

Missouri institutions of higher education, working with each other and with the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education (CBHE), have established a goal of making the information resources in the libraries of these institutions more widely available and accessible so that use of these resources will enhance the economic and educational development of the citizens of Missouri. To this end, the Missouri Public Academic Library Administrators (MPALA) adopted, on February 11, 1997, the following statement:

Statewide access of postsecondary students to needed library services and materials will require the combined resources of the state's public and private libraries. An effective system will require a common and easy-to-use system for requesting materials and quick delivery to any location in the state.

1) To facilitate this, the CBHE should seek funds for and promote the use of:

a) a common library system platform;

b) a statewide resource delivery system for all academic libraries.

2) The CBHE should encourage independent institutions, the state library, and other public and private libraries to participate in the statewide circulation and delivery system.

3) To allow institutions to capture the most value from their current systems, these changes could be phased in over a period of years.

*(from **Recommendations for a Telecommunications-Based Delivery System**, presented to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education by the Resource Group for a Telecommunications-based Delivery System, June 13, 1996, p. 28)*

The MPALA appointed a Task Force to develop a strategy and schedule for achieving these goals. In furtherance of its work, the MPALA Task Force on a Common Library System Platform, through the good offices of the CBHE, is issuing this Request For Information (RFI)

2. Purpose.

The purpose of this Request For Information (RFI) is to solicit from established vendors of integrated automated library systems information which will assist the task force in developing a specific project plan and a detailed budget request. This RFI provides to potential respondents basic information about the proposed project and solicits responses to several specific questions. The questions are designed to help us learn about how various automated library systems have addressed the specific functional goals of our project and, most importantly, to help us estimate the costs of our project.

3. Background.

The planning for this project is in its early stages, and it is proceeding very quickly. To give focus to the project and facilitate the planning process, MPALA has informally agreed to certain guidelines:

Missouri intends to carry out this project on the basis of the best available technology. We do not believe that achieving our goals will depend on the development of new software.

- We are aware that there are alternative system architectures which can be used to deliver direct patron borrowing functionality in a consortial environment. We lean strongly towards a model which involves the installation of integrated library systems, all supplied by the same vendor, at participating institutions. In some instances, more than one participating institution might share a system while other institutions would have systems individually. We doubt it is practical to achieve the support of direct patron borrowing with a single installation of an integrated library system to be used by all participating institutions.

We intend to provide direct patron borrowing to participating institutions which elect to use other than the selected integrated library system by requiring the vendor selected for this project to work with selected other vendors to develop the capability to support direct patron borrowing between those disparate automated library systems.

4.Schedule and Responses.

4.1.The tentative schedule for this project is:

March 21, 1997 - Release RFI

May 2, 1997 - RFI responses due

June 1, 1997 - Draft budget request due

July 1, 1997 - Final budget request document due

July 1997-June 1998Request for Proposal (RFP) document prepared

January 1998 - Missouri State Assembly begins consideration of budget request

June 1998 - Missouri State Assembly completes action on budget request

July 1998 - RFP released to vendors

Fourth quarter 1998 - Contract signed

First quarter 1999 - Implementation begins

4.2. Please send five copies of your response to this RFI to:

Mr. Eldon Wallace
Associate Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs
Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109

If you are able to provide your response on or before May 2, 1997, it will be most helpful to us in the preparation of our budget estimates and project plan.

4.3. We encourage you to contact us with any questions or comments you may have about this RFI. Please direct your questions and comments in writing to:

Mr. Eldon Wallace
Associate Commissioner for Fiscal Affairs
Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109
(573) 751-6635 (fax)
wallace?cbhe400@admin.mocbhe.gov

The answers to all questions will be provided to all potential respondents, with the identify of the questioner concealed.

