

**APPEL D'OFFRES
 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS No. 2017052-RFP**

DATE 2017-11-29

PAGE 1 DE 90

FERMETURE DE L'APPEL D'OFFRES - OUVERTURE DES OFFRES CLOSING OF THE CALL FOR TENDERS - OPENING OF THE OFFERS		APPROBATION (S) APPROVAL (M/Ms)
2018-01-22 Noon 15:00 HNE EST		cd
TPS : GST :	APPLICABLE EN TOUT TEMPS ALWAYS APPLICABLE	
TAXE DE VENTE PROVINCIALE : PROVINCIAL SALES TAX	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPLICABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> NON APPLICABLE
POUR RENSEIGNEMENT, COMMUNIQUEZ AVEC - FOR INFORMATION, CONTACT		TELE QUE PRÉCISÉE CI-APRÈS AS SPECIFIED HEREINAFTER
Carole Dessureault, Senior Procurement Officer		
N° DE TÉL. TEL NO	613-562-5800	POSTE EXT. 6559

LES TERMES ET CONDITIONS CI-DESSOUS, LES RÈGLEMENTS ET LES CONDITIONS GÉNÉRALES DU PROTOCOLE DE RELATION D'AFFAIRES AVEC L'UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA S'APPLIQUENT.
 THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS BELOW, THE POLICIES AND THE GENERAL CONDITIONS IN THE BUSINESS RELATION PROTOCOL WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA APPLY.

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) # 2017052-RFP
 Software as a Service (SaaS) Library Services Platform**

1. This RFP is issued by the University of Ottawa on behalf of the participating members of the Ontario Council of University Libraries. It is divided into four (4) sections and nine (9) appendices:

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

PART 2 - THE DELIVERABLES

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

PART 4 - TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP PROCESS

- | | |
|--|--|
| APPENDIX A - THE FORM OF AGREEMENT | APPENDIX F-1 - RFP PARTICULARS - introduction |
| APPENDIX B - SUBMISSION FORM | APPENDIX F-2 - MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS AND RATED CRITERIA |
| APPENDIX C - RATE BID FORM | APPENDIX G - PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES |
| APPENDIX D - FORM INTENT TO RESPOND TO RFP | |
| APPENDIX E - REFERENCE FORM | |

2. The RFP must be completed as specified and submitted by Electronic Bid Submission (MERX), by January 22nd, 2018 at 12:00 P.M. noon (EST)

3. Questions will be accepted until December 15, 2017.

4. The deadline to submit the mandatory form "Intent to Respond" is January 5th, 2018 by 4:00 P.M. (EST).

NOUS SOMMES BILINGUES.

WE ARE BILINGUAL.

VEUILLEZ RÉPONDRE À NOTRE APPEL D'OFFRES EN FRANÇAIS OU EN ANGLAIS, SELON VOTRE CHOIX.

PLEASE ANSWER OUR CALL FOR TENDERS IN EITHER FRENCH OR ENGLISH, AS YOU PREFER.

JE, SOUSSIGNÉ, OFFRE DE FOURNIR LES BIENS ET SERVICES REQUIS AUX PRIX INDICUÉS ET SELON LES CONDITIONS CITÉES DANS LA PRÉSENTE.
 I, THE UNDERSIGNED, OFFER TO SUPPLY THE REQUESTED GOODS AND SERVICES AT THE PRICES QUOTED AND ACCORDING TO THE CONDITIONS IN THIS REQUEST

_____	_____	_____
NOM (CARACTÈRES D'IMPRIMERIE) - NAME (PRINT)	TITRE - TITLE	N° DE TEL - TEL NO
_____	_____	_____
DATE	(AUTORISATION) SIGNATURE	(AUTHORIZATION)

Request for Proposals

For

a

Software as a Service (SaaS) Library Services Platform

Request for Proposals No.: 2017052-RFP

Issued: **November 29, 2017**

**Proposal Submission Deadline: January 22, 2018, by 12:00 p.m. (noon)
local time in Ontario, Canada**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1 – INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Invitation to Proponents	3
1.2 OCUL Background	3
1.3 Type of Contract for Deliverables	4
1.4 No Guarantee of Volume of Work or Exclusivity of Contract.....	5
1.5 Trade Agreements (CFTA - CETA).....	5
1.6 Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act	5
PART 2 - THE DELIVERABLES	6
2.1 Description of Deliverables	6
2.2 Material Disclosures.....	8
PART 3 - EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS	9
3.1 Stages of Proposal Evaluation	9
3.2 Stage I - Mandatory Requirements, Initial Submission Date.....	10
3.3 Stage II – Evaluation of Rated Criteria	11
3.4 Stage III – Proponent Interviews and Product Demonstration (40 Points).....	12
3.5 Stage IV – Evaluation of Pricing.....	12
3.6 Cumulative Score and Selection of Highest Scoring Proponent	12
PART 4 - TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP PROCESS	13
4.1 General Information and Instructions	13
4.2 Communication After Issuance of RFP	14
4.3 Submission of Proposals.....	14
4.4 Negotiations, Notification Debriefing and Dispute	16
4.5 Prohibited Communications, Confidential Information and FIPPA.....	18
4.6 Procurement Process Non-Binding	19
4.7 Governing Law and Interpretation	20
APPENDIX A – FORM OF AGREEMENT	22
APPENDIX A-1 - DEFINITIONS TO THE FORM OF AGREEMENT	27
APPENDIX B – SUBMISSION FORM	28
APPENDIX C – RATE BID FORM	31
APPENDIX D – INTENT TO RESPOND TO RFP FORM	39
APPENDIX E – REFERENCE FORM	40
APPENDIX F-1 F-2 – RFP PARTICULARS	41
APPENDIX G – PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES	78

PART 1 – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Invitation to Proponents

This Request for Proposal ("RFP") is an invitation by the University of Ottawa (hereinafter referred to as uOttawa) on behalf of the **members of the Ontario Council of University Libraries who are participating in the RFP (hereinafter referred to as OCUL)** to prospective Proponents to submit non-binding proposals for the provision of a **Software as a Service (SaaS) Library Services Platform** (herein referred to as LSP), as further described in Part 2 - The Deliverables (the "Deliverables").

1.2 Background of OCUL and the Collaborative Futures Project

OCUL is a consortium of Ontario's 21 university libraries, whose mission is to enhance information services in Ontario and beyond through collective purchasing and shared digital information infrastructure, collaborative planning, advocacy, assessment, research, partnerships, communications, and professional development.

OCUL has a strong tradition of collaboration amongst member institutions to maximize collective expertise and resources. OCUL members currently fund and use a range of shared services (link resolver, interlibrary loan, virtual reference, journal hosting, research data management and preservation) and shared custom-developed web-based platforms (Journals, Books, Accessible Content E-Portal (ACE), OCUL Usage Rights database (OUR), GeoPortal, odesi). These shared technology services and infrastructure are referred to as Scholars Portal and are managed by a central support team. OCUL and Scholars Portal are highly regarded leaders in the provision of shared services and technologies.

Building on this solid foundation of collaboration and cooperation, OCUL has developed a shared vision of the future of library management systems in Ontario's academic libraries - a vision that articulates new possibilities for collaboration. This has been described as the Collaborative Futures (CF) project.

The CF vision involves radical collaboration to help OCUL libraries face the challenges of today - the transformation of scholarly communication and higher education, rapid developments in information technology, and declining or limited resources.

The vision is defined by the existence of *a distributed and shared collaborative approach to print and electronic/digital resource management and discovery*. This approach builds upon existing OCUL-wide collaborative initiatives such as Scholars Portal technology and collaborative licensing, as well as smaller-scale initiatives such as shared ILS systems and print storage facilities. The keys to achieving the vision include:

1. Implement shared next generation library services platforms.
2. Collaborate to manage and preserve print resources in a sustainable system.
3. Collaborate to effectively use shared systems to manage electronic & print resources.

