. Since we don't have that, implementers will have to have different workarounds. It would likely be a special patron group, because that would allow for the writing of circulation rules to change the behavior of items out on ILL loan.

You may also see item-level information changing. For example, if I loan an item via OCLC, I might change the loan type to *ill-loan* and write a circ rule that says items with that loan type can't be requested, since we can't get it back in time.

But, for items that are being managed through Relais D2D, it might need to be tied to a patron group / dummy record, because my understanding is that Relais requires a patron record to interface with.

So it's unfortunately not that simple.

And I'm assuming that some institutions may create brief item records to check a received requested item out to their own patron, to track if that item becomes overdue, lost, etc. If so, how can we identify those brief records as "ILL" items

- *created by a specific staff member*
- *a field in the bib record*
- *an item type*
- *assigned a special location in the holdings record*
- *some other method?*

Correct. You are getting at the discussion of “on-the-fly” item records - <https://issues.folio.org/browse/UXPROD-1057>

For Relais D2D, brief bibs are created in our current system for loans. You would identify it based on the item status and the item sublibrary. I have no clue how we would identify it in FOLIO.

Response from **Joshua Lambert, Missouri State Univ:**

Your email includes lots of questions so I’ll do my best to respond to a couple of them. The Missouri State University Libraries currently use OCLC’s Tipasa for ILL functionality and it will remain that way for the near future. The only connection between Tipasa and our current ILS (Sierra) is an ILL “patron.” When ILL lends a book to another institution, we check that book out to the ILL patron in Sierra. When the book comes back, we check it back in using Sierra. We don’t currently use that ILL patron record for any of our statistical gathering but instead use Tipasa. At migration time, we don’t expect any more integration with FOLIO than we have with Sierra. FOLIO already has enough functionality and the Reporting SIG would not need to do anything.

The Missouri State University Libraries are currently in a consortium and use consortial borrowing functionality through Innovative Interfaces’ INN-REACH system. That consortial borrowing will cease when we migrate to FOLIO. I listened in on the Consortia SIG meetings and concur with what you say below regarding that SIG reevaluating options later this month.

Response from **David Larsen, Univ. of Chicago:**

At the University of Chicago, the items we borrow from other libraries are given a brief bib and item record via the NCIP AcceptItem process, which also places the newly created item on hold for the requesting patron. We can easily identify these items for statistical purposes because they have unique locations, special barcode prefixes, and loan types. The items that we lend from our collections to other libraries are also easily identified for statistical purposes because they are lent to pseudo-borrowers that represent the borrowing libraries and which have borrower types that identify them as lending accounts. I would expect that regardless of whether we are lending within the consortium on a single instance of FOLIO or between ILS systems, we’d still need to do something similar. I also don’t think it will matter whether we are using ReShare, ILLiad, Relais D2D, or another system, we’ll still want to create short bibs & items for the things we borrow and want to lend our materials to other libraries using lending pseudo-borrower accounts.

Response from **Kate Zdepski, Univ. Of Massachusetts:**

Are we talking about intraconsortial borrowing - one set of institutions that are all using a single FOLIO implementation and lending within it (which seems like it would be covered by internal circulation activity reports), or one FOLIO instance to another using a FOLIO tool that hasn't been developed yet? If the latter, that may need to wait a bit. My understanding is that Consortia SIG is on hold til the end of April, waiting for development of ReShare, to see if it would be preferred to use that tool rather than develop an internal FOLIO tool. If that sounds like a mischaracterization of that situation, please speak up.

When we talk about ILL in the 5C, we pretty much never mean intraconsortial borrowing. We frequently have to educate our patrons on the difference between a 5C loan (which is from another library, but in our own system) and what we would consider an ILL loan, which is from a farther afield library, and comes in through another system. I think our 5C sharing needs are being communicated to FOLIO already.

Or is ILL exclusively external lending and borrowing via a third-party system (OCLC, etc)? If we're talking about reporting on external interlibrary loan activity, how is that tracked within the ILS now?

Yes, ILL is exclusively external lending and borrowing through third-party systems. We use ILLiad as an Interlibrary Loan Management System, and we share through OCLC and Rapid as well as via outside requests sent through LWeb and email. This activity is not tracked within our ILS. We track these statistics through ILLiad. When we need to report to ACRL etc., this is where the stats come from. I know Gordon had some thought that the 5C loans should be counted towards ILL numbers when reporting out, but I don't know if he was combining them or just thought they should be.