5. Specification.

5.1.Integrated System Foundation. The automated library system which is ultimately selected as the technical foundation of this project will be a complete system. A "complete system" is defined as the applications software, system software, hardware (except for terminals and certain data communications equipment), hardware and software installation, training, software and hardware documentation, hardware and software maintenance and ongoing software enhancements necessary to provide easy-to-use online real-time integrated automated support for the following library functions:

- Acquisitions (including acquisitions fund management)
- Bibliographic database management (including online cataloging and record maintenance and authority control)
- Circulation control (including offline backup and reserve room)
- Serials control
- Name and address record creation and maintenance
- Public access to the catalog and other information databases
- Management reporting

In addition, the system will support appropriate information technology and library standards, specifically (but not limited to) the most current versions of:

- ANSI Z39.50 Information Retrieval Service Definition and Protocol Specification for Library Applications
- ANSI Z39.2 Bibliographic Information Interchange Standard and USMARC for bibliographic and authority data

All of these functional modules will be in production use at customer sites.

5.2.Direct Patron Borrowing. In addition to the functionality inherent in the requirements of paragraph 5.1, the selected system will contain specific functions to support direct patron borrowing among participating institutions in a consortium. For example:

- a student enrolled at a Missouri college or university can determine, quickly and easily, whether a library on the institution's campus owns a copy of an item of information (book or similar type of item) and, if so, whether the item is available;
- if the desired item of information is not owned by the institution where the student is enrolled or is not available, the student can determine, with a single keystroke, whether the item is in the library of another participating institution in Missouri and, if so, whether the item is available;
- if the desired item of information is available from another participating institution, the student can request the item, again with a single keystroke, after which the system will prompt the student to supply identifying information;
- as a result of the request, and given a valid patron, the item will be speedily retrieved and charged out to the student;
- if the copy originally selected by the system to fill the student's request turns out not to be available, the system will forward the request to another owning institution or, should there not be an available copy, notify the requestor and return the request to the originating institution.

The automated library system environment which supports these activities must have the following characteristics:

- each participating academic institution will have control of its own bibliographic database and access to a full range of automated functions for creating and managing that database and for acquiring, cataloging and circulating the books and other materials in that database;
- it must not be necessary to have library staff involvement in

the process of identifying and requesting an item of information, that is, the system functions involved must be available directly to the OPAC user;

- at the time a remotely-located item is requested by a student and scheduled for retrieval by the system, a copy of the patron record for the person initiating the request must be transmitted from the system where the person is a registered patron to the system having the record for the requested item so that the lending institution can check out the item directly to the person requesting the item;

- it must not be necessary for the information seeker to rekey a search or to use an interface or system which is different from that used to search the local institution's collection to accomplish the task of requesting an item from a different institution;

- the automated library systems must be able to function within a tcp/ip network environment and to use that tcp/ip network to communicate the information needed to complete the transactions described above;

- the functionality described must be available in character (telnet), WWW and GUI interfaces.

6. Questions.

Please answer the following questions on the answer form that is provided in this RFI. You may attach additional pages to the answer form, as required, but we would appreciate having the basic answer to each question on the form.

6.1. Does the current production release of your integrated automated library system include specific functions which support the direct patron borrowing scenario described in paragraph 5.2? If it does, please describe how these functions work and at what customer sites they are in use. In addition, please describe the architecture of your intersystem circulation functions.

6.2. If the answer to the first question in paragraph 6.1 is "no", are you currently developing such functions? If you are, please describe the way the functions will work and the architecture of your intersystem circulation functions.

6.3.If you answer "yes" either to paragraph 6.1 or 6.2, are you willing and able to work with vendors of other systems to interface your intersystem circulation functions with similar functions in systems from other vendors?