At this time, thirteen (13) of the 21 OCUL university libraries have agreed to move forward with migration to a shared Library Services Platform (LSP), with three (3) possible additions in the near term, and other interested OCUL members may join in future. The partners are listed in Appendix G.

CF project background:

Libraries in Ontario's universities are seeking to improve their support for faculty and students; to modernize backroom workflows with greater streamlining and reduced duplication of effort; to reduce or redirect costs; to share expertise; and to meet their stewardship responsibilities for the province's valuable print and electronic research collections.

These aims coincide with a challenging financial, technological, and service environment for many libraries:

- There are a greater number of collections—in print, audiovisual, and digital formats—to acquire, manage, and provide access to.
- The multiple systems for doing so are expensive, hardware-heavy, staff-intensive, rarely interoperable
- There is a significant transformation happening in scholarly communication, research, and higher education generally. The digital age is resulting in the rapid development of new research methodologies and new means and models of scholarly dissemination. Online learning and technology-enhanced teaching and learning offer new opportunities for the integration of scholarly resources and digital collections. Assisting faculty with research data management and stewardship has emerged as a new priority for many libraries
- An added concern is the overall financial well-being of Ontario's university libraries; universities in Ontario rely heavily on provincial funding, which is at or near the lowest per student in comparison to the other provinces. There is no guarantee that even the current level of financial support from the Ontario government will continue.

To work towards these aims and address these challenges, Phase One of the shared LSP project began in 2015 as Collaborative Futures, with the participation of all 21 OCUL member institutions. This phase involved intensive information-gathering in many areas - library workflows, opportunities for shared print management, current system costs, market analysis, and collaboration models used in other library consortia - and resulted in a feasibility study presented to OCUL Directors. At the end of Phase One, the Directors expressed strong support for continuing the project and decided to concentrate on the procurement of an LSP as a first step to achieve our short- and long-term collaboration goals.

Phase Two proceeded in 2016 with further market research, developing the technological and business requirements for a shared system, and building consensus on the nature of this complex collaboration.

Currently, in Phase Three of the project (Procurement and Implementation), thirteen (13) OCUL institutions are committed to the RFP, with three (3) possible additions in the near term, and other interested OCUL members may join in future.

1.3 Type of Contract for Deliverables

The selected Proponent will be requested to enter into negotiations for an agreement with **the Council of Ontario Universities (COU)** for the provision of the Deliverables in the form attached as Appendix A, Form of Agreement, to the RFP. The Form of Agreement is presented in "Draft Form" and may be modified following the contract negotiation process. COU accepts no liability for the acts of, decisions by, and information about the participating OCUL members. The master agreement will be signed by COU and the selected Proponent will also be required to develop a Customer Service Agreement (CSA) to be used in conjunction with Appendix A that will be executed between the selected Proponent and COU detailing the specific technical and functional requirements between these two parties. It is COU's intention to enter into the Form of Agreement based on that attached as Appendix A to the RFP with only one (1) legal entity. The term of the agreement is to be for a period of five years, with an option in favour of

COU to extend the agreement on the same terms and conditions for an additional term of up to five years. It is anticipated that the agreement will be executed on or around March 1, 2018. The CSA will echo the terms of this agreement.

1.4 No Guarantee of Volume of Work or Exclusivity of Contract

UOttawa makes no guarantee of the value or volume of work to be assigned to the Successful Proponent. The Agreement to be negotiated with the selected Proponent will not be an exclusive contract for the provision of the described Deliverables. UOttawa or participating OCUL members may contract with others for the same or similar Deliverables to those described in this RFP or may obtain the same or similar Deliverables internally.

1.5 Trade Agreements (CFTA – CETA)

Proponents should note that procurement falling within the scope of the Canadian Free Trade Agreement (www.cfta-alec.ca) as well as the Common Economics Trade Agreement <http://www.international.gc.ca/trade-commerce/trade-agreements-accords-commerciaux/agr-acc/ceta-aecq/index.aspx?lang=eng> are subject to that chapter but that the rights and obligations of the parties shall be governed by the specific terms of each particular tender call.

1.6 Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 – O. Reg. 429/07, applies to the services provided by the Proponent.

This Regulation establishes accessibility standards for customer service and it applies to every designated public sector organization and to every other person or organization that provides goods or services to members of the public or other third parties and that has at least one employee in Ontario.

<http://www.mcass.gov.on.ca/en/mcass/programs/accessibility/index.aspx>

Procurement must comply with these laws and ensure that all conditions are met.

Information modules will be provided to the Successful Proponent.

[End of Part 1]

PART 2 - THE DELIVERABLES

2.1 Description of Deliverables

This RFP is an invitation to submit non-binding proposals for the provision of a **Software as a Service (SaaS) Library Services Platform (LSP)**, full-featured to meet the specified requirements, as well as implementation services to migrate the partners to the new shared solution, and ongoing support and development.

Participating OCUL members (**Appendix G**) are seeking proposals for a SaaS LSP with robust, proven, “next generation”, forward-looking solutions, with a full range of integrated functionality for both staff and public-facing user services, and which readily integrates with the technology environments in each of the participating universities. The system should address the specific needs of Higher Education and be scalable for a group that includes both large research-intensive institutions as well as small undergraduate institutions, and to add more OCUL partners in future. Additionally, uOttawa and participating OCUL members are looking for benefits of a shared LSP that will leverage the spending on behalf of all the partner institutions.

OCUL seeks a shared LSP solution that will support the CF vision. The vision sees OCUL library employees working in an environment in which collaborative work is a given. They collaborate routinely with staff at other OCUL libraries, are familiar with OCUL-wide standards and policies, share expertise across the consortium, and may work on local projects or on behalf of another institution for the good of the OCUL community.

OCUL currently carries out many aspects of its work in this way, and this LSP should both leverage that collaborative mindset and also expand and extend it. Other library consortia have found that a shared platform enables a wider range of basic sharing of data, resources, and services, and introduces efficiencies and opportunities. The shared LSP environment should also facilitate the discovery and management of electronic and print resources in ways that are not possible with current siloed systems, through which information about collections is not shared or viewable by a wide range of researchers across multiple institutions. The LSP should position the member libraries to work together in order to take advantage of future library, technology, and higher educational opportunities, initiatives, and services.

COU and participating OCUL members are interested in implementing a world class solution that will address these needs and achieve the overall objectives described below.

2.1.1 Objectives

A number of guiding objectives have been recognized by the participating OCUL members for implementing a shared LSP system. This initiative is expected to realize the following collaboration priorities, while also providing robust and forward-looking operational functionality. As a newly forming partnership, some sharing will take longer to achieve for technical and policy reasons, but we need a system that provides this capacity from the outset, so that we can phase in as needed over time. This includes adding new partners within OCUL

- Capability to share a common configuration by default, but would also allow for local differences where necessary
- Shared records, cataloguing, and electronic resource management
- Preserving local information for important local variations or specialized collections
- Shared integrated knowledgebase on a platform with unified workflows where management of print/physical records and licenses is increasingly similar
- Enabling future collaborations such as deeper shared licensing, shared acquisitions and collection management.
- Shared bibliographic record loading at the consortial level
- Shared Discovery interface, in choice of English or French, with capability for local and expanded consortial views and integrated fulfillment
- Shared patron services facilitated by appropriate authentication and access
- Shared analytics

2.1.3 Opportunity

Participating OCUL members seek a supplier who will enter into a creative and capable partnership with us to take OCUL forward into this new level of collaboration.

However, for this project OCUL members reserve the right to have fewer than thirteen institutions at the initial implementation.

