



Request for Proposal

Shared Library Management Service

Major Deadlines

January 16, 2012, 5 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time

Declaration of Intent to Bid (Appendix I) delivered as MSWord or pdf attachment to email sent to orbiscas@uoregon.edu.

February 29, 2012

Proposal (Appendix II) delivered as MSWord or pdf attachment to email sent to orbiscas@uoregon.edu

See Section 2.2 for Key Dates.

Sole contact for all questions and correspondence

John F. Helmer
Executive Director
Orbis Cascade Alliance
1299 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1299
jhelmer@uoregon.edu
541.346.1835

Email contact is preferred.

Table of Contents

1. Purpose and General Information	p. 3
2. RFP Process and Key Dates	p. 6
3. Scope of Services	p. 9
4. Evaluation & Scoring	p. 9
Appendix I. Declaration of Intent to Bid	p. 11
Appendix II. Scope of Services and Proposal Template	p. 12
Section A. Overall intent and outcomes desired	p. 13
Section B. Price	p. 14
Section C. Customer References	p. 15
Section D. Vendor Capacity	p. 15
Section E. Systems	p. 16
Section F. Staff Functions	p. 24
Section F.1. Collections and Resource Management	p. 25
Section F.2. Description and Metadata	p. 29
Section F.3. Circulation and Resource Sharing	p. 32
Section G: Discovery and User Experience	p. 37
Section H: Additional product or service information	p. 40

1. Purpose and General Information

1.1. Intent

The Orbis Cascade Alliance (“Alliance,” a 501c3 nonprofit corporation) encourages proposals from vendors, nonprofit organizations, consortia, and others offering to provide library management services in a shared environment (commonly referred to as a “Shared ILS”).

Through strategic planning, the Alliance has concluded that improved services, cost efficiency, and prospects for cooperative collection development and collaborative approaches to technical services will be facilitated by a move from more than 30 stand-alone Integrated Library Systems (ILS) to a single shared solution. More than simply replicating legacy systems in a shared or cloud-computing environment, we are issuing this RFP with the expectation of contracting for a unified set of services that exceed traditional ILS capabilities. Because we expect to consider new systems and approaches, this RFP is intentionally broad in scope and focused on outcomes rather than detailed functional requirements. *Respondents are strongly encouraged to respond with functional details and to convey how their service would work in a shared environment to achieve the outcomes described in the RFP.*

Beyond the 37 governing members, the Alliance is also helping to explore ILS options for a broader and more diverse group of non-member libraries that currently share an ILS with one or more Alliance members. The Alliance does not represent these non-member libraries or their consortia but may elect to play a role in facilitating their adoption of the product(s) selected by the Alliance.

1.2. Contractual structure

The Alliance expects to contract with one vendor for Staff Functions and may contract with the same vendor or additional vendor(s) for Discovery and User Experience. The Alliance will serve as an intermediary providing this shared management system to member libraries. The Alliance will, at minimum, coordinate member library input on service, product development, etc. and, as appropriate, may elect to play an expanded role in supporting the service(s) selected. Any contract resulting from this RFP process will be a separate agreement, incorporating relevant provisions of the RFP, proposal, and subsequent negotiation.

1.3. Confidentiality

If requested by respondents, the Alliance will limit distribution of full proposals to the Shared ILS Team and Working Groups, Council of library directors, and consortium staff. The Alliance may elect to share a written summary of proposals selected for demonstration with member library staff and may elect to make those product demonstrations available to non-member libraries that currently share an ILS with one or more Alliance members. The Alliance will not agree to a more restrictive approach to confidentiality.

Document or demonstration	Accessible to the following groups
Full proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Council of library directors● Shared ILS Team and Working Groups● Alliance staff
Summary of proposals (without pricing information) from those invited to provide product demonstrations Product demonstrations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Council of library directors● Shared ILS Team and Working Groups● Alliance staff● Member library staff● Non-member libraries that currently share an ILS with one or more Alliance members

1.4. About the Orbis Cascade Alliance

The Orbis Cascade Alliance is a consortium of 37 academic libraries in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho serving faculty, staff, community members, and the equivalent of more than 258,000 full-time students. Alliance member libraries work together to provide outstanding services to students and faculty, share information resources and expertise, develop library staff, and help members allocate financial and human resources to serve the unique needs of each member. To this end, the Alliance considers the combined collections of member institutions as one collection. The Alliance supports a number of services that support this vision, including Summit, a WorldCat Navigator system that allows students, faculty and staff to easily search and request library materials owned by member libraries; courier service offering delivery of library materials in Oregon, Washington and Idaho; the Northwest Digital Archives, offering enhanced access to primary sources in the Northwest US; cooperative purchasing of databases, ebooks and ejournals, and other digital library services. In addition to its members, the Alliance extends selected services to more than 280 libraries, museums, archives, and historical societies in seven western states. For more information: www.orbiscascade.org

Members

Central Oregon Community College	Mt. Hood Community College	University of Idaho**
Central Washington University	Oregon Health & Science University	University of Oregon
Chemeketa Community College	Oregon Institute of Technology	University of Portland
Clark College	Oregon State University	University of Puget Sound
Concordia University	Pacific University	University of Washington
Eastern Oregon University*	Portland Community College	Walla Walla University
Eastern Washington University	Portland State University	Warner Pacific College
George Fox University	Reed College	Washington State University
Lane Community College	Saint Martin's University	Western Oregon University
Lewis and Clark College	Seattle Pacific University	Western Washington University
Linfield College	Seattle University	Whitman College
Marylhurst University	Southern Oregon University	Willamette University
	The Evergreen State College	

* = Evergreen ILS ** = Voyager ILS, Ex Libris All other members use the Millennium ILS, III

2. RFP Process and Key Dates

2.1. RFP Process

The RFP will proceed in four phases:

- Phase 1: Declaration of Intent to Bid,
- Phase 2: Written Proposals,
- Phase 3: Product Demonstrations, and
- Phase 4: Negotiation & Award.

Each phase is expected to yield a reduction in the number of proposals under consideration.

Phase 1: Declaration of Intent to Bid

Those vendors intending to bid are required to submit a “Declaration of Intent to Bid” (Appendix I). Based on the list of those making such a declaration, the Alliance will

a) Determine and manage any [Conflicts of Interest \(COI\)](#). See orbiscascade.org/index/cms-filessystem-action/legal/final/conflict_of_interest_policy_2011_november.pdf

b) Create a Disclosure Web page

In the interest of providing a full and complete understanding of members' involvement with proposers, the Alliance will create a publicly-accessible web page that lists any involvement with declared bidders that members or individuals choose to disclose. Such disclosures are expected go beyond potential COI issues to include development partnerships, service on advisory boards, leadership positions in user groups, private gifts and contributions, etc.

Phase 2: Written Proposals

Proposers must use the Proposal Template given in Appendix II. This format is intended to aid the Shared ILS Team in evaluating and comparing proposals but does not limit creativity in responses. Proposers may submit proposals that are responsive to the Discovery and User Experience part of the RFP, Staff Functions part of the RFP or both parts. The Alliance will score proposals and invite those submitting the strongest (highest scoring) proposals to proceed to Phase 3, Product Demonstrations. The Alliance will let all proposers know who among them have been selected to provide product demonstrations and will provide an opportunity for comment.

Phase 3: Product Demonstrations

Proposers selected from Phase 2 will be required to conduct a series of Web-based product demonstrations. Each demonstration will focus on an area of functionality determined by the Alliance. For example, on a given day Vendor A may present on Acquisitions & Cataloging from 10-11am, Circulation and Resource Sharing from 11-Noon, Discovery from 2 - 3pm, etc. Proposers will be assigned times and topics and will be required to supply Web-based conference technology and provide a recording of each session to the Alliance. The Alliance

may contact proposers to seek clarification or ask follow-up questions before scoring product demonstrations.

The Alliance will consider comments from member libraries when evaluating and scoring product demonstrations. The scores for Phase 2 (Written Proposals) and Phase 3 (Product Demonstrations) will be cumulated and used to inform the Shared ILS Team's recommendations for Phase 4, Negotiation and Award. The Alliance will let all proposers know who among them have been selected for negotiation and will provide an opportunity for comment.

