

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 2023-001  
Integrated Library Systems (ILS)  
RESPONSE ADDENDUM #2  
August 10, 2022**

**MODIFICATION TO SUBMISSION DUE DATE**

Respondent submission due date is modified to August 28, 2022 on or before 11:59 pm EST.

**QUESTIONS**

1. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)  
[ANSWER: Refer to RFP Section 1.3.2 Eligibility to Submit Responses.](#)
2. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?  
[ANSWER: Refer to RFP Section 4.0, Rider A, Business and Performance Reviews](#)
3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)  
[ANSWER: Refer to RFP Section 4.0, Rider A, Business and Performance Reviews.](#)
4. Can we submit the proposals via email?  
[ANSWER: Refer to RFP Section 1.3.8.](#)
5. In File 03, on p. 15, item 3.1.4 states: "The Respondent may not provide additional attachments beyond those specified in the document for the purpose of extending their response. Any material exceeding the response limit will not be considered in rating the response and will not be returned."  
Regarding the phrase "exceeding the response limit," we did not see a page limit for the RFP response. Is there one?  
[ANSWER: Please include the information requested as part of the response.](#)
6. In File 03, on p. 6, item 10. States that "An MS Excel Version must be included in your final submission for all of these tables." Are we to include the spreadsheet as well as copy the tables into our Submission Form document?  
[ANSWER: Provide the excel version only please.](#)
7. Will you accept an electronic signature via DocuSign for the required authorized signature on Appendix A?  
[ANSWER: Yes](#)
8. Will you accept an electronic signature via DocuSign for the required authorized signature on Appendix A?  
[ANSWER: We cannot waive our statutory requirements for FOAA, "Yes" indicates you understand.](#)
9. Per Appendix I instructions item 3:
  3. When completing the HECVAT, the HECVAT Full must be completed (and not the HECVAT Lite) when any of the following conditions apply:
    - a. The solution includes providing consulting services.
    - b. The data transmitted, stored, processed or accessed includes protected health information (PHI) or any data covered by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA),
    - c. The solution involves processing credit or debit card payment transactions.

Note that we are not providing any consulting services, have no PHI or HIPPA protected info and do not process payment transactions, those are handled directly by the third party. Therefore, according to these instructions, it's our understanding that we would submit the HECVAT Lite - is that correct?

[ANSWER: Yes, you are correct, based on these circumstances, you would submit a HECVAT Lite. If for some reason you have already completed a HECVAT Full, that would be acceptable in lieu of a HECVAT Lite.](#)

10. Please elaborate on the type of collaboration you would like to be able to do around inventory control.

[ANSWER: We would like to be able to engage in collaborative collection development and we anticipate more sophisticated methods than are available in our current solution.](#)

11. What kind of access would you like to data and system functions?

[ANSWER: Please review the detailed questions in the section on Data Analysis and Reporting.](#)

12. In what manner would you like patrons to be able to "freeze" an account? What kind of control should patrons have over their children's accounts?

[ANSWER: We would like to know more about self-service patron ability to shut down an account from being able to perform some actions such as borrowing or requesting items. Separately, we want to know the range of parental controls that exist in your system and to what extent those controls can be implemented differently at different partner libraries.](#)

13. In what way do library staff want to override these activities (fines, fees, replacement charges)?

[ANSWER: We envision both individually waiving fines and fees and potentially using a "batch" function to remove a whole class of charges following a policy change.](#)

14. How does your review file process operate, does it provide suitable algorithms to provide the needed data? Please elaborate on this question. What types of review files would you like to create, and what data are involved?

[ANSWER: "Review files" may be language specific to our current solution. We are interested in the ability to query the patron, bibliographic, and item data in our ILS for various purposes such as reporting, making changes to multiple files at once, public display & use, record export, etc. We want to make sure that we can save queries to perform on a regular or frequent basis and/or edit for future use.](#)

15. How does the system track titles, those acquired through shared agreements, track, or storage agreements? What does the second mention of "track" mean in this question?

[ANSWER: That was a typographical error, and it should read "How does the system track titles, those acquired through shared agreements, and track or store those agreements?"](#)

16. Please provide the following information about the size and composition of your library collections. Please provide the numbers for:

- Total number of bibliographic titles (including e-books)
- Total number of unique e-journal titles
- Total number of digital metadata records that represent digital assets having one or more objects associated with them?
- Size of your digital collection (in MBs)? (if applicable)

[ANSWER: We have roughly 4.99 million bibliographic records across the participating libraries, including 1,682,000 e-book records. The academic/public breakdown is roughly 3.5 million bibs in the academics and 1.5 million bibs in the publics. A perfect deduped bibliographic record count is not possible because Portland Public Library is not](#)

[currently in the same ILS instance as the rest of the participating libraries. The publics do not have bibs for their Cloud Library e-books in the ILS, but would like those to be discoverable through a discovery layer if possible.](#)

[We have 95,200 e-journal bibliographic records across the entire URSUS system, mostly in the academic libraries.](#)

[We don't have a reliable means of collecting the digital metadata record and digital collection size data in the time permitted due to the distributed, varied manner in which those collections are managed and maintained.](#)

17. What is the total number of users needing staff logins to the ILS/Library Services Platform, including part-time staff and student workers?