The proposal provides an opportunity for suppliers to demonstrate how they can provide the best solution to launch the OCUL vision, addressing the following:

- Functionality and services to facilitate our priority collaboration outcomes for the new consortium, now and into the future
- A unified discovery solution that enables discovery and fulfillment of resources locally and consortially
- Unified management of resources, including selection and acquisition of physical and electronic resources, metadata management and fulfillment across all resource types
- Integrated functionalities that facilitate streamlined workflows and user experience
- Advanced and forward-looking technologies for high reliability cloud-hosted solution
- Demonstrated and flexible tools for integration and interoperability with local institutional and third party systems
- Highly capable and experienced support for a complex migration to a new consortial implementation
- Demonstrated capability and scalability to support an academic consortial implementation of the size and scope of the OCUL partnership and anticipated expansion, with potential to serve all universities in Ontario
- Demonstrated record of innovative product development to meet the needs of the evolving library market to support a creative and involved academic customer base

2.2 Material Disclosures

2.2.1 Funding.

Thirteen Universities are in a position to acquire the system at this time, and are listed in **Appendix G Participating Universities**.

[End of Part 2]

PART 3 - EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

3.1 Stages of Proposal Evaluation

UOttawa and the selected evaluation team will conduct the evaluation of proposals in the following five (5) stages:

Stages	Evaluation	Weight (in percentage)
Stage I	Mandatory Requirements	Pass / Fail
Stage II	Rated Criteria	50%
Stage III	Scripted Interview/Demo	30%
Stage IV	Pricing (5 year cost of ownership)	20%
Stage V	Cumulative Score References Security/Privacy Risk Assessment (selected Proponent)	100%

3.1.1 Stage I – Mandatory Requirements

Stage I will consist of a review to determine which proposals comply with all of the mandatory requirements. Proposals failing to satisfy the mandatory proposal content requirements as of the Initial Submission Date will be provided with an opportunity to rectify any deficiencies. Proposals failing to satisfy the mandatory proposal content requirements as of the Submission Date will be excluded from further consideration.

3.1.2 Stage II – Rated Criteria (50%)

Stage II will consist of a scoring by uOttawa and the selected evaluation team of each qualified proposal on the basis of the rated criteria.

In order to proceed to the next stage, Proponents must meet the **minimum threshold of 70%** or 70 points, (70 points is 70% of Total Points excluding those for pricing and the Interview/Product Demonstration). Proposals failing to meet the minimum threshold requirement, subject to the reserved rights of uOttawa, may be disqualified and not evaluated further. If no proposal meets the minimum threshold requirement of 70%, then uOttawa reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to invite up to three of the highest scoring Proponent(s) to the next stage of the evaluation.

3.1.3 Stage III – Interviews and Product Demos (30%)

Interviews and product demonstrations will be held with up to three short-listed Proponents who provided qualified proposals on the basis of the rated criteria. In order to make the short list Proponents must meet the minimum score on the rated criteria as set out in 3.1.2. After the Interviews and Product Demos Proponents **must meet and maintain the minimum threshold of 70%** to be considered for the next Stage IV – Pricing.

There will be an extended group with off-site viewing via the web for the interviews and product demonstrations. OCUL may need to record the sessions.

3.1.4 Stage IV – Pricing (20%)

Upon completion of Stage III for all Proponents, the sealed pricing envelope provided by each Proponent will then be opened and Stage IV will consist of a scoring of the pricing submitted. The evaluation of price/cost shall be undertaken after the evaluation of mandatory requirements and any rated requirements has been completed.

3.1.5 Stage V - Cumulative Score and References

At the conclusion of Stage IV, all scores from Stage II, III and Stage IV will be added to identify the highest scoring Proponent. UOttawa will contact the references provided by the highest scoring Proponent and should these all prove satisfactory, the Proponent will be asked to complete a Security/Privacy Risk Assessment compatible with EDUCAUSE and Cloud Security Alliance (CSA) standards. Should this prove satisfactory, uOttawa will then enter into contract negotiations.

3.2 Stage I - Mandatory Requirements, Initial Submission Date

3.2.1 Initial Submission Date

Other than inserting the information requested on the mandatory submission forms set out in this RFP, a Proponent may not make any changes to any of the forms. Proponents submitting proposals that do not meet the mandatory requirements will be provided with an opportunity to rectify any deficiencies.

3.2.2 Submission Form (Appendix B) MANDATORY REQUIREMENT

Each proposal **must** include a Submission Form (Appendix B) completed and signed by a person authorized to bind the Proponent.

3.2.3 Rate Bid Form (Appendix C) MANDATORY REQUIREMENT AND FILED SEPARATELY

Each Proponent **must** include this form completed according to the instructions contained in the form as well as those instructions set out below:

- (a) rates shall be provided in Canadian Funds, inclusive of all applicable duties and taxes except for HST or PST and GST (where applicable) which should be itemized separately; and
- (b) rates quoted by the Proponent shall be all inclusive and shall include all labour and materials, travel and lodging costs, insurance costs and all other overhead including but not limited to any fees or other charges required by law.

3.2.4 Reference Form (Appendix E) MANDATORY REQUIREMENT

Each Proponent must complete the Reference Form (Appendix E) and include it with its proposal.

3.3 Stage II – Evaluation of Rated Criteria (Stage II - weight 50%)

3.3.1 Rated Criteria (for eight categories calculated on a value of 100%)

The following is an overview of the categories and weighting for the rated criteria of the RFP:

Rated Criteria Category	Weighting (Percentage)
Vision OCUL Vision: Requirements to support Collaboration Outcomes Accessibility, Multilingual requirements Supplier Vision: future enhancements/roadmap	12%
Business Resource Selection, Acquisition and Management	15%
Business Description and Metadata	10%
Business Discovery, User Services and Fulfillment	15%
Business Physical Circulation	6%
Business Reporting and Analytics	12%
Technology Cloud/security/privacy System Administration and Configuration Authentication and Authorization Extensibility/Interoperability	15%
Customer Service Implementation and Data Migration Training Support and documentation	15%
Total	100%

Proposals failing to meet the **minimum threshold requirement of 70%** subject to the reserved rights of uOttawa, may be disqualified and not evaluated further. If no proposal meets the minimum threshold requirement of 70%, then uOttawa reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to invite up to three of the highest scoring Proponent(s) to the next stage of the evaluation.

For simplicity of analysis of the rated criteria, the Proponents are asked to insert their responses to each question within each section immediately following that question in that section. Proponents are encouraged to provide diagrams, charts, tables and other explanatory text to ensure a clear understanding of their response. Please refrain from including links, except where otherwise noted.

3.4 Stage III – Proponent Interviews and Product Demonstration (30 %)

Stage III will consist of Proponent interviews of each qualified proposal on the basis of the rated criteria. UOttawa and the selected evaluation team reserve the right to adjust the scores awarded from Stage II as a result of information received during the Proponent interviews.

The shortlisted Proponents will be asked to provide a scripted demonstration of their product to the evaluation team and participate in an interview with scripted questions.

After the Interviews and Product Demos Proponents **must meet and maintain the minimum threshold of 70%** to be considered for the next Stage IV – Pricing.

3.5 Stage IV – Evaluation of Pricing (20%)

Pricing will be scored based on a relative pricing formula using the Rates set out in the Rate Bid Form. See Appendix C.

Each Proponent will receive a percentage of the total possible points allocated to price for the particular category it has bid on by dividing that Proponent's total cost of ownership for that category into the lowest bid's total lowest cost of ownership in that category. For example, if the lowest bid total lowest cost of ownership for a particular category is \$120.00, that Proponent receives 100% of the possible points for that category ($120/120 = 100\%$), a Proponent who bids \$150.00 receives 80% of the possible points for that category ($120/150 = 80\%$) and a Proponent who bids \$240.00 receives 50% of the possible points for that category ($120/240 = 50\%$).