Phase 4: Negotiation & award

The Alliance will enter into negotiation with proposers selected via Phases 1-3 and present a recommendation for Board and Council approval. Final decisions will be made by vote of Council in accordance with Alliance bylaws, with one vote per member institution. The final contract(s) will be a separate agreement, incorporating relevant provisions of the RFP, proposal, and subsequent negotiation. The Alliance will publicly announce any contracts awarded as a result of this RFP.

Questions and clarifications

Proposers are required to direct all questions and requests for clarification to:

John F. Helmer
Executive Director
Orbis Cascade Alliance
1299 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1299
jhelmer@uoregon.edu
541.346.1835

Substantive answers and clarifications will be distributed to all proposers that have declared an intent to bid (Appendix I).

2.2 Key Dates

January 2, 2012: RFP is released and publicized via major professional email lists, direct email contact with vendors identified via the Alliance RFI process, and advertisements in major newspapers in Portland, Oregon and Seattle, Washington.

Phase 1: Declaration of Intent to Bid

January 16, 2012, 5pm Pacific Daylight Time: Deadline for email receipt of Declaration of Intent to Bid (Appendix I).

Phase 2: Written Proposals

February 29, 2012, 5pm Pacific Daylight Time: Deadline for email receipt of proposals. (Appendix II)

Phase 3: Product Demonstrations

April 2-6, 2012: each day will be devoted to topical product demonstrations by proposers identified in Phases 1&2. Proposers will be assigned times and topics and will be required to supply Web-based conference technology and provide a recording of each session to the Alliance. The Alliance may contact proposers to seek clarification or ask follow-up questions before scoring product demonstrations.

Phase 4: Negotiation & award

April 2012: Board acts on Shared ILS Team recommendations and may appoint a Negotiation Team.

June 2012: Board acts on Negotiation Team recommendations and determines Board recommendation for Council consideration.

July 2012: Council acts on Board recommendation.

3. Scope of Services

The Scope of Services is conveyed in Appendix II, Scope of Services and Proposal Template.

4. Evaluation & Scoring

4.1. Scoring Team

Written Proposals (Phase 2) and Product Demonstrations (Phase 3) will be evaluated, scored, and cumulated by the Shared ILS Team according to the criteria set out in the following sections.

4.2. Scoring Written Proposals and Product Demonstrations

The Shared ILS Team will score proposals (Phase 2) to determine which proposers will proceed with product demonstration (Phase 3). The scores for Phase 2 and Phase 3 will be cumulated and used to inform the Shared ILS Team's recommendations for Phase 4, Negotiation and Award. Scores in each service area will be determined by comparing proposer responses to the outcomes specified in the Scope of Services (Appendix II).

Staff Functions and Discovery and User Experience

Scoring methodology for proposals that offer both staff and discovery functionality.

	Phase 2: Written Proposal	Phase 3: Product Demo	Total possible points	% of Total
Responsiveness to RFP	5		5	2.5%
Collections and Resource Management	10	30	50	25%
Description and Metadata	10			
Circulation and Resource Sharing	10	20	30	15%
Discovery and User Experience	10	30	40	20%
Systems	10	20	30	15%
Price	30		30	15%
Business references and vendor capacity	15		15	7.5%
Total	100	100	200	100%

Staff Functions only

Scoring methodology for proposals that offer staff functionality without discovery.

	Phase 2: Written Proposal	Phase 3: Product Demo	Total possible points	% of Total
Responsiveness to RFP	5		5	2.5%
Collections and Resource Management	13	40	66	33%
Description and Metadata	13			
Circulation and Resource Sharing	14	30	44	22%
Systems	10	30	40	20%
Price	30		30	15%
Business references and vendor capacity	15		15	7.5%
Total	100	100	200	100%

Discovery and User Experience only

Scoring methodology for proposals that offer discovery without staff functionality.

	Phase 2: Written Proposal	Phase 3: Product Demo	Total possible points	% of Total
Responsiveness to RFP	5		5	2.5%
Discovery and User Experience	30	60	90	45%
Systems	20	40	60	30%
Price	30		30	15%
Business references and vendor capacity	15		15	7.5%
Total	100	100	200	100%

**Orbis Cascade Alliance
RFP for a Shared Library Management System
Appendix I**

Declaration of Intent to Bid

-- Required from all proposers --

[MS Word version](#)

REQUIRED: All proposers are required to complete and email this form to orbiscas@uoregon.edu in order for their proposal to be eligible for consideration.

DEADLINE: January 16, 2012, 5pm Pacific Daylight Time

In compliance with the requirements of the Orbis Cascade Alliance's RFP for Shared Library Management Services, the following individual or business is hereby indicating an intent to submit a proposal:

Company

Name: _____

Address: _____

Website: _____

Representative for all Communication related to the RFP

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Orbis Cascade Alliance contact for all questions and correspondence:

John F. Helmer
Executive Director
Orbis Cascade Alliance
1299 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1299
jhelmer@uoregon.edu
541.346.1835

Orbis Cascade Alliance
RFP for a Shared Library Management System
Appendix II

Scope of Services and Proposal Template

-- Required from all proposers --

[MS Word version](#)

Every proposal is required to include responses to

- Section A: Overall intent and outcomes desired
- Section B: Price
- Section C: Customer References
- Section D: Vendor Capacity
- Section E: Systems

Proposals will include bids on one or more of the following

- Section F: Staff Functions, and/or
- Section G: Discovery and User Experience, and/or
- Sections F & G: Both Staff Functions and Discovery and User Experience.

Proposals may also include responses to

- Section H: Additional product or service information
Information from this section will not be used to score proposals.

A. Overall intent and outcomes desired

Through strategic planning, the Alliance has concluded that improved services, cost efficiency, and prospects for cooperative collection development and collaborative approaches to technical services will be facilitated by a move from more than 30 stand-alone Integrated Library Systems (ILS) to a single shared solution. More than simply replicating legacy systems in a shared or cloud-computing environment, we are issuing this RFP with the expectation of contracting for a unified set of services that exceed traditional ILS capabilities.

A.1. Describe how the proposed solution meets the overall intent and outcomes desired.

B. Price

Scoring will strongly favor pricing proposals

- that are calculated using a straightforward formula,
- that include no or very minimal start-up/implementation fees (for example, those that amortize start-up costs across multiple years).

B.1. Preferred approach to pricing

B.1.1. Pricing for Staff Functions (without Discovery and User Experience)

Contract period: five years, options to renegotiate and renew in five-year increments.

Provide a pricing formula for academic libraries based on

- readily available descriptive statistics collected by trusted third parties (for example IPEDS) and
- base year and annual inflation

such that the Alliance can readily calculate an annual service fee or price for existing and prospective member libraries.

B.1.2. Pricing for Discovery and User Experience (without Staff Functions)

Contract period: five years, options to renegotiate and renew in five-year increments.

Provide a pricing formula for academic libraries based on

- readily available descriptive statistics collected by trusted third parties (for example IPEDS) and
- base year and annual inflation

such that the Alliance can readily calculate an annual service fee or price for existing and prospective member libraries.

B.1.3. Pricing for both Staff and Discovery functions

Contract period: five years, options to renegotiate and renew in five-year increments.

Provide a pricing formula for academic libraries based on

- readily available descriptive statistics collected by trusted third parties (for example IPEDS) and
- base year and annual inflation

such that the Alliance can readily calculate an annual service fee or price for existing and prospective member libraries.

B.2. Alternative approach to pricing

In addition to the preferred approach to pricing described in B.1., proposers may provide any other suggested approaches to pricing the services bid.

B.3. Pricing for non-member libraries (information not used to score proposals)

Beyond the 37 governing members, the Alliance is also helping to explore ILS options for a broader and more diverse group of non-member libraries that currently share an ILS with one or more Alliance members. The Alliance does not represent these non-member libraries or their consortia but may elect to play a role in facilitating their adoption of the product(s) selected by the Alliance.

Proposers are encouraged to respond with

- B.3.1. A statement concerning proposer's willingness and potential approach to serving such non-member libraries.
- B.3.2. Pricing for non-member libraries (academic, public, special, school, etc.).