[ANSWER: Approximately 250 to 300](#)

18. What is the total number of full-time enrolled students, or the number of library patrons who will use a library account through discovery?

[ANSWER: We currently have more than 152,700 patron accounts in URSUS and another 45,000 at the Portland Public Library. The current FTE of the University of Maine System is 21,535.](#)

19. What do the participating institutions/libraries use for:

- Managing and discovering digital assets? [Digital assets are managed primarily through vendor-hosted content, local servers or in our Digital Commons accounts. Discovery is managed at academic libraries through Summon, through our current ILS, or through a direct search of Digital Commons. Discovery at the public libraries currently participating in URSUS is managed through the ILS or through a direct search of Digital Commons. Portland Public Library's digital assets are searchable through the systems they are currently using, which includes a standalone Sierra instance, a standalone Bibliocommons instance, and their own Digital Commons repository.](#)
- Electronic course reserves? [Some campus libraries use ARES but could move to a built-in course reserve module if your solution has one. Others use the basic function of our current ILS solution.](#)
- A learning management system? [BrightSpace, also known as DL2](#)
- An institutional repository? [Digital Commons](#)
- A student system? [An Oracle-based PeopleSoft instance branded MaineStreet.](#)
- A bursar system? [The academics use MaineStreet \(see above\). Publics use various systems including QuickBooks and BlackBaud. The Maine State Library works through a centralized state government application called Advantage.](#)
- A financial invoicing system? [Same as above.](#)
- An identity management system and Single Sign-on? [The public libraries use the patron database of our current ILS and have no single-sign-on function. The academic libraries use a mix of a CAS/PeopleSoft and our current ILS for identity management and single sign-on.](#)
- A mobile interface to the library for patrons? [Mobile users are diverted to m.ursus.maine.edu when a mobile device attempts to connect to ursus.maine.edu. Portland Public Library uses both Bibliocommons and our current solution's native OPAC.](#)

[ANSWER: \(see above\)](#)

20. Do any of the libraries pay fees for authority control?

[ANSWER: We pay Backstage for authority control and Marcive for GPO services.](#)

21. Do any of the libraries use local authority files?

[ANSWER: No.](#)

22. Can you provide an estimate of the percentage of out-of-state ILL transactions among the libraries?

[ANSWER: If you mean all transactions that involve lending an item between libraries for the benefit of a patron at the borrowing library, then this should be a vanishingly small figure across the entirety of the participating libraries, certainly less than 10% and probably less than 1%. However, at some academic institutions with lower](#)

[numbers of INN-Reach requests and in-network requests, coupled with high journal-article ILL requests, the number may be as high as 50%, even when considering transactions within the ILS and INN-Reach. If, on the other hand, you only mean “traditional” ILL and not the transactions managed by our shared ILS or our INN-Reach services, then the number would vary wildly from library to library and would be very hard to calculate and probably not terribly meaningful to you.](#)

23. Please clarify question 1 in Appendix H – Solution Requirements. It appears to have a word (or words) missing: “Describe your firm’s understanding of the ??? for providing the products/services...”

[ANSWER: Apologies for the typo! The question marks should be replaced with the phrase “overarching environment;” we are looking for big picture / vision of the ILS marketplace and where it is going.](#)

24. Please provide a breakdown of the following statistics by institution so we can use the correct pricing models in our response:

- Library staff users of the current system
- FTE for the academic institutions
- Annual circulation for the public libraries
- Items/holdings for each institution
- Bibliographic records for each institution and a de-duped total for the consortium

[ANSWER:](#)

**[Library staff users of the current system:](#)**

**[FTE for the academic institutions:](#) 21,535**

**[Annual Circulation for the public libraries:](#) 315,325**

**[Items/holdings for each institution:](#)**

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">Portland Public Library:</a>        | <a href="#">362,255</a>   |
| <a href="#">UMA</a>                             | <a href="#">158,601</a>   |
| <a href="#">BPL</a>                             | <a href="#">375,970</a>   |
| <a href="#">ELECTRONIC (Shared)</a>             | <a href="#">444,113</a>   |
| <a href="#">UMaine (Orono)</a>                  | <a href="#">3,060,819</a> |
| <a href="#">University of Southern Maine</a>    | <a href="#">507,304</a>   |
| <a href="#">UM Farmington</a>                   | <a href="#">63,376</a>    |
| <a href="#">UM Presque Isle</a>                 | <a href="#">172,227</a>   |
| <a href="#">UM Fort Kent</a>                    | <a href="#">73,110</a>    |
| <a href="#">UM Law School</a>                   | <a href="#">142,446</a>   |
| <a href="#">UM Machias</a>                      | <a href="#">61,928</a>    |
| <a href="#">Maine State Library</a>             | <a href="#">274,236</a>   |
| <a href="#">Maine Law &amp; Leg Ref Library</a> | <a href="#">59,278</a>    |