Lowest rate

----- x Total available points = Score for proposal with 2nd lowest rate
2nd lowest rates

Lowest rate

----- x Total available points = Score for proposal with 3rd lowest rate
3rd lowest rates

etc for each proposal

3.6 Cumulative Score and Selection of Highest Scoring Proponent

At the conclusion of Stage IV, all scores from Stage II, III and Stage IV will be added together and the highest scoring Proponent will be selected for negotiations in accordance with Part 4 Terms and Conditions of the RFP process. *In the event of a tie score, the selected Proponent will be determined by way of a coin toss conducted by the evaluation committee.*

The following nomenclature has been added for clarity:

M: Indicates a mandatory requirement that must be complied with in order for the proposal to be given further consideration. Please answer Compliant or Not Compliant

MS: Indicates a mandatory requirement that requires substantiation to support compliance.

R: These items (criteria) will be assigned a point rating during evaluation. Please answer Available (A), Not Available (N), or In development (D)

RS: Indicates a rated item (criteria) that requires substantiation to support a claim or specification

[End of Part 3]

PART 4 - TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP PROCESS

4.1 General Information and Instructions

4.1.1 Timetable

Issue Date of RFP	29th November 2017
Deadline for Questions	15th December 2017 by 4.00 PM (EST)
Deadline for Issuing Addenda	21th December 2017 by 4.00 PM (EST)
Intent to Respond Form	5th January 2018 by 4:00 PM (EST)
Submission Date	22nd January 2018 by 12.00 PM (EST)
Interviews and product demos	21st to 23rd February 2018 (tentative dates)
References Security/privacy risk assessment Conclusion of Contract Negotiations	90 calendar days from notification of award to selected Proponent

The RFP timetable is tentative only and may be changed by uOttawa at any time.

Please note that University of Ottawa offices will be closed for the Holiday Season, from December 23, 2017 to January 2nd 2018 inclusive.

4.1.2. Intent to Respond Form (Appendix D)

The Intent to Respond Form (Appendix D) should be completed and submitted by email or facsimile to the uOttawa Contact;

Carole Dessureault
Senior Procurement Officer, Procurement Services
University of Ottawa
E-Mail: carole.dessureault@uottawa.ca
Facsimile: 613-562-5780

4.1.3 Proponents to Follow Instructions

Proponents should structure their proposals in accordance with the instructions in this RFP. Where information is requested in this RFP, any response made in a proposal should reference the applicable section numbers of this RFP where that request was made. Responses to the Evaluation Criteria questions must be in the same order as presented in the RFP.

4.1.4 Proponents to Obtain RFP through MERX

This RFP is available through the electronic tendering system MERX at; www.merx.com/.

4.1.5 Proposals in English

All proposals are to be in English only.

4.1.6 Information in RFP Only an Estimate

UOttawa and its advisors make no representation, warranty or guarantee as to the accuracy of the information contained in this RFP or issued by way of addenda. Any quantities shown or data contained in this RFP or provided by way of addenda are estimates only and are for the sole purpose of indicating to Proponents the general size of the work.

It is the Proponent's responsibility to avail itself of all the necessary information to prepare a proposal in response to this RFP.

4.1.7 Proponents Shall Bear Their Own Costs

The Proponent shall bear all costs associated with or incurred in the preparation and presentation of its proposal including, if applicable, costs incurred for interviews or demonstrations.

4.2 Communication After Issuance of RFP

4.2.1 Proponents to Review RFP

Proponents shall promptly examine all of the documents comprising this RFP and:

- (a) shall report any errors, omissions or ambiguities; and
- (b) may direct questions or seek additional information

in writing by e-mail on or before the Proponent's Deadline for Questions to the uOttawa Contact. All questions submitted by Proponents by e-mail to the uOttawa Contact shall be deemed to be received once the e-mail has entered into the uOttawa Contact's e-mail inbox. No such communications are to be directed to anyone other than the uOttawa Contact. UOttawa is under no obligation to provide additional information but may do so at its sole discretion.

It is the responsibility of the Proponent to seek clarification from the uOttawa Contact on any matter it considers to be unclear. UOttawa shall not be responsible for any misunderstanding on the part of the Proponent concerning this RFP or its process.

4.2.2 All New Information to Proponents by way of Addenda

If uOttawa, for any reason, determines that it is necessary to provide additional information relating to this RFP, such information will be communicated to all Proponents by addenda. Each addendum shall form an integral part of this RFP. Such addenda may contain important information including significant changes to this RFP. Proponents are responsible for obtaining all addenda issued by uOttawa. In the Submission Form (Appendix B), Proponents should confirm their receipt of all addenda by listing the number of each addendum in the space provided.

4.2.3 Post-Deadline Addenda and Extension of Initial Submission Date

If any addendum is issued after the Deadline for Issuing Addenda, uOttawa will extend the Initial Submission Date for a reasonable amount of time.

4.2.4 Verify, Clarify and Supplement

When evaluating responses, the University may request further information from the Proponent or third parties in order to verify, clarify or supplement the information provided in the Proponent's submission. The University may revisit and re-evaluate the Proponent's response or ranking on the basis of any such information.

4.3 Submission of Proposals

4.3.1 General

To be considered in the RFP process, a Proponent's Proposal must be received **on or before** the Proposal Submission Deadline as set out in Section 4.1.1. Proposals received after the Proposal Submission Deadline shall not be considered.

4.3.2 Proposal Submission Requirements

Proposals must be submitted electronically through MERX, the electronic tendering system used by the University. Proposals submitted in any other manner may be disqualified. Each Proponent shall submit only electronic copy of its proposal, presented in two files: their proposal including Appendix B, D, E, F-2 and others, and Appendix C Rate Bid Form and Item Details must be filed separately using MERX Electronic Bid Submission (EBS). Proposal file size cannot exceed 500MB. Each Proponent is solely responsible for the delivery of submissions in the manner and time described. The University is not responsible for computer malfunctions, uploading delays or technical difficulties using Merx EBS.

Please note that submissions will be time stamped with the time and date at the completion of the upload process not the beginning. Responses are not available to the University for viewing by the Merx EBS until after the Proposal Submission Deadline. Proposals submitted to MERX after the specified closing time will be rejected.

For assistance in using MERX, please watch the online Electronic Bid Submission tutorial:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=To0fqSccw3M>

Alternatively, Proponents may contact MERX directly at 1-800-964-MERX (6379) or visit the MERX website at www.merx.com

It is important that the Proponents obtain and retain the PIN number assigned to them by MERX in order to upload electronic proposal documents.

4.3.3 Other Proposal Considerations

In preparing its Proposal, the Proponent should adhere to the following:

- All pages should be numbered.
- The entire content of the proposal must be in fixed form, and the content of the websites, links or other external documents referred to in the proposal will not be considered to form part of the proposal unless otherwise noted.
- The Appendices provided, as appropriate, should be used for completing the Proposal.
- Completely address, on a point-by-point basis, each requirement identified in the RFP and the Proposal should be complete in all respects.

4.3.4 Withdrawal or Amendment of Proposal

At any time prior to the Submission Deadline a Proponent may withdraw or amend a submitted proposal using Merx EBS. If a Proponent decides to send a new submission it must be submitted before the Submission Deadline. The latest submission will supersede all others.

4.3.5 Proponent's Proposals Retained by University

All Proposals submitted by the Proposal Submission Deadline shall become the property of the University and will not be returned to the Proponents.

4.3.6 Amendments to RFP

Subject to Section 4.1.1 and Section 4.2.3, the University shall have the right to amend or supplement this RFP in writing prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline. No other statement, whether written or oral, shall amend this RFP. The Proponent is responsible to ensure it has received all Addenda.

4.3.7 Clarification of Proponent's Proposals

The University shall have the right at any time after the RFP Proposal Submission Deadline to seek clarification from any Proponent in respect of the Proponent's Proposal. The University shall not be obliged to seek clarification of any aspect of any Proposal.