C. Customer References

Three references from libraries that are not members of the Alliance are required, including

Contact name:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Products used:

Number of years doing business with proposer:

References from consortia and customers using the proposed solution are strongly preferred.

The Alliance will seek two additional references from libraries that are not members of the Alliance, for a total of five business references external to the consortium. The Alliance will also request references from member libraries.

D. Vendor Capacity

A statement of qualifications is required. This statement must include

- D.1. Number of years in businesses related to RFP.
- D.2. Type of Operation (e.g., Individual, Partnership, Corporation, Nonprofit corporation, Consortium, Government, etc.).
- D.3. Company-wide annual sales volume.
- D.4. Number of employees.
- D.5. Key employees involved in implementing and sustaining the proposed solution.
- D.6. Demonstrated expertise in supporting similar services.
- D.7. Demonstrated history as a trusted partner to libraries, museums, archives, or similar cultural institutions.
- D.8. List of subcontractors (if any) and their expected role.

E. Systems

From its inception, the Alliance has supported systems-enabled resource sharing and collaboration across its member base. The Alliance maintains a national leadership role in the application of technology to enhance library cooperation. The Alliance continues to push the boundaries of what libraries can accomplish through shared systems in areas such as consortial sharing and delivery, cooperative buying and digital collection initiatives. Through this RFP, the Alliance seeks a vendor and new shared ILS to help realize even greater possibilities in service delivery. The demands and requirements placed upon the shared ILS will be as great as the benefits it will bring to members.

High-level systems requirements

Reliability. Many Alliance institutions are open 24 hours a day, most are open year-round, and patrons and staff expect a very high degree of system availability and response time 24/7/365. The solution must meet these very high reliability expectations. And the vendor must be ready, when failures do occur, to mitigate and resolve them quickly and accurately.

Scalability and performance. The Alliance includes a growing set of 37 institutions throughout Oregon, Washington and Idaho, from small, private liberal arts colleges to large public research institutions. The University of Washington alone hosts over 170,000 patron records and Portland Community College holds over 167,000 patron records. The Alliance currently handles over 280,000 consortial lending requests per year, which represent only a small part of the total combined circulation within the Alliance. The solution must successfully accommodate this workload across a wide geographic area, with acceptable performance and room for future growth.

Manageability. The Alliance and its member libraries maintain lean, cost-effective systems staffing levels within a complex and constantly changing environment. The Alliance therefore requires an easily managed solution with low administrative overhead. The solution should also generally be designed with configuration flexibility in mind, with a minimum of “no going back” configuration or design decisions.

Security. The Alliance will entrust an extremely large amount of critical data to its shared ILS. The solution should offer strong mechanisms for data backup and recovery, as well as safeguards against data tampering and theft. In addition, the solution must allow Alliance members to manage data security and privacy at multiple levels: individual staff or patron user, single institution, subset of the consortium, consortium-wide,

Robust identity management. The Alliance has a very large patron and staff population, with many of those patrons and staff already represented in institutional identity management systems. The solution should allow the Alliance to leverage those identity stores, instead of requiring their re-creation. The solution should also provide for ILS-hosted identities for institutions with no identity store of their own.

Robust authorization model. The Alliance strongly embraces a cooperative management model, and the solution should allow for administrative and functional authorization at multiple levels: individual staff or patron, single institution, subset consortia, and consortium-wide.

Integration flexibility. Many Alliance members rely on integration between their ILS and other institutional platforms to support strategic workflows. Examples of such systems include registrar management, collection agency, enterprise resource management, course management, general ledger management, and identity management. Many Alliance members also participate in interlibrary loan with libraries outside the Alliance, via platforms such as ILLiad, Ariel, Odyssey, Rapid ILL and Clio. The solution must allow Alliance members to retain strategically important systems integrations.

Extensibility. Alliance members perform a large amount of analysis, reporting and management on the large volume of ILS-related data they collectively hold. The solution should offer flexible, powerful capabilities for large-scale data extraction, manipulation, reporting and automation. These capabilities might include native reporting tools, integration with external reporting tools, application programming interfaces (APIs), and scripting functionality.

Migration feasibility. Owing to its size, the Alliance envisions its migration occurring in stages, with a subset of libraries migrating at each stage. The Alliance would like to complete the migration of all libraries in an elapsed time of two years or less, to commence no later than January, 2013. Both the solution and its vendor should be prepared to support such a migration plan, or be able to offer an equally suitable plan.

Comprehensive support. The Alliance desires long-term partners that can not only deliver a sound, useful solution with a strong documentation set, but can also deliver services, training, and support when called upon. The Alliance also seeks partners with a history and culture of proactively responding to customer needs and suggestions, and supporting the activity of user groups and communities.

E.1. Reliability

As previously described, the Alliance intends to share a single ILS across multiple states and institutions. The Alliance seeks to maintain the highest possible level of service availability and response times to all Alliance participants in all locations.

E.1.1. Describe how the solution minimizes business disruption and maximizes system availability, particularly within the context of a geographically large implementation. What kind of “up” time do you typically deliver (also define any terms within your answer as appropriate)? What are the biggest risks to the solution, in terms of availability (e.g., power outages, network outages, data corruption, software bugs, reliance on external partners), and how are these risks mitigated? Provide any examples you can of large outages that have occurred, how long they lasted, and how you resolved them.

E.1.2. Describe how the solution monitors and reports on system reliability and performance, and provide sample reference data or screenshots, as appropriate, of monitoring feedback.

E.1.3. Describe what kind of scheduled down time, or “quiet time,” the solution requires, noting the frequency, duration and purpose. What tools are available to continue core functions during down times? How are jobs that are scheduled to run during down times handled?

- E.1.4. Describe the parameters of your “typical” Service Level Agreement (SLA) with a large partner such as the Alliance. How well does the solution meet those targets?

E.2. Scalability and Performance

The Alliance has recently experienced membership growth, and will continue to absorb and recruit new members in the future. The Alliance also expects its user population and collection size to grow over time. At times, the growth may be rather immediate, as when a new, larger member is added. In addition, the systems workload of the Alliance varies dramatically, on a minute-by-minute, hourly, daily, weekly and monthly basis.

- E.2.1. Describe how the solution addresses the need to add new institutions over time, with the accompanying -- often immediate and large -- increases in users served and collections managed that such additions require.
- E.2.2. Describe how the solution manages peaks and spikes in workload over varying periods of time, including seconds, minutes and hours.
- E.2.3. Describe how the solution enables simultaneous batch operations across multiple institutions, including any limits on such operations.
- E.2.4. Describe how the solution insures that identifiers that are unique within an institution are also unique across all institutions. Areas where this issue may manifest itself include but are not limited to item and patron barcodes, university identification numbers, and user names.
- E.2.5. Describe the hard and soft limits on the number of records of various types which the solution can manage. What is involved in changing the soft limits?
- E.2.6. Describe the hard and soft limits on both the size of and the number of values in data elements within records of various types which the solution can manage. What is involved in changing the soft limits?
- E.2.7. Describe any performance vs. workload relationships inherent in the solution, citing specific examples. For example, if cataloging transaction load is higher than normal, does this affect search and display? How do you monitor and adjust the solution to address competing needs?

E.3. Architecture

- E.3.1. Do you provide the solution as a hosted service, a local service, or either, depending on customer preference? If you support both, what is your recommended architecture, and why?
- E.3.2. Describe the expected level of local systems staffing required for the solution, given a consortium such as the Alliance.
- E.3.3. What is the largest system (e.g., sites, record counts) you have deployed for a single customer using the solution? When did you implement this system? Describe any significant hurdles you encountered in its implementation.
- E.3.4. Describe any initial configuration or implementation decisions that cannot be later changed, or altered only with great effort or expense.
- E.3.5. Explain which system profiling/configuration decisions apply globally across the system, and which can apply to a subset of institutions.