We know some libraries have one or more "ILL borrower" user accounts that they use for checking out items before they send them out to other libraries. They can see how many items were checked out, and when, and what the status of those items are (overdue, lost, etc). In that case, is there

- a special patron group or other mechanism to identify these "ILL borrower" accounts
- a note or other field in that borrower record(s)
- a handful of specific accounts that otherwise look like regular patron accounts (that only the institution would know how to identify)

Or, is it handled only on the level of the item's record

- a change in item status
- a change in item location
- some other method?

We have one single ILL Borrower account (there's even a physical card) which we use to check out materials in the ILS which we are sending to other libraries. We talked about and documented how this works somewhat in a FOLIO discussion last year, about non-human borrowers. Some libraries have separate borrower accounts for every library they lend to, which I think is why this question is phrased this way -- that would be a nightmare! ILLiad documents which library items go to. We do also have a change in item status, which was created to stop local patrons from being able to Recall a book which was sent to another library by ILL. This is because it's better for the patron to get another 5C copy if one exists -- or for them to put in an ILL request themselves.

In the new system, I do not have a particular preference between having an ILL Borrower account for our items, or having the item status be changed, as long as making the change is quick and simple for ILL staff to do, easily visible that the item is out on ILL if a staff person needs to look it up, and non-recallable by patrons.

And I'm assuming that some institutions may create brief item records to check a received requested item out to their own patron, to track if that item becomes overdue, lost, etc. If so, how can we identify those brief records as "ILL" items

- created by a specific staff member
- a field in the bib record
- an item type
- assigned a special location in the holdings record
- some other method?

We do NOT do this! We have no records for ILL items in our ILS. Overdues, lost, etc. are tracked in ILLiad.

Some institutions create these brief catalog records for everything they get in through ILL. The benefit is that the ILL items can be seen in one place on the patron's account; this is why our patrons have to look in one place for their 5C loans, and another place for their ILL loans (unless their using MyLibraryAccount, which pulls info from both places). While some libraries have set up processes in their systems to make the records automatically, others are basically cataloging short records by hand for each item. These records then have to be deleted out of the system when the ILL item is returned.

Response from Paul Engelberg at Fenway Lib Org:

I think of ILL as being the borrowing and lending done outside of our Fenway Library Organization consortium, via OCLC WorldShare. We have one patron account in Voyager to which we charge books out that are for ILL. It belongs to a special patron group so that we can be sure that items are given a loan period that will be in sync with the loan period we use in WorldShare.

Response from Joanne Leary at Cornell University:

Here are details from Cornell about our Borrow Direct and Interlibrary Loan systems:

Borrow Direct : a consortial borrowing/lending system managed via a shared catalog of the 13 Ivies Plus libraries, and a shared request management database (Relais)

- Lending: Cornell materials are requested via Relais and checked out in Relais, which automatically generates a local checkout in Voyager. We create "accounts" (patron records) in Voyager for each of the 13 members of the consortia, and loaned items are checked out to the appropriate account. We get stats from both Relais and Voyager.

- Borrowing: items requested from member institutions are updated in Relais, which generates an item record in Voyager and places a hold for the patron. We get stats from both Relais and Voyager.

Interlibrary Loan: traditional ILL with requests generated via OCLC or a local web request form. All requests managed within the ILL management database ILLiad. Cornell has three ILL processing units (one each for endowed colleges, contract colleges, and school of Law).

- Lending: Loaned material is updated to "checked out" within ILLiad to the specific borrowing institution. ILL has a library account in Voyager for all ILL checkouts (no institution-specific accounts as is done in Borrow Direct). Staff manually check-out any ILL loans to the ILL loan account. We primarily get stats from ILLiad as this allows us to differentiate between request types, but also count check-outs to the ILL patron record in Voyager.
- Borrowing: all borrowing is managed in ILLiad; there is no Voyager component for ILL check-outs to Cornell patrons.

Response from **Ingolf Kuss at HbZ**

Hi Elena and sorry for the late answer.

At hbz and GBV, taking part in ILL means that the Folio instance needs to connect to a "central ILL server".

Folio needs to communicate via an "SLNP interface" to this central ILL server.

There are Jira-Tickets for building the SLNP support: UXPROD-1005 and UXPROD-1006.

This functionality hasn't been developed yet.

As an alternative, libraries may use e-mails to communicate with the central ILL server.

- Ingolf