Any clarification sought shall not be an opportunity for the Proponent to either correct errors or to change its Proposal in any substantive manner.

4.3.8 Verification of Information

The University shall have the right, at its sole discretion, to verify any Proponent's statement or claims made in the Proponent's Proposal or made subsequently in an interview, site visit, oral presentation, demonstration, or discussion by whatever means the University may deem appropriate, including contacting persons in addition to those offered as references, and to reject any Proponent statement or claim, if such statement or claim or its Proposal is patently unwarranted or is questionable.

The University may revisit and re-evaluate Proponent scores on the basis of any such information.

4.3.9 Proposal Acceptance

The lowest price Proposal or any Proposal shall not necessarily be accepted. While price is an evaluation criterion, other evaluation criteria, as set out in Section 3.3, will form a part of the evaluation process.

4.3.10 No Guarantee of Volume of Work or Exclusivity of Contract

The University makes no guarantee of the value or volume of work to be assigned to the Proponent. The Contract executed with the Proponent will not be an exclusive contract for the provision of the described Services. The University may contract with others for the same or similar Services to those described in this RFP or may obtain the same or similar Services internally.

4.3.11 No Publicity or Promotion

The proponent shall not at any time directly or indirectly communicate with the media in relation to the RFP.

In the event of a conflict or inconsistency between the hard copy and the electronic copy of the proposal, the hard copy of the proposal shall prevail.

4.4 Negotiations, Notification Debriefing and Dispute

4.4.1 Selection of Top Ranked Proponent

The top ranked Proponent, as established under Part 3 - Evaluation of Proposals, will be asked to complete a security/privacy risk assessment, compatible with Educause and Cloud Security Alliance (CSA) standards to the satisfaction of OCUL. Subsequent to a successful assessment, the top ranked Proponent will receive a written invitation to enter into direct contract negotiations with uOttawa and the selected evaluation team.

4.4.2 Timeframe for Negotiations

UOttawa and the selected evaluation team intend to conclude negotiations within ninety (90) days commencing from the date uOttawa invites the top ranked Proponent to enter negotiations. A Proponent invited to enter into direct contract negotiations should therefore be prepared to provide requested information in a timely fashion and to conduct its negotiations expeditiously.

4.4.3 Process Rules for Negotiations

Any negotiations will be subject to the process rules contained in this Part 4 Terms and Conditions of RFP Process and the Submission Form (Appendix B) and will not constitute a legally binding offer to enter into a contract on the part of uOttawa, participating OCUL members or the Proponent. Negotiations may include requests by uOttawa for supplementary information from the Proponent to verify, clarify or supplement the information provided in its proposal or confirm the conclusions reached in the evaluation and may include requests by uOttawa for improved pricing from the Proponent.

4.4.4 Terms and Conditions

The terms and conditions will be negotiated between COU and the selected Proponent. Requirements that must be included in the final agreement are shown at Appendix A.

4.4.5 Failure to Enter Into Agreement

Proponents should note that if the parties cannot execute a contract within the allotted ninety (90) days, uOttawa may invite the next ranked Proponent to enter into negotiations. In accordance with the process rules in this Part 4 and the Submission Form (Appendix B), there will be no legally binding relationship created with any Proponent prior to the execution of a written agreement. With a view to expediting contract formalization, at the midway point of the above-noted timeframe, uOttawa may elect to initiate concurrent negotiations with the next best ranked Proponent. Once the ninety (90) days lapse with a Proponent, uOttawa may discontinue further negotiations with that particular Proponent. This process shall continue until a contract is formalized or until there are no more Proponents remaining that are eligible for negotiations.

4.4.6 Notification to Other Proponents

Other Proponents that may become eligible for contract negotiations will be so notified at the commencement of the negotiation process. Proponents that are ineligible for contract negotiations will also be so notified at the commencement of the negotiation process. Once a contract is executed between uOttawa and a Proponent, the other Proponents will be notified by uOttawa in writing of the outcome of the procurement process and the award of the contract.

4.4.7 Debriefing

Proponents may request a debriefing after receipt of a notification of award. All requests must be in writing to the uOttawa Contact and must be made within sixty (60) days of notification of award. The intent of the debriefing information session is to aid the Proponent in presenting a better proposal in subsequent procurement opportunities. Any debriefing provided is not for the purpose of providing an opportunity to challenge the procurement process.

4.4.8 Dispute

In the event that a Proponent wishes to review the decision of uOttawa in respect of any material aspect of the RFP process, the Proponent shall submit a protest in writing to the Bid Protest Contact within ten (10) business days from the date of posting of a contract award notification in respect of the RFP.

Any protest in writing that is not timely received will not be considered and the Proponent will be so notified in writing.

A protest in writing shall include the following:

1. A specific identification of the provision and/or procurement procedure that is alleged to have been breached;
2. A specific description of each act alleged to have breached the procurement process;
3. A precise statement of the relevant facts;
4. An identification of the issues to be resolved;
5. The Proponent's arguments and supporting documentation; and
6. The Proponent's requested remedy.

For the purpose of a protest under this RFP, any bid protests should be submitted to the Bid Protest Contact;

Patrick Foré
Director and Chief Procurement Officer
Procurement Services
University of Ottawa
1 Nicholas St. Suite 500
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
(613) 562-5800 x6552

patrick.fore@uottawa.ca

Bid protests will be dealt with in a timely and appropriate manner.

4.5 Prohibited Communications, Confidential Information and FIPPA

4.5.1 Prohibited Proponent Communications

The Proponent shall not engage in any Conflict of Interest communications and should take note of the Conflict of Interest declaration set out in the Submission Form (Appendix B).

4.5.2 Proponent Not to Communicate With Media

A Proponent may not at any time directly or indirectly communicate with the media in relation to this RFP or any contract awarded pursuant to this RFP without first obtaining the written permission of the uOttawa Contact.

4.5.3 Trade Shows on Campus

For the entire period covered by the RFP process (the Blackout Period) – from the date the RFP is issued to the Date when the successful bid is announced - Proponents must not set up trade shows or product demonstrations at any OCUL partner institutions. Likewise, members of the selected evaluation committee will not attend any demonstrations of Proponent solutions other than the ones set up for evaluation purposes.

4.5.4 Confidential Information of uOttawa

All information provided by or obtained from uOttawa in any form in connection with this RFP either before or after the issuance of this RFP:

- (a) is the sole property of uOttawa and must be treated as confidential;
- (b) is not to be used for any purpose other than replying to this RFP and the performance of any subsequent Contract;
- (c) must not be disclosed without prior written authorization from uOttawa; and
- (d) shall be returned by the Proponents to uOttawa immediately upon the request of uOttawa.

4.5.5 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act

The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.F.31, as amended, applies to information provided to uOttawa by a Proponent. A Proponent should identify any information in its proposal or any accompanying documentation supplied in confidence for which confidentiality is to be maintained by uOttawa. The confidentiality of such information will be maintained by uOttawa, except as otherwise required by law or by order of a court or tribunal. Proponents are advised that their proposals will, as necessary, be disclosed on a confidential basis, to uOttawa advisers retained for the purpose of evaluating or participating in the evaluation of their proposals. If a Proponent has any questions about the collection and use of Personal Information pursuant to this RFP, questions are to be submitted to the uOttawa Contact in accordance with Section 4.2.1.

4.6 Procurement Process Non-Binding

4.6.1 No Contract A

The procurement process is not intended to create and shall not create a formal legally binding bidding process and shall instead be governed by the law applicable to direct commercial negotiations. For greater certainty and without limitation: (a) the RFP shall not give rise to any "Contract A" based tendering law duties or any other legal obligations arising out of any process contract or collateral contract; and (b) neither the Proponent nor uOttawa shall have the right to make any claims against the other with respect to the award of a contract, failure to award a contract or failure to honour a response to this RFP.