- E.3.6. What portions of your proposed system(s) are separable? E.g., is it possible to use an alternate discovery environment but still use your solution for fulfillment and for back-end processing? With what specific third-party discovery solutions does your solution work? Describe any interfaces and APIs that are available to support such integration/interoperability.
- E.3.7. The Alliance desires the ability to roll out upgrades, feature enhancements, updates and fixes for the solution quickly and easily. For example, if a staff client component needs to be upgraded on a local PC, the Alliance would like the update to take place automatically, on a scheduled basis. Describe how the solution meets this goal.
- E.3.8. Describe how staff interact with the solution (e.g., browser-based client, locally installed client). Describe any related system requirements for the staff client (e.g., operating systems, memory, drive space). For locally executed clients, describe the client's ability to run from a virtual desktop platform, such as Citrix XenApps, or Microsoft Desktop Virtualization, and from a non-administrator account. For Windows clients, does the client possess a "known publisher" security certificate from Microsoft?
- E.3.9. From what operating systems (e.g. Windows, OS/X, Linux) can staff interact with the solution? Describe any functional differences or limitations that might exist for particular platforms. For browser-based systems, what browsers do you officially support? How do you determine which platforms and browsers you will support?

E.4. Data Security and Data Access

- E.4.1. Describe data management practices to which the solution adheres, including those for patron and circulation transaction information. Include relevant information on standards compliance (such as ISO 27001) and any organizational information technology audits that have been completed. Can data access be segmented -- for example, can institutions decide what patron information is viewable by staff at other institutions?
- E.4.2. Describe the solution's use of and support for secure protocols to safeguard data in transit.
- E.4.3. Describe the solution's support for encryption in backups and in replica sets.
- E.4.4. Describe how the solution prevents loss of data, and how it provides data recovery or rollback to specific points in time in the event data loss does occur. Also describe the process through which data is recovered. For example, is the recovery process a self-service mechanism? Or, must the customer contact your organization to request data recovery? What is the typical turn-around time to have data recovered? How compartmentalized is the data with respect to data recovery? In other words, can a customer recover a subset of bibliographic records, a subset of patrons, or a particular range of transactions? Or, is system recovery or rollback only possible in its entirety?
- E.4.5. What protocols have been established for dealing with unauthorized access to or disclosure of confidential data?

- E.4.6. Describe what data validation the solution performs on records as they are created or edited, and indicate whether this is different for batch jobs as compared to single records.
- E.4.7. Describe how the solution tracks changes to records. Is there an audit trail for edits? Is it possible to revert to previous versions of a record?
- E.4.8. Describe the extent to which the solution has been designed to comply with laws and regulations governing the storage and use of “protected” user data. Examples of such laws and regulations include: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), and Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI-DSS).

E.5. Authentication, authorization and identity management

- E.5.1. Many Alliance institutions have significantly invested in the development and management of existing identity-related data stores (e.g., Active Directory, LDAP). Describe how the solution can leverage these identity stores, both for staff and patron accounts. Describe also how such capabilities can co-exist alongside identities natively managed within the proposed solution.
- E.5.2. Describe how administrative rights are assigned within the system. Can administrative rights be assigned to identities stored in external identity stores, such as Active Directory? Can administrative rights be assigned to groups, as well as users? Does the solution allow compartmentalizing of administrative rights on a per-institution basis? For example, can you limit the effect of administrative rights assignment to a single institution?
- E.5.3. Because of the number of staff, the Alliance requires the ability to assign membership to groups, and then manage permissions and privileges based on group membership. Describe how your solution addresses group-based permissions. Also describe any differences in what permissions and privileges can be managed for a group vs. an individual account.
- E.5.4. Describe the level of granularity of access controls for staff functions (principle of least privilege). E.g., can certain data elements be made read-only for some staff and read-write for others?
- E.5.5. Some Alliance staff and patrons may have identities with multiple institutions. How would users with multiple affiliations be supported in the system, with respect to authentication, permissions assignment to their account, and permissions on their accounts?
- E.5.6. Describe your support for single sign-on authentication and authorization solutions (e.g., CAS, Shibboleth, and Microsoft’s Identity and Access Management solution).

E.6. Integration and Extensibility

- E.6.1. Describe the integration the solution provides with respect to related services such as self-check, resource sharing (ILL), link resolution, proxy services, collection agency services, discovery, and so on.
- E.6.2. Describe the integration the solution provides with campus financial systems, as used for ordering, invoicing and other functions.
- E.6.3. Describe the integration the solution provides with report writing platforms, such as Crystal Reports.
- E.6.4. Describe the ability of the solution to process transactions via NCIP and SIP2.
- E.6.5. Describe how the solution exposes data through documented web services and APIs, including supported data operations (read, write, update, delete, and so on). Describe any licensing or technical restrictions or constraints placed on the use of these tools and services. Are business rules and access controls applied?
- E.6.6. Describe any facility the solution provides for staff client automation, using such techniques as keyboard shortcuts, task-oriented macros, and keystroke recording.
- E.6.7. Describe the product's support for the Library Linked Data model, including the Resource Description Framework (RDF) and RDFa. For example, does the solution possess the ability to expose, as linked data, authority-controlled names and holdings in the shared management system?
- E.6.8. Alliance libraries rely on a wide variety of data presentation and reporting beyond the traditional per-record views typically available in an ILS staff client. Describe how the solution delivers customizable, relational views of ILS data. Include information about what data are available through these views, whether the views are read-only or provide update capabilities, and any export or scripting capabilities. Can these views include arbitrary data from multiple record types (e.g., bibliographic data and order data)? What, if any, limitations exist on combining data elements from multiple record types for reporting or updating?
- E.6.9. Describe how the solution supports batch loading and batch updates of records (all types).
- E.6.10. For all reporting, updating, importing and exporting functions, describe the level of staff expertise needed to perform the operation. In particular, identify which functions require the intervention of a database administrator or Systems/IT personnel as opposed to functions that library staff can perform on their own.

E.7. Migration

- E.7.1. Describe a recommended or typical migration timeline for an organization such as the Alliance. Include recommendations regarding the grouping of libraries, and the number of stages.
- E.7.2. Describe the typical or recommended amount of ILS downtime for the migration, based on institutional size, number of patron or bibliographic records, or some other applicable metric.
- E.7.3. Describe the migration services you offer, including data migration services, training, and configuration and policy planning.

- E.7.4. The Alliance currently uses OCLC WorldCat Navigator (NRE) to support consortial borrowing and lending. The solution must interoperate with NRE until all Alliance members have migrated. Describe how the solution and your organization can meet the following requirements related to NRE:
- Full responder support for the following NCIP services: Request Item, Check Out Item, Accept Item, Check In Item, Cancel Request Item, Lookup Item, and Renew Item
 - Ability and interest in working directly with the Alliance and OCLC to resolve issues between the proposed solution and NRE
- E.7.5. Describe your experience migrating data from Innovative Interfaces Millennium, Evergreen and Ex Libris Voyager. Describe any specific considerations or difficulties in migrating bibliographic, acquisitions, serials, check-in, electronic resource, content license, patron and circulation records and data from these systems into your solution.
- E.7.6. Describe the ability to retain and preserve transient or temporal data, such as checkouts, holds, item status, item statistics (such as total checkouts), patron status and patron blocks, through the migration process.
- E.7.7. Describe the ability during migration to merge similar bibliographic records without loss of locally-created data.
- E.7.8. Describe the ability during migration to handle and resolve duplicate barcodes.

E.8. Vendor support

The Alliance seeks a long-term solutions partner committed to customer service and open to customer feedback.

- E.8.1. Describe any proactive monitoring of the solution by your organization, and any actionable communications to the customer that result from this monitoring. For example, do you warn the customer if certain system limits are being reached, such as record counts or processing availability? How do you alert the customer in the event of planned downtime and unplanned system anomalies?
- E.8.2. Describe your customer support venues (e.g., web, phone, email), periods of coverage, and expected response times.
- E.8.3. Describe your customer support model. For example, would you accept support requests from any Alliance staff member, or only from designated representatives? Do you provide a primary contact(s) for a given customer account, or do you provide support by geographic region, or by area of specialty (e.g., circulation, cataloging)?
- E.8.4. Alliance member libraries have a history of actively participating in vendor-centric user community groups to help positively steer product direction and enhance the usefulness of a solution for all community members. Describe any customer community activities you sponsor or support, such as online or in-person venues to allow customers to share ideas and solutions. Include information about annual conferences and attendance, and regional interest groups (particularly in the Northwest).