6.4.Appendix A identifies four groups of institutions which will participate in the Missouri project. The groups are based on size, and Appendix A defines the groups in terms of FTE and the library collection (volumes). For each group, please provide an estimated cost for an installation of your system, including all of the modules entailed by the requirements of paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2. The estimated cost should include the host hardware and software and any client software that is an integral part of your system as well as installation, training and documentation costs. The estimated cost should not include any data communications or terminal equipment or printers. In addition, if the architecture of your intersystem circulation functions relies on a union database system please include an estimated cost for this union database system (Appendix A contains collection size information for a union database system). **Note:** we recognize that the cost information we have requested will be based on projected scenarios; the only use to which this information will be put is assistance to us in developing a budget request for the first phase of this project.

6.5.Appendix B describes two alternative scenarios involving combinations of institutions from various of the groups defined in Appendix A. Please provide an estimated total cost for each scenario. If your architecture includes a union catalog system, please include the cost of that system in the total cost for each scenario. Please provide a breakdown of the total cost for each scenario by cluster.

6.6.In this section of the Answer Form please specify ongoing costs after warranty expiration for each of the cost scenarios identified in 6.4 and 6.5.

Answer Form

Question 6.1 Does the current production release of your integrated automated library system include specific functions which support the scenario described in paragraph 5.2?

Yes:No:If you answered "yes", please attach additional pages containing the additional information requested in paragraph 6.1.

Question 6.2 If the answer to the first question in paragraph 6.1 is "no", are

you currently developing such functions?

Yes:No:If you answered "yes", please attach additional pages containing the additional information requested in paragraph 6.2.

Question 6.3Are you willing and able to work with vendors of other systems to interface your intersystem circulation functions with similar functions in systems from other vendors?

Yes:No:

Question 6.4Estimated cost, Group 1 institution:

Estimated cost, Group 2 institution:

Estimated cost, Group 3 institution:

Estimated cost, Group 4 institution:

Estimated cost, Union Database System:

(If applicable)

Question 6.5Estimated total cost, Scenario 1

Cluster 1

Cluster 2

Cluster 3

Estimated total cost, Scenario 2

Cluster 1

Cluster 2

Cluster 3

Cluster 4

Cluster 5

Cluster 6

Cluster 7

Answer Form (continued)

Question 6.6 Estimated Ongoing Costs, Scenario 1:

Cluster 1:

Cluster 2:

Cluster 3:

Estimated Ongoing Costs, Scenario 2:

Cluster 1:

Cluster 2:

Cluster 3:

Cluster 4:

Cluster 5:

Cluster 6:

Cluster 7:

Appendix A

Group Collection (Volumes) FTE

1 Up to 150,000 Up to 3,000

2 150,000 - 500,000 900 - 14,000

3 500,000 - 1,000,000 4,500 - 13,000

4 1,000,000 - 3,000,000 7,000 - 19,000

Appendix B

Scenario 1 has academic institutions organized in three clusters, each of which represents one installation of an integrated library system that is used by all institutions in the cluster.

Cluster 1: 3.3 million volumes, 22,000 FTE users, two institutions (one from group 3, one from group 4).

Cluster 2: 270,000 volumes, 6,000 FTE users, four institutions, all from group 1.

Cluster 3: 2.8 million volumes, 21,000 FTE users, three institutions (one from group 1, one from

group 3, one from group 4).

Scenario 2 has academic institutions organized in seven clusters, each of which represents one installation of an integrated library system that is used by all institutions in the cluster.

Cluster 1: 3.3 million volumes, 22,000 FTE users, two institutions (one from group 3, one from group 4).

Cluster 2: 800,000 volumes, 10,500 FTE users, two institutions from group 2.

Cluster 3: 370,000 volumes, 3,000 FTE users, two group 1 institutions, one group 2 institution.

Cluster 4: 170,000 volumes, 6,500 FTE users, three group 1 institutions.

Cluster 5: 2.8 million volumes, 21,000 FTE users, three institutions (one from group 1, one from group 3, one from group 4).

Cluster 6: 740,000 volumes, 17,000 FTE users, one group 2 institution, one group 3 institution.

Cluster 7: 500,000 volumes, 9,000 FTE users, two group 2 institutions.