4.6.2 No Contract until Execution of Written Agreement

The RFP process is intended to identify prospective vendors for the purposes of negotiating potential agreements. No legal relationship or obligation regarding the procurement of any good or service shall be created between the Proponent and COU by the RFP process until the successful negotiation and execution of a written agreement for the acquisition of such goods and/or services.

4.6.3 Non-Binding Price Estimates

While the pricing information provided in responses will be non-binding prior to the execution of a written agreement, such information will be assessed during the evaluation of the responses and ranking of the Proponent. Any inaccurate, misleading or incomplete information, including withdrawn or altered pricing, could adversely impact any such evaluation, ranking or contract award.

4.6.4 Disqualification for Misrepresentation

UOttawa may disqualify the Proponent or rescind a contract subsequently entered if the Respondent's response contains misrepresentations or any other inaccurate, misleading or incomplete information.

4.6.5 References and Past Performance

UOttawa evaluation may include information provided by the Proponent's references and may also consider the Proponent's past performance on previous contracts with uOttawa or participating OCUL members.

4.6.6. Inappropriate Conduct

UOttawa may prohibit a supplier from participating in a procurement process based on past performance or based on inappropriate conduct in a prior procurement process and such inappropriate conduct shall include but not be limited to: (a) the submission of quotations containing misrepresentations or any other inaccurate, misleading or incomplete information; (b) the refusal of the supplier to honour its pricing or other commitments made in its proposal; or (c) any other conduct constituting a Conflict of Interest.

4.6.7 Cancellation

UOttawa may cancel or amend the RFP process without liability at any time.

4.7 Governing Law and Interpretation

4.7.1 Governing Law

The terms and conditions in this Part 4 Terms and Conditions of RFP Process: (a) are included for greater certainty and intended to be interpreted broadly and separately (with no particular provision intended to limit the scope of any other provision); (b) are non-exhaustive (and shall not be construed as intending to limit the pre-existing rights of the parties to engage in pre-contractual discussions in accordance with the common law governing direct commercial negotiations); and (c) are to be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the federal laws of Canada applicable therein.

4.7.2 Definitions

Unless otherwise specified in this RFP, capitalized words and phrases have the meaning set out in the Form of Agreement.

"Business Day" means any working day, Monday to Friday inclusive, but excluding statutory and other holidays, namely: New Year's Day; Good Friday; Easter Monday; Victoria Day; Canada Day; Civic Holiday; Labour Day; Thanksgiving Day; Remembrance Day; Christmas Day; Boxing Day and any other day which uOttawa has elected to be closed for business, between 9:00 am EST and 4:00 pm EST;

"Conflict of Interest" shall have the meaning ascribed to it in the Submission Form (Appendix B);

"OCUL" means the Ontario Council of University Libraries. OCUL is an active association of all Ontario universities along with affiliate's members from colleges within the province. The association promotes strategic supply, co-operative procurement and the ethical exchange of information between its members and affiliates. For the purpose of the RFP, OCUL means the members of the Ontario Council of University Libraries who are participating in the RFP (hereinafter referred to as OCUL).

"Evaluation Team" means the individuals selected to evaluate the responses received from this RFP. The evaluation team will consist of participating OCUL members.

“Ontario Universities” means any university in Ontario.

‘uOttawa and Evaluation Team’ Contact means;

Carole Dessureault
Senior Procurement Officer
Procurement Services
University of Ottawa
1 Nicholas St. Suite 500
Ottawa, Ontario, K1B 7N7
Email: carole.dessureault@uottawa.ca

“Proponent” means any third party supplier, contractor or consultant who responds to this RFP;

[End of Part 4]

APPENDIX A – FORM OF AGREEMENT (PRESENTED IN DRAFT FORM)

This master agreement, or Form of Agreement, will be signed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and the selected Proponent will also be required to develop a Customer Service Agreement (CSA) to be used in conjunction with this Form of Agreement that will be executed between the selected Proponent and COU detailing the specific technical and functional requirements between these two parties. COU accepts no liability for acts of, decisions by, and information about the participating OCUL members.

THIS AGREEMENT

Made this _____ day of _____ 2018.

- BETWEEN -

The COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

Hereinafter called "COU ",

- AND -

[Insert Selected Proponents Name**]
& Address**

Hereinafter called the "*Successful Proponent*"

WHEREAS on **November 29, 2017**, uOttawa issued a Request for Proposal 2017052-RFP posted by the University of Ottawa on behalf of the participating Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL) members and (if applicable) **Addendum(s) [**Insert Addendum Number(s)**] dated [**Insert date(s)**], repeat for each Addendum**]** for 2017052-RFP (the "RFP");

AND WHEREAS on [**enter date of Successful Proponents proposal**] the Successful Proponent submitted a bid in response to the RFP 2017052-RFP (the "Bid");

AND WHEREAS COU wishes to enter into an agreement with the Selected Proponent (for the services, as more particularly described in the RFP; the Successful Proponent's bid submission; and all negotiated terms and conditions hereinafter and forming part of this Agreement (the "Services"));

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that in consideration of the premises and other good and valuable consideration, the sufficiency whereof is acknowledged hereby by the parties, the parties hereto agree with each other as follows:

1. The Successful Proponent shall provide the services pursuant to all the terms and specifications set out in this agreement. If there should be any conflict between the provisions of this Agreement and the provisions of the RFP or the Proponent's bid submission, the provisions of this Agreement shall prevail.

2. The Agreement shall not only include the terms and conditions set out in the RFP and the Successful Proponent's bid, but shall also include all negotiated and mutually agreed upon terms and conditions set forth below,

[Insert all negotiated and agreed upon changes, additions and/or deletions**]**

The Agreement is the undertaking by both parties to perform their respective duties, responsibilities and obligations as prescribed and represents the entire agreement between the parties.

3. **Contract Term:** The term of the agreement is to be for a period of five (5) years, with an option in favour of COU to extend the agreement on the same terms and conditions for an additional term of up to 5 years. The Successful Proponent must adhere to the same price structure (in effect at the time of the extension), terms and conditions and covenants contained in the original Form of Agreement, unless otherwise agreed to by uOttawa. It is anticipated that the agreement will be executed on or around **March, 2018**.

UOttawa will not accept auto-renew contracts.

4. **Pricing:** uOttawa shall not be responsible to pay the Successful Proponent for any goods or services they provide. COU will enter into a Customer Service Agreement on behalf of OCUL with the Successful Proponent, and shall pay the Successful Proponent for all required deliverables as outlined in the Rate Bid Form, (Appendix C of the RFP) unless otherwise agreed upon.

The Successful Proponent must be registered in Ontario for the collection and remittance of HST from the sale of goods and services.

All charges must be all inclusive as per the Rate Bid Form Appendix C.

Prices are to be in Canadian funds.

The Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) shall be shown separately as extra on all invoices.

5. Insurance

The Successful Proponents must supply proof:

From the Broker, of commercial liability insurance of at least \$5 million per occurrence and COU, its Board of Governors, officers, directors, employees, students and agents named as Additional Insureds. Such provision shall apply in proportion to and to the extent of the negligent acts or omissions of the non-University party or any person or persons under the non-University parties' direct supervision and control. The liability insurance should include personal injury and property damage, non-owned automobile liability, owners and contractors' protective coverage and contractual liability coverage.

- From the Broker, of automobile liability insurance with coverage of at least \$2 million per occurrence for liability arising at law for damages caused by reason of bodily injury (including death) or damage to property by employees or sub contractors.
- Provide thirty (30) days advance written notice to uOttawa of any modification, change, or cancellation of any of the insurance coverage,

6. Legislated Safety Regulations

The successful Proponent shall be in compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario and its regulations <http://www.gov.on.ca/LAB/english/hs/ohsaguide/>.