- E.8.5. Describe the product enhancement process, and the role that customers play in determining and prioritizing new features and enhancements. Describe any changes or updates you have made to your solution in the past year as a direct result of customer feedback.
- E.8.6. Describe the frequency and scope of both major and minor releases. How long do you support a major platform release after it has been superseded by a new version?
- E.8.7. Describe the content and delivery method (context-sensitive, online, knowledgebase, etc.) of administrative and end-user documentation sets, as well as the frequency of documentation updates. Also describe the availability of user-authored content, such as community wikis.
- E.8.8. Describe the support (including documentation and online forums) provided for APIs and web services that enable the customer to extend management system functionality.

F. Staff Functions

The Alliance is seeking a solution to manage the technical services operations of all member libraries in a shared environment. As the primary record keepers and record control managers in library operations, the technical services staff members are seeking a solution that supports the discovery, acquisition, description and maintenance of all library formats, including the tracking and allocation of resources in an efficient and responsible manner. The solution should be flexible enough to accommodate individual institutional preferences while retaining the ability to eliminate duplicate record-keeping and redundant procedures across member libraries. In addition, the solution must support the processing and preserving of items for their continued use. It should also be able to facilitate management of the growing world of electronic resources while providing the tools to manage the tangible collections in member libraries.

Operational The Alliance is looking for a solution that will be operational for acquisition, description and management of both tangible and electronic resources with integrated workflows for all resources in an organized and efficient manner.

Facilitate effective collection management As the Alliance moves to managing its many collections together, a solution must be capable of supporting the entire lifecycle of a library resource from acquisition through access, administration, support, and evaluation activities.

Flexible The Alliance consists of many institutions with a variety of business requirements. The solution must support flexible options in dealing with a variety of vendor systems, purchasing systems and local third-party systems within one integrated workflow.

Collaborative yet unique Each Alliance member brings unique strengths to the whole. Therefore the consortium requires a solution which will support a structure of shared records while retaining the ability to add and maintain unique local fields as needed.

Standards oriented Collaborative functionality will require adherence to a shared set of standards. The Alliance shared ILS will be required to support current and future standards and frameworks for all record and data types including, but not limited to, licensing, electronic resource, bibliographic, holdings and authority control records.

Customizable As each library is unique, so is each staff member. Any solution must support individual library customization of staff work interfaces for maximum productivity and security while providing institution-only views in staff interfaces, as well as the ability to share and view group information.

Data management support An Alliance shared ILS will be the repository of data which will be used to support collection decisions, provide access, ensure fiscal responsibility and support the overall operations of each member. Therefore a solution must support a comprehensive, flexible and granular reporting structure to import and export data out of the system at no cost and into formats that are usable.

F.1. Collections and Resource Management

The work of technical services staff should be a point of service for library patrons, making materials in all formats available in the most efficient way possible. In such an environment, the Alliance libraries are seeking to minimize repetitive staff tasks in technical services that can be done more efficiently as part of one shared system, instead of at the institution level. A large part of this greater efficiency and flexibility will be the sharing of data among member institutions to manage collection development and resource management in a shared database. In a new solution, member libraries are seeking to eliminate any silos that currently exist within different library services units, providing for an integrated workflow that allows a staff person (with the proper permissions) to access any component of the system that is necessary for them to efficiently achieve the overall goal.

F.1.1. Collaboration

- F.1.1.1. What workflows can be integrated across institutions to avoid repetitive data management?
- F.1.1.2. Describe the process of batch loading of records by Alliance libraries into the shared system. How will duplicate records be avoided if multiple institutions purchase the same record sets? How will designated fields be protected from overlay? How will these records be displayed in a shared environment?
- F.1.1.3. What records can be shared across institutions to streamline workflows (bibliographic, authority, order, check-in, item, license, patron, fiscal, vendor, etc.)? Describe how dynamic or flexible record sharing is, and the ease or difficulty of changing sets of records from local control to shared control.
- F.1.1.4. How does the solution support the ability of libraries to do cooperative collection development in a shared environment through access to common files of on-order materials, check-in records, etc.? In a shared environment, how can member libraries become aware of what other libraries are purchasing either from individual vendors or from specialized approval plans? Would the solution allow member libraries to be notified automatically when another library cancels a publication to which both of them subscribe?
- F.1.1.5. Describe how each institution will handle local information (e.g. binding information, donor information, processing notes, etc.) in a shared environment.
- F.1.1.6. Describe how the solution will allow for the management and maintenance of a shared bibliographic and authority control file.
- F.1.1.7. Describe how the solution will handle access to electronic resources in a shared bibliographic environment where libraries may have different contractual arrangements with the same vendor. Where will individual links to electronic resources be stored and displayed in a shared environment?

F.1.2. Integration

- F.1.2.1. Describe the solution's integrated workflow from the point of material selection to circulation. How do materials move through the library pipeline?

- F.1.2.2. Describe the interaction between the e-resource component and the other functional system components (acquisitions, interlibrary loan, fiscal, public interface, etc.).
- F.1.2.3. Describe how the solution supports the integration between interlibrary loan and acquisitions to provide support for purchase-on-demand programs.
- F.1.2.4. Describe the local options for customizing the integration of workflows (for example: Can the system support multiple cataloging queues? Can the solution support multiple labeling queues?) Describe the system's support for workflow tracking such as automated reminders or alerts.

F.1.3. Acquisitions Management

- F.1.3.1. In general, describe how the solution supports the acquisitions workflow, including, but not limited to, ordering, receiving, invoicing, claiming, payment, etc. Describe how order data is stored in relationship to bibliographic and item data, including, but not limited to, linking an order record to multiple bibliographic records.
- F.1.3.2. Describe the solution's support for automated selection, ordering, invoicing, and claiming, using standards like EDIFACT and X12. Can these transactions be completely automated? How is data sent and received in this manner integrated with acquisitions and financial modules? How does the solution check for duplicate records?
- F.1.3.3. Describe the solution's ability to import bibliographic records individually or in batches from a vendor, including, but not limited to, the automatic creation of order, invoice, and/or item records from data supplied by the individual institution.
- F.1.3.4. Describe your solution's support for ordering and claiming including, but not limited to, print and electronic submissions and what electronic submission protocols are supported.
- F.1.3.5. Describe how the solution supports the creation of brief bibliographic records for ordering purposes, if there is no bibliographic record available? Conversely, describe how the solution supports non-purchased materials, such as gifts or government documents that require a bibliographic record but do not necessarily have an order or invoice?
- F.1.3.6. Describe the fund structure for acquisition payments and the invoice creation and payment workflow. Is there a limit on the number of funds? Can multiple funds be used to pay for a single order?
- F.1.3.7. Describe the solution's support for storing and sharing vendor data and how it is used in different functional areas.
- F.1.3.8. Describe the solution's ability to integrate with campus/state financial systems, including, but not limited to, export and import of financial transactions such as payment of invoices by various methods.
- F.1.3.9. Describe how the solution will handle taxes for material purchasing. Will the system be capable of paying taxes at different tax rates based on where

the item is received/housed/paid? Will the solution be able to track tax exempt status?

- F.1.3.10. Describe the solution's financial reporting functionality, including, but not limited to, granularity of data retrieval and level of local and consortial customization, without intervention by solution vendor.
- F.1.3.11. Describe the solution's support for fiscal-year closing functionality. Will the solution be capable of closing by a variety of fiscal-year options (for example, biennium versus calendar year). In what format and for how long can fiscal close records be retained?
- F.1.3.12. Describe what records or data are stored in the solution from acquisition processes and for how long? Can individual institutions choose custom retention periods for specific kinds of data? What kind of audit trail is available? Are reports available in print and electronic formats for storage? For how long are reports available?
- F.1.3.13. Describe the solution's support for generating statistics from acquisitions records. Describe data which is not available to be reported out. Describe how data can be extracted across record types, including, but not limited to, order, vendor, item, and bibliographic records.