**[Bibliographic records for each institution and a de-duped total for the consortium:](#)**

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <a href="#">De-duped total for whole consortium (does not include PPL):</a> | <a href="#">4,990,000</a> |
| <a href="#">Portland Public Library (not currently an URSUS member):</a>    | <a href="#">274,566</a>   |
| <a href="#">Electronic</a>  | <a href="#">500,000</a>   |
| <a href="#">Bangor Public Library</a>                                       | <a href="#">350,000</a>   |
| <a href="#">Maine Law &amp; Legislative Reference Library</a>               | <a href="#">30,000</a>    |
| <a href="#">Maine State Library</a>   | <a href="#">200,000</a>   |
| <a href="#">UMaine (Orono)</a>  | <a href="#">2,400,000</a> |
| <a href="#">UMaine’s Darling Marine Center</a>                              | <a href="#">7,000</a>     |
| <a href="#">UMA’s Augusta Collection</a>                                    | <a href="#">65,000</a>    |
| <a href="#">UMA’s Bangor Collection</a>                                     | <a href="#">18,000</a>    |
| <a href="#">UM Farmington</a>   | <a href="#">60,000</a>    |
| <a href="#">UM Fort Kent</a>  | <a href="#">65,000</a>    |
| <a href="#">UM Law School</a>   | <a href="#">100,000</a>   |

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| <a href="#">UM Machias</a>   | 65,000  |
| <a href="#">UM Presque Isle</a>                                    | 270,000 |
| <a href="#">University of Southern Maine Gorham Collection</a>     | 130,000 |
| <a href="#">University of Southern Maine Auburn Collection</a>     | 25,000  |
| <a href="#">University of Southern Maine - Osher Map Library</a>   | 33,000  |
| <a href="#">University of Southern Maine's Portland Collection</a> | 260,000 |

25. For the following question, would you be able to provide more information on what you need and expect from these deleted records?

Describe what information is available for reporting purposes after item records are deleted?

[ANSWER: We would like to know about historical usage of items even past the deletion of the item. We could conceivably want to know if it was ever designated for retention under our shared print program.](#)

### Evaluation Question(s) – Solution Requirement Questions

26. A word appears to be missing between "the" and "for" in the first sentence. "1. Describe your firm's understanding of the for providing the products / services described in this document. In addition to addressing the specific questions below, include in your response what challenges do higher education organizations face in this area how would your solution support our goals?"

[ANSWER: Apologies for the typo! The question marks should be replaced with the phrase "overarching environment;" we are looking for big picture / vision of the ILS marketplace and where it is going.](#)

27. Please elaborate on the type of collaboration you would like to be able to do around inventory control.

5. Collaborations describe:

- Collection development
- Technical services functions
- Circulation
- ILL software platforms outside of the consortium
- Patron driven resource sharing
- Inventory control

[ANSWER: We would like to be able to engage in collaborative collection development and we anticipate more sophisticated methods than are available in our current solution.](#)

28. What kind of access would you like to data and system functions?

6. Architecture describe: access to data and system functions.

[ANSWER: Please review the detailed questions in the section on Data Analysis and Reporting.](#)

### Evaluation Question(s) – Patron Experience

29. In what manner would you like patrons to be able to "freeze" an account? What kind of control should patrons have over their children's accounts?

2. Patron self-service: Freeze accounts (public library specific) and Control account for their children.

[ANSWER: We would like to know more about self-service patron ability to shut down an account from being able to perform some actions such as borrowing or requesting items. Separately, we want to know the range of parental controls that exist in your system and to what extent those controls can be implemented differently at different partner libraries.](#)

30. In what way do library staff want to override these activities?

2b. Describe how patrons will be able to pay fines, fees, and replacement charges online?

- What options for payment beyond cash/check does your system support?
- Credit cards? Venmo? PayPal? Others?

- Is there an option for including payment for research services?
- **How can library staff override these activities, if necessary?**

ANSWER: We might want to override a charge if we determined that it should be forgiven or overridden or was due to library error. We might also at some point have a policy change which would cause us to erase a whole batch of past charges at once.

#### **Evaluation Question(s) – Acquisitions and Serials**

31. Please elaborate on this question. What types of review files would you like to create, and what data are involved?

1c. How does your review file process operate, does it provide suitable algorithms to provide the needed data?

ANSWER: "Review files" may be language specific to our current solution. We are interested in the ability to query the patron, bibliographic, and item data in our ILS for various purposes such as reporting, making changes to multiple files at once, public display & use, record export, etc. We want to make sure that we can save queries to perform on a regular or frequent basis and/or edit for future use.

32. What does the second mention of "track" mean in this question?

5h. How does the system track titles, those acquired through shared agreements, **track**, or storage agreements?

ANSWER: That was a typographical error, and it should read "How does the system track titles, those acquired through shared agreements, and track or store those agreements?"