7. Sub Contractors

Neither party may assign, transfer its right and obligations or sub contract any portion of its contract except with the written consent of the other party.

Subcontractors shall adopt all the same terms and conditions of the contract agreement, as that of the contractor or Successful Proponent.

Nothing contained in the contract agreement shall create a contractual relationship between the subcontractor and COU.

Sub-contracting to any firm or individual whose current or past corporate or other interests may, in COU's opinion, give rise to a conflict of interest in connection with this proposal will not be permitted.

The Successful Proponent shall be held as fully responsible to COU for the acts and omissions of its sub-contractors and of persons directly or indirectly employed by its sub-contractors as for the acts and omissions of persons directly employed by the Successful Proponent.

8. Governing Laws

The laws of the Province of Ontario shall govern in any dispute that may arise as a result of the Successful Proponent's submission and the subsequent contract awarded to the Successful Proponent.

This Agreement shall be construed and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario. The express rights and remedies of COU and obligations of the Proponent set out in this contract agreement are in addition to and shall not limit any other rights and remedies available to uOttawa or any other obligations of the Proponent at law or in equity. Neither acceptance of a bid nor execution of a contract will constitute approval of any activity or development contemplated in any bid that requires approval, permit or license pursuant to any federal, provincial, regional district or municipal statute, regulation or by-law. COU will not reimburse or be responsible for any additional or unforeseen costs resulting from government regulation or any other cause.

The Successful Proponent shall comply with all Federal, Provincial and Municipal laws and regulations, including but not limited to the Ontario Ministry of Labour Employment Standards Act.

Any required permits, licenses, approvals or inspections shall be the complete responsibility of the Successful Proponent.

The Successful Proponent shall comply with all applicable Occupational Health and Safety regulations and take every precaution at all times for the complete supervision and protection of all persons, owned and non-owned property, staff, students, and personnel. In an emergency affecting the safety of individuals, or of the work, or of adjoining property, the Successful Proponent, without special instruction or authorization is granted permission to act, at its own discretion, to prevent such threatened loss or injury. Should the Successful Proponent, in order to prevent threatened loss or injury, be instructed or authorized to act by uOttawa, shall so act without appeal.

9. Confidentiality

Proponents may not use COU's name or markings or those of participating OCUL member institutions for any external marketing purposes without the express written permission from COU or the participating OCUL member.

All plans, materials and electronic or digital files paid for by COU or the participating OCUL members are the property of COU or the participating OCUL members.

All parties shall treat the contract and all documents, drawings, specifications and information connected with this Form of Agreement as confidential and shall not disclose any information or documents acquired by it or its employees, agents or sub-contractors to any third parties, nor use, or copy the information, except as required to perform the Successful Proponent's obligations in fulfilling the terms of this contract.

All parties agree that OCUL maintains maintain ownership of their own data and the rights associated with the use of that data, including the ability to export it in whole or in part.

10. Force Majeure

Neither party shall be considered in default in the performance of its obligations under this Contract to the extent that the performance of any such obligation is prevented or delayed by any cause, existing or future, which is beyond the reasonable control of the affected party such as acts of God (including hurricanes, major natural disasters), regulations or orders of government authorities, fire, flood, explosion, acts of terrorism, war, disorder, civil disaster, or other emergency. If either party claims that performance of its obligations was prevented or delayed by any such cause, that party shall promptly notify the other party of that fact, and of the circumstances preventing or delaying performance. Such party so claiming a cause for delayed performance shall endeavour, to the extent reasonable, to remove the obstacles which preclude the Successful Proponent from fulfilling its obligations as stated in this contract. Re-assignment, resignation, or incapacity of assigned personnel is specifically excluded from consideration as force majeure.

11. Indemnification

The Successful Proponent shall indemnify and hold harmless COU, its directors, employees, students and agents from and against all actions, suits, claims, causes of action, demands, penalties, fines, costs and expenses including legal fees or other proceedings of any kind or nature directly or indirectly arising out of performance of the Work or Supply of Goods, including but not limited to personal injuries to anyone, breach or alleged breach of intellectual property laws, environmental non-compliance, product liability or property damage.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have duly executed this Agreement.

[Insert Successful Proponent's Name**]**

Signature of Witness

Signature of Proponent Representative

Name of Witness

Name and Title

Date:

I have authority to bind **[**Insert Successful Proponents Name**]**

THE COUNCIL OF ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES

Signature of Witness

Signature of University Representative

Name of Witness

Name and Title

Signature of

Date:

I have authority to bind **COU**

Executed under the seal shown below, with the intent that such execution take effect as a deed.



DEFINITIONS TO THE FORM OF AGREEMENT

Unless otherwise specified in the RFP, capitalized words and phrases have the meaning set out in the Form of Agreement attached as Appendix A to the RFP.

“Agreement” means a formal written legal contract for the supply of goods, equipment or services entered into at the end of the procurement process.

“Auto - renew clause” means a formal written legal clause for the supply of goods, equipment or services entered into at the end of the procurement process which the Successful Proponent invokes if no written notification is received that informs the Successful Proponent in writing that the contract has been terminated or cancelled.

“Contract” means an obligation, such as an accepted offer, between competent parties upon a legal consideration, to do or abstain from doing some act. It is essential to the creation of a contract that the parties intend that their agreement shall have legal consequences and be legally enforceable. The essential elements of a contract are an offer and an acceptance of that offer; the capacity of the parties to contract; consideration to support the contract; a mutual identity of consent or consensus ad idem; legality of purpose; and sufficient certainty of terms.

“Work” includes the whole of the works, labour, materials, required equipment, services, matters and things to be done, furnished and performed by the Successful Proponent under the agreed upon contract.

APPENDIX B – SUBMISSION FORM

To the University of Ottawa:

1. Proponent Information

(a) The full legal name of the Proponent is:

(b) Any other relevant name under which the Proponent carries on business is:

(c) The jurisdiction under which the Proponent is governed is:

(d) The name, address, telephone, facsimile number and e-mail address of the contact person for the Proponent is:

2. Acknowledgment of Non-Binding Procurement Process

The Proponent acknowledges that this RFP process will be governed by the terms and conditions of the RFP and that, among other things, such terms and conditions confirm that this procurement process does not constitute a formal legally binding bidding process and that there will be no legal relationship or obligations created until individual universities and the selected Proponent have executed a written contract.

3. Ability to Provide Deliverables

The Proponent has carefully examined the RFP documents and has a clear and comprehensive knowledge of the Deliverables required under the RFP. The Proponent represents and warrants its ability to provide the Deliverables required under the RFP in accordance with at the Rates set out in the Rate Bid Form.

4. Non-Binding Price Estimates

The Proponent has submitted its Rates in accordance with the instructions in the RFP and in the Rate Bid Form set out at Appendix C. The Proponent confirms that the pricing information provided is accurate. The Proponent acknowledges that any inaccurate, misleading or incomplete information, including withdrawn or altered pricing, could adversely impact the acceptance of its quotation or its eligibility for future work.

5. Addenda

The Proponent has read and accepted all addenda issued by uOttawa prior to the Deadline for Issuing Addenda. The onus remains on Proponents to make any necessary amendments to their proposal based on the addenda. The Proponent is requested to confirm that it has received all addenda by listing the addenda numbers or, if no addenda were issued, "None":
 _____ . Proponents who fail to complete this section will be deemed to have received all posted addenda.

6. Conflict of Interest

For the purposes of this section, the term "Conflict of Interest" means "in relation to the RFP process, the Proponent has an unfair advantage or engages in conduct, directly or indirectly, that may give it an unfair advantage, including but not limited to: (i) having or having access to confidential information of uOttawa or participating OCUL members in the preparation of its proposal that is not available to other Proponents; (ii) communicating with any person with a view to influencing preferred treatment in the RFP process (including but not limited to the lobbying of decision makers involved in the RFP process); or (iii) engaging in conduct that compromises or could be seen to compromise the integrity of the RFP process."