F.1.4. Serials Management

- F.1.4.1. In general, describe the solution's support for material management at the issue level, including receiving, item generation, labeling, routing, claiming, and binding.
- F.1.4.2. Describe the solution's support for the creation of date prediction patterns and enumeration patterns for check-in purposes. Describe the solution's ability to reuse prediction and enumeration patterns. Describe how the solution supports externally supplied check-in data, for example data coded in bibliographic MARC tag 891.
- F.1.4.3. Describe the solution's support for the check-in of multiple instances of a given title; for example, one subscription to a title might include individual issues, bound volumes, pocket parts, pamphlet supplements, legislative service, and possibly other parts, each received on a regular or irregular basis. Describe how each of these parts can be accommodated and distinguished, either within a single record or on separate records.
- F.1.4.4. Describe the solution's support for recording and receipt of issues via SISAC and/or UPC codes.
- F.1.4.5. Describe the solution's integration of serials claiming across workflows.
- F.1.4.6. Describe the solution's support for current MARC 21 holdings record standards. Specifically, describe how the system's serials check-in system can automatically update the MARC 21 holdings record, including all content related to the 85X/86X paired fields, either during receiving or as a separate function.
- F.1.4.7. Describe system support for generating statistics from serial records (number of active subscriptions, number of pieces received, etc.).

F.1.5. Electronic Resource Management

The Alliance has a robust consortial purchasing system in place for electronic resources. This includes both individual electronic resource purchasing, negotiated by the consortium, and ownership of electronic resources as a group. Individual institutions also negotiate and purchase products on their own. A successful solution will be able to support all three of these models and will provide tools for managing information associated with these purchases, both individually and consortially. The solution must support existing national and international standards for electronic resource management.

- F.1.5.1. Describe the creation of an electronic resource record. Can these records be created at different hierarchical levels to support electronic resource package and combination purchases? Can these records be created at the local and the consortial level? How do these records link to license documents and information?
- F.1.5.2. Describe the solution's support for the management of license agreements, for local and consortial purchases. How are license and related documents stored and displayed in the solution? What fields are available for license terms and how can these be exported and integrated into other areas of the solution?
- F.1.5.3. Describe the solution's ability to manage administrative information for electronic resources and contact information for vendors and publishers.
- F.1.5.4. Describe the workflow management available for electronic resources. This might include reminders for renewal or the ability to track new resources from trials through to access setup.
- F.1.5.5. Describe the solution's OpenURL resolver. If there is no integrated OpenURL resolver, describe the solution's interactions with third-party OpenURL applications.
- F.1.5.6. Does the solution include a knowledgebase? Is this knowledgebase local or consortial? Describe how the knowledgebase works with OpenURL resolvers and how it integrates with the electronic resources functionality of the system.
- F.1.5.7. Describe the solution's ability to ingest and manage usage statistics for electronic resources at the local and consortial level. Can these statistics be reported out at both levels in a flexible customizable format?
- F.1.5.8. Describe the solution's ability to output electronic resource records in customizable ways for integration into library webspaces and catalogs.

F.1.6. Collection Maintenance

- F.1.6.1. Describe how the solution supports the processing of physical materials including support for spine-label printing either through the solution itself or via a third party solution. How can these processes be scaled at the consortial level as well as locally managed? Also, describe the process for customizing multiple label layouts and printer options.

- F.1.6.2. Describe the functionality of identifying and collapsing serial binding units. Does the solution provide automated alerts for serial binding?
- F.1.6.3. Describe the methods and formats for exporting binding information to a file and the method for generating binding information from the solution to send electronically to a vendor, including the interaction with bindery software. Describe which bindery communication protocols are supported.
- F.1.6.4. Describe how the solution generates binding preparation reports or reports which facilitate preservation assessment.
- F.1.6.5. Describe how the solution will allow staff to generate reports on their institution's collections (for example, reports based on collection age, collection usage, etc.)

F.2. Description and Metadata

The Alliance seeks a solution which supports user tasks to find, identify, select and obtain resources. The solution must support multiple historic and future standards for description in multiple frameworks, provide reliable and flexible importing and exporting of records, support cataloging in non-Roman scripts, and provide support for both shared and local metadata. The solution should also support future metadata frameworks and schema, reporting functionality that facilitates the extraction and manipulation of data by the institution(s), and the capacity for extensive interoperability with external systems.

F.2.1. Cataloging

- F.2.1.1. The solution must be capable of importing and exporting bibliographic, holding and authority records in MARC 21 Format and future frameworks from OCLC Connexion.
- F.2.1.2. Describe how the solution provides for display of all valid and invalid MARC content designators (field tags, subfield codes, indicators) on the cataloging workstation and suppresses display of codes on all patron access workstations. Describe how record display is handled for all aspects of the solution, including, but not limited to: staff workstations, public interface, Web browser, and mobile devices and platforms.
- F.2.1.3. Describe how the solution manages multiple classification schema and subject vocabularies including, but not limited to, Library of Congress Classification and Subject Headings, Dewey Decimal Classification, SuDoc classification numbers, local classification schema, National Library of Medicine Subject Headings, and LC Genre Form Terms.
- F.2.1.4. Describe the solution for inputting characters in non-roman scripts, e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Cyrillic. Describe how ALA diacritics are stored, displayed and input. Include any specific requirements for peripheral hardware or software to ensure this support. Describe how the solution supports display of Unicode characters in all screens of the solution.
- F.2.1.5. Describe the solution's support for bidirectional cataloging and support for bidirectional script display (e.g. Arabic, Hebrew).

- F.2.1.6. Identify all metadata schemas that are supported and describe how they are implemented. Describe any conversion tools or utilities that will translate from one metadata schema to another.
- F.2.1.7. Describe how the solution accommodates multiple content standards and encoding schemas including, but not limited to, Encoded Archival Description; Metadata Object Description Schema, and Dublin Core. Describe plans for incorporating future containers, alternative vocabularies and cataloging description methods.
- F.2.1.8. Describe how the solution supports unique local data needs within a consortial environment of shared records. Review how the solution will support and protect local notes, access points, classification schemes, and other unique metadata while synthesizing it into a consortial database.
- F.2.1.9. Describe plans for implementing Resource Description and Access including adjustments to the MARC framework, and how the solution will incorporate those changes to enhance the user experience.

F.2.2. Holdings Management

- F.2.2.1. Describe the solution's support for holdings records which are fully compatible with current MARC standards including the export and import of holdings records for both serials and monographs.
- F.2.2.2. Describe the solution's support for the ability to define multiple holdings locations and sub-locations, both consortially and locally.
- F.2.2.3. Describe how local and consortial holdings are set in WorldCat for all library resources.
- F.2.2.4. Describe the solution's support for linked records. For example, items bound together with separate bibliographic records but shared holdings records.

F.2.3. Authority Control

- F.2.3.1. Describe how the solution supports current standards for authority data and allows all relevant bibliographic fields to be authority controlled without intervention by solution vendor. Describe how the system identifies which fields can be controlled.
- F.2.3.2. Describe how the solution will allow the management and maintenance of a shared authority file.
- F.2.3.3. Describe how the solution manages the import and export of authority data with one or more authority vendors.
- F.2.3.4. Describe the default authority control practices and the ability to customize these practices.
- F.2.3.5. Describe how the solution manages and displays cross-references. Describe how locally created cross-references will be preserved and displayed.
- F.2.3.6. Describe how the solution supports unique persistent identifiers and linked data applications.

F.2.4. Quality Control

- F.2.4.1. Describe how your solution supports global changes to entire fields and subfields, and specific strings within fields and subfields in all record types including, but not limited to, order, vendor, bibliographic, circulation, and authority records. Include a description of the listing or reporting functionality, ability to search across record types, and output methods.
- F.2.4.2. Describe validation routines provided in the solution for order, bibliographic, holdings, item, and authority records.
- F.2.4.3. Describe the solution's standard database maintenance reports including, but not limited to, headings, data duplication, etc.
- F.2.4.4. Describe export and import procedures including how the solution manages the import and export of different encoding levels and unique fields. Include a description of how the solution sets parameters for ranking encoding levels. Does the solution provide overlay alerts when importing records?
- F.2.4.5. Describe the consortium or local institution's ability to manipulate data during record loads. For example, adding fields, deleting fields, etc.
- F.2.4.6. Describe how the solution provides the option of export and import of all types of records for manipulation by third-party applications without intervention by solution vendor, at no extra cost and with full preservation of all content designators.
- F.2.4.7. Describe how the solution will allow staff to load records from multiple sources with any metadata scheme (standard and non-standard).
- F.2.4.8. Describe how the solution will provide tracking of and accountability for staff editing of all records within the shared environment.

F.3. Circulation and Resource Sharing

The Alliance seeks a single, shared ILS solution that can meet the wide variety of circulation and resource sharing needs of its member libraries:

The Alliance seeks a solution that enables efficient, transparent circulation and resource sharing as if each institution were a member of a single, large multi-branch library system. The Alliance also seeks a solution that allows members to service extra-consortial borrowing and lending workflows. (see Borrowing & Lending Processing section)

The Alliance desires an “any item, any patron, any library” circulation model within a complex consortial environment. The Alliance consists of a broad set of institution types, from small, private liberal arts colleges to large state universities, with widely differing workflows, collection profiles, operational requirements, and users. The Alliance therefore anticipates the need to implement a mix of consortium-wide circulation lending rules, alongside rules that apply to just one, or a subset of institutions. (see Circulation section)

The Alliance has a strong culture of maintaining data privacy and security on behalf of its patrons. Only data functionally necessary to perform a given transaction should be available during transaction processing, following the principle of least privilege. (see Data section)

To ensure that its patrons’ needs are being met, the Alliance engages in a continual process of modifying services and workflow based on empirical data. Therefore, the Alliance expects its new, shared ILS to deliver statistical data and metrics in a timely, actionable manner. (see Statistics and Reporting section)

The Alliance considers communication with and among its staff and patrons to be of critical importance. Therefore, the Alliance requires a shared ILS that provides tools for information and notification delivery to staff and patrons in both electronic and printed form. (see Communications and Notifications section)

Even within a consortium as large as the Alliance, not all materials can be obtained within the consortium. Therefore, the Alliance seeks a solution that can integrate at a transaction level with sharing platforms outside the shared ILS. Currently, Alliance members participate in such platforms as ILLiad, Clio and RapidILL. (see Circulation / ILL integration section)

F.3.1. Borrowing & Lending Processing

F.3.1.1. Local (single institution)

F.3.1.1.1. Describe the workflow from the point of an item-level request made by a patron on a local item, through to delivery of the item to the patron at the patron’s specified pickup location, and circulation of the item to the patron.

F.3.1.1.2. Describe how the solution handles multiple branches, remote storage facilities, and special collections within a single institution with respect to requesting, circulation, and delivery.

F.3.1.2. Consortial (Alliance)

F.3.1.2.1. Describe the borrowing and lending workflow of an item-level request made by a patron on a consortial item, through to the delivery of the item to the patron at the patron’s specified pickup location,

circulation of the item to the patron, and then the return of that item to its home library.

- F.3.1.2.2. Describe how the solution determines due dates and hold priority at the consortial level given numerous global and library-specific shelving locations, categories of patrons, and material formats.
- F.3.1.2.3. Describe the mechanisms for tracking items in transit for delivery from and to their home libraries.
- F.3.1.2.4. Describe the tools available to manage and balance borrowing requests across member libraries, to target outcomes such as workload fairness and speed of delivery. Include information about how quickly such changes take effect.
- F.3.1.2.5. Describe how the solution manages circulation of and access to licensed electronic materials.

F.3.1.3. Interlibrary Loan (non-Alliance)

- F.3.1.3.1. Describe how the solution federates with other circulation platforms, including traditional interlibrary loan systems (ILLiad, Odyssey, etc.), for the delivery of electronic and physical materials of items not owned by the consortium.
- F.3.1.3.2. Describe the ability to create temporary circulation records for ILL items coming from a non-Alliance library .
- F.3.1.3.3. Describe any copyright and licensing agreements, procedures, and compliance tracking that your system offers.

F.3.2. Circulation

F.3.2.1. Administrative

- F.3.2.1.1. Describe how the solution enables distributed responsibility for maintaining permission to specific circulation functions.
- F.3.2.1.2. Describe how permissions can be assigned to groups, as well as to individuals.
- F.3.2.1.3. Describe the ability to tailor staff screens by workstation, showing only functions needed by staff at that workstation rather than all available functions.
- F.3.2.1.4. Describe how the solution provides for the coexistence of consortial lending rules and local lending rules.
- F.3.2.1.5. Describe how the solution provides the ability to view-only, edit and manage lending rules.
- F.3.2.1.6. Describe how the solution integrates lending rules with library hours and closures.
- F.3.2.1.7. Describe the flexibility within the staff client to change between circulation and other staff modes, such as cataloging or acquisitions.

F.3.2.2. Billing and Payments

- F.3.2.2.1. Describe how the solution manually and automatically generates bills and fees for services, fines, and lost items.
- F.3.2.2.2. Describe the history and detail that is kept on bills and fines.

- F.3.2.2.3. Describe how the solution allows libraries to accept payment for services, fines, and materials at a service desk in the library and also waive fines.
- F.3.2.2.4. Describe the types of payments the solution can accommodate (credit card, cash, campus cash cards, etc.).
- F.3.2.2.5. Describe how the solution can transmit and receive patron debit and credit information to and from an institutional Business office or external service bureau.
- F.3.2.2.6. Discuss your awareness of applicable laws and university standards regarding payments and confidentiality.
- F.3.2.2.7. Describe how the solution can facilitate billing between consortium libraries.
- F.3.2.3. Bookings / Scheduling**
 - F.3.2.3.1. Describe how the solution provides for the booking and scheduling of equipment, materials, and rooms.
- F.3.2.4. Check-in / Check-out**
 - F.3.2.4.1. Describe how the solution determines due dates, due times, and fines for checkouts, renewals, recalls (local and consortial), holds, and bookings.
 - F.3.2.4.2. Describe what options are available when exceptions need to be made, for example backdating check-in or overriding a due date.
 - F.3.2.4.3. Describe the ability to support offline circulation transactions when the system is unavailable. If a site loses access to the shared ILS, what kinds of activities (e.g., checkout, checkin, cataloging) would the site be able to continue? Describe the process involved in resynchronizing the local site with the shared ILS after the issue has been resolved.
 - F.3.2.4.4. Describe how the solution handles creation of patron records and temporary item records.
 - F.3.2.4.5. Describe what mechanisms are supported to scan or read material and patron identifiers into the system (barcodes, RFID tags, mag stripes, etc.).
 - F.3.2.4.6. Describe the hold/holdshelf management capabilities of the solution.
- F.3.2.5. Collection Management**
 - F.3.2.5.1. Describe the mechanisms you offer for Floating Collections.
 - F.3.2.5.2. Describe the inventory/collection management tools available in the solution.
- F.3.2.6. Course Reserves**
 - F.3.2.6.1. Describe the solution's course reserves functionality (both print and electronic) ,including the ability to cross-link courses and items and to suppress temporary items.
 - F.3.2.6.2. Describe any copyright and licensing agreements, procedures, and compliance tracking that your system offers.

F.3.2.7. Patrons

- F.3.2.7.1. Describe how the solution allows automatic and manual blocks of patrons from borrowing and other services both at the consortial and local level.
- F.3.2.7.2. Describe how the solution allows a patron to access services at multiple Alliance institutions while maintaining a primary affiliation.
- F.3.2.7.3. Describe how the solution allows management of patrons (alumni, community borrowers, etc.) who have local privileges, but not consortial privileges or remote access to licensed databases .
- F.3.2.7.4. Describe the elements and structure of a patron record in the solution and how patron records are created.
- F.3.2.7.5. Describe the ability to update patron records both individually and globally.
- F.3.2.7.6. Describe how the solution protects patron data and privacy.

F.3.2.8. Patron Self-Service

- F.3.2.8.1. Describe the patron self-service features of the solution, including self-service for such activities as holds, bookings, renewals, notice preferences, self-updates of patron information, etc.
- F.3.2.8.2. Describe how the solution integrates with self-checkout systems.

F.3.2.9. Support and Training

- F.3.2.9.1. Describe your customer support and training services related to circulation and resource sharing.
- F.3.2.9.2. Describe the available user documentation sets covering circulation and resource sharing, including format, accessibility, and availability of context-sensitive help within the staff client interface.
- F.3.2.9.3. Describe how the solution reports transaction errors and other errors, so that staff may take action on them.

F.3.3. Statistics and Reporting

- F.3.3.1. Describe the reporting tools available, including use of the collection and its services (lending/borrowing, logins to e-resources, etc.).
- F.3.3.2. Describe the array of variables about which reporting tools can gather statistics, such as locations, call numbers, patron categories, and material formats, or owning library.
- F.3.3.3. Describe the ability of the solution to generate lists of records and export the record data into various software programs and formats.
- F.3.3.4. Describe the ability of the solution to retain transaction-oriented information (without patron-identifiable data) indefinitely for statistical reporting purposes, even if the associated item or patron has been removed from the system.

F.3.4. Communications and Notifications

- F.3.4.1. Describe the types of notices and print products which the solution provides (receipts, paging slips/lists, book bands, hold shelf tags, pickup and overdue notices).
- F.3.4.2. Describe the ability to customize, design, and brand print and electronic notices (templates).
- F.3.4.3. Describe the types of automated patron notifications the solution provides (e-mail, SMS, etc.).
- F.3.4.4. Describe the ability for staff communication (local and inter-institutional) about individual transactions (message alerts in records, as an example).

F.3.5. Circulation / ILL integration

- F.3.5.1. Describe how the solution supports the NISO Circulation Interchange Protocol (NCIP), ANSI/NISO Z39.83, or the SIP2 Protocol.
- F.3.5.2. Provide examples of how the solution integrates with RFID and material inventory sorting systems.
- F.3.5.3. Several Alliance members maintain resource-sharing agreements with non-member libraries with which they currently share an ILS. The ability to maintain these resource-sharing arrangements after migration is desirable. Describe how the solution supports extra-consortial circulation transactions and resource sharing beyond basic interlibrary loan that might occur between Alliance members and non-member libraries.

G. Discovery and User Experience

Library users expect a Google-like search experience and often don't understand the myriad resource silos and access restrictions that they encounter when searching library collections. The Alliance seeks a discovery solution that supports users' research needs, enabling them to locate and access relevant resources efficiently. We seek a solution that can do this by integrating resource silos, by providing a more feature-rich search interface than has typically been found in library systems, and by facilitating access to the resources our users need. At the same time, the discovery solution should provide search options for experienced researchers who require a greater level of control and specificity in an interface. The Orbis Cascade Alliance's 37 member institutions include a wide range of academic institutions, from comprehensive research universities to community colleges, from specialized universities granting professional degrees to undergraduate liberal arts colleges. We seek a discovery solution that will serve the widely different needs of our diverse population of library users.

High Level User Experience Requirements

The Alliance seeks a discovery solution/user interface that meets the following user experience requirements, which are loosely based on Jakob Nielsen's 10 Heuristics for User Interface design (http://www.useit.com/papers/heuristic/heuristic_list.html):

Connect the user to all of the content that is available. Whether content comes from books and other tangible items or in silos of digital information, it should all be visible and accessible to the user.

Don't lie to the user. The solution should show users the resources that are available to them and provide accurate information about accessing those that are not immediately available.

Don't leave the user at a dead end. The solution should provide clear pathways to help connect the user with the resources and context-specific help within the user interface.

Allow the user to manage his or her own experience. The solution should allow users to control search limits and preferences; manage lists; and request, check out, and renew library materials.

Be accessible. The solution should be available to users with disabilities, with different levels of experience as researchers, and with different technology platforms or devices.

Use existing user credentials. The solution should be able to recognize and accept credentials from multiple institutions and sources in order to provide seamless access for library users.

G.1. Discovery

We envision a single discovery solution that enables discovery of resources, regardless of format or resource type, in local or consortial collections and beyond. This discovery solution could be a component of the integrated library system or an independent offering designed solely for discovery.

The discovery solution will enable institutions and individual users to customize the search experience by controlling for preferred formats and locations, including the local

institution's collection, locations within the local collection, or any resources that can be accessed or obtained by members of the consortium. The discovery solution will search across disparate resource silos, integrate the search results, and present them to the user through an intuitive interface.

- G.1.1. Describe how your solution will provide library users with an intuitive interface that searches disparate resource silos (e.g., local returnable and/or digital collections, vendor-supplied electronic resources, manuscripts and archival material, etc.); enables users to create searches in their own words; retrieves relevant items available to them regardless of format or physical location; and displays, organizes, and limits search results in an understandable manner.
- G.1.2. Describe how your solution will enable users to control the scope of or refine the search by criteria such as availability, location, creation or publication date, format, and version or resource type.
- G.1.3. Describe how your solution will facilitate both known-item searches and open-ended searches (including authors, titles, subject terms, or other identifying information) using an intuitive interface.
- G.1.4. Describe how your solution will facilitate expert searching features for researchers who require more control in formulating search statements and handling results.
- G.1.5. Describe how your solution recommends subjects or other terminology, alternate titles, spelling corrections, and other ways to help user identify and use alternate search strategies.
- G.1.6. Describe how your solution manages and enables users to locate course reserve materials.
- G.1.7. What supplemental and contextual information will your solution provide about items such as book covers, tables of content, indexes, reviews, and other content previews that enrich the user's understanding of the nature and content of items and collections?

G.2. User/System Interaction

We envision a shared solution that provides an intuitive interface for users to obtain or access resources available to them at their own institutions or other institutions within the consortium. This solution will provide users with easy-to-understand tools for using system features to request, obtain, and access resources.

- G.2.1. Describe how your solution will enable users to discover the availability, status, and location of specific resources.
- G.2.2. How will your solution enable users to borrow or request tangible items from their own institution's collections, from other institutions in the consortium, or from other libraries outside the consortium?
- G.2.3. Currently, each institution within the consortium manages its own electronic resources and frequently these resources are not available to users at other institutions. Similarly, items in digital repositories maybe be subject to access restrictions imposed by the creator or the holding institution. How will your

solution clearly expose the resources a user has the right to access and connect users with the appropriate electronic or digital resource? How might this experience differ if a user is on or off-campus?

- G.2.4. Describe how your solution will enable users to access their own accounts in order to view, renew, and track requested or checked out tangible items from local or consortial library collections.
- G.2.5. How will your solution enable users to create and save, print, share, or export single items or lists of items to citation management, word processing or other productivity software?
- G.2.6. Describe the help available to users from within your solution's interface. How will you respond to users who contact you directly for assistance?
- G.2.7. Describe how your solution might enable users to set and receive alerts and notifications about the status of specific items or categories of items available to them through an intuitive interface.
- G.2.8. Describe how users might interact with the solution through tagging, recommending, or writing reviews of resources.

G.3. Interface Design and Integration

We envision a shared solution whose end-user interface should be Section 508 compliant, accessible from multiple devices, and subject to periodic, structured evaluation. The solution also should allow libraries and individual library users to integrate external systems and services such as electronic resource vendors, web content management systems, learning management systems, and chat reference.

- G.3.1. Describe how your solution will be accessible (Section 508 compliant) to users with disabilities.
- G.3.2. With the current proliferation of browsers and devices, the user experience should be platform agnostic so that it works regardless of mode of access. Describe how your end-user interface will meet those user needs.
- G.3.3. How is user feedback obtained and used to drive system/interface changes? What is your release cycle for system fixes, changes, etc.?
- G.3.4. Describe how you will approach evaluating and improving the usability of your solution.
- G.3.5. Describe how your solution will enable interoperability with local online reference services, social networks, external subject guides, and other electronic services for communication between library users and staff.
- G.3.6. Describe the branding and customization options that will be available to libraries at the local level, including capabilities for setting default options.

G.4. APIs and User-Contributed Data

We envision a shared solution that enables and encourages local development from a robust community of users. The solution will also value and take measures to preserve user-created data.

- G.4.1. APIs (application programming interfaces) frequently are used by individuals and institutions to fill gaps where local service demands are not met by the solution or provider. Describe the APIs you make available to users of your solution. What are your use policies for the API?
- G.4.2. Describe your company's policies on backing up, recovering, and purging user-supplied data. For example, how might you handle a user who has accidentally deleted a resource list created in your solution? One who no longer wants information they contributed to be available through the solution?

H. Additional product or service information (information not used to score proposals)

Proposers are welcome, but not required, to provide information about related products and services.