If the box below is left blank, the Proponent will be deemed to declare that: (1) there was no Conflict of Interest in preparing its proposal; and (2) there is no foreseeable Conflict of Interest in performing the contractual obligations contemplated in the RFP.

Otherwise, if the statement below applies, check the box.

- The Proponent declares that there is an actual or potential Conflict of Interest relating to the preparation of its proposal, and/or the Proponent foresees an actual or potential Conflict of Interest in performing the contractual obligations contemplated in the RFP.

If the Proponent declares an actual or potential Conflict of Interest by marking the box above, the Proponent must set out below details of the actual or potential Conflict of Interest:

The following individuals, as employees, advisors, or in any other capacity (a) participated in the preparation of our proposal; **AND** (b) were an employee of a university in Ontario and have ceased that employment within twelve (12) months prior to the Initial Submission Date:

Name of Individual:
Job Classification (of last position with an Ontario university):
Department (where last employed with an Ontario university):
Last Date of Employment with an Ontario university:
Name of Last Supervisor with an Ontario university:
Brief Description of Individual's Job Functions (at last position with an Ontario university):
Brief Description of Nature of Individual's Participation in Preparation of Proposal:

(Repeat above for each identified individual)

The Proponent agrees that, upon request, the Proponent shall provide uOttawa with additional information from each individual identified above in the form prescribed by uOttawa.

7. Disclosure of Information

The Proponent hereby agrees that any information provided in this proposal, even if it is identified as being supplied in confidence, may be disclosed where required by law or if required by order of a court or tribunal. The Proponent hereby consents to the disclosure, on a confidential basis, of this proposal by uOttawa to uOttawa advisers retained for the purpose of evaluating or participating in the evaluation of this proposal.

8. Proof of Insurance

By signing the Submission Form, the Proponent agrees, if selected, to provide proof of insurance coverage as required in the Form of Agreement. If selected, the Proponent must provide proof of insurance coverage in the form of a valid certificate of insurance prior to the execution of the Agreement by uOttawa.

Signature of Witness

Signature of Proponent representative

Name of Witness

Name and Title

Date:

I have authority to bind the Proponent

APPENDIX C – RATE BID FORM (TO BE FILED SEPARATELY)

PRICING

1. Proponent should provide a quote in Canadian dollars, excluding HST. If not, please specify the currency.
2. The pricing details must reflect total cost of ownership and therefore include all costs (purchase, installation, training, usage, support, maintenance etc.) to all parties concerned (University, supplier, third-party software or integration *) as they apply. (See grid below)

* if exact costs are unavailable, include approximation and reference to actual source

3. The pricing (as described above) must clearly state the cost of any component that would be shared by all participants for any common functionality.
4. The pricing must include clear definitions of the terms of the commitment (i.e. \$ initial purchase + \$ maintenance/year for a minimum of 5 years).

The project is for phased implementation of thirteen (13) institutions in first implementation /migration with implementations of additional partners on an individual basis or small groups.

Implementation for thirteen (13) Partners (initial group)

Specify your Software License Model and Pricing Formula	
---	--

Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Assumptions and additional Notes
<p>Software License:</p> <p>For full production system, including all modules and applications</p>						
<p>For a Test environment (Sandbox) for learning and testing as specified in Requirement 5.4.1</p>						
<p>Professional Services:</p>						
<p>Implementation (costs for each step in the implementation plan)</p>						
<p>Data Migration services</p>						
<p>Project Management</p>						
<p>Interfaces/Integration or interoperability as specified in Requirements 1.4 and 5.6</p>						

Testing						
Training						
Documentation						
Additional charges for Phased Installation						
Maintenance Cost and Support:						
Annual Maintenance Cost Including updates / Bug fixes						
Client Support (overall support model that meets the needs of the Requirement 6.3.1 and other options available)						
Other costs to meet the requirements of this RFP						
Grand Total						

Discounts:

Please identify any discounts where applicable.

Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Notes

Implementation for additional Partners (joining on an individual basis or small groups)

Specify your Software License Model and Pricing Formula	
---	--

Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Assumptions and additional Notes
Software License: For full production system, including all modules and applications						
For a Test environment (Sandbox) for learning and testing as specified in Requirement 5.4.1						
Professional Services: Implementation (costs for each step in the implementation plan)						
Data Migration services						
Project Management						
Interfaces/Integration or interoperability as specified in Requirements						

1.4 and 5.6						
Testing						
Training						
Documentation						
Additional charges for Phased Installation						
Maintenance Cost and Support:						
Annual Maintenance Cost Including updates / Bug fixes						
Client Support (overall support model that meets the needs of the Requirement 6.3.1 and other options available)						
Other costs to meet the requirements of this RFP						
Grand Total						

Discounts:

Please identify any discounts where applicable.

Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Notes
-------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-------

Additional information (for information purpose only)

<p>Explain your Formula for license and service costs to <u>add</u> other additional partners after the implementation of the initial group.</p>	
<p>Explain your Formula for license and service costs to <u>add</u> additional partners in the future.</p>	

Other fees

Description	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Notes
<p>Customization Professionals to do extra customization work. Per Resource please provide Position type and hourly rate (if applicable) with a description</p>						
<p>Estimated Costs for new releases/versions</p>						
<p>Extended Warranty</p>						

Support Program (if applicable)						

Provide Projected Costs for Contract Extension - Five (5) extensions of one year each

Description	Extension 6 th Year	Extension 7 th Year	Extension 8 th Year	Extension 9 th Year	Extension 10 th Year	Notes
Software license						
Maintenance						
Administrative Support						
Other costs						
Total Costs						

OPTIONS (FOR INFORMATION ONLY):

Please provide pricing for optional products or services that may be of interest to OCUL, whether individually or as a group, such as:

- Electronic course reserves (e-reserves)
- Interlibrary loan (ILL)
- Other

APPENDIX D – INTENT TO RESPOND TO RFP FORM

Please complete and e-mail this form to the uOttawa Contact at carole.dessureault@uottawa.ca, or by facsimile: 613-562-5780 **before January 5, 2018, 4.00 PM (EST).**

This is a MANDATORY REQUIREMENT.

To: Carole Dessureault	From:
Software as a Service LSP RFP University of Ottawa Procurement Services E-mail: carole.dessureault@uottawa.ca	Company Name Company Address Phone # Fax # Email

Re: Software as a Service LSP Request for Proposal (RFP)

Please indicate your intention to respond to this RFP by placing an “X” in the following box.

<input type="checkbox"/> We intend to respond to this RFP

Company Name

Contact Person

Title/Position

Signature of Contact Person

APPENDIX E – REFERENCE FORM

Each Proponent is requested to provide three references from clients who have obtained goods or services from the Proponent in the last three years similar to those requested in this RFP. Two of the references should come from clients in the University sector, preferably ones located in Canada, North America or Europe.

The supplier must demonstrate that the proposed system has the capacity to support the size and scope of the proposed consortial implementation and is scalable for growth. Demonstration of capacity and scalability must include at minimum one current academic consortial customer reference using the proposed system that is comparable in size and scope to the OCUL partnership.

Reference #1

Company Name:	
Company Address:	
Contact Name:	
Contact Telephone Number:	
Email Address:	
Date Work Undertaken:	
Nature of Assignment:	

Reference #2

Company Name:	
Company Address:	
Contact Name:	
Contact Telephone Number:	
Email Address:	
Date Work Undertaken:	
Nature of Assignment:	

Reference #3

Company Name:	
Company Address:	
Contact Name:	
Contact Telephone Number:	
Email Address:	
Date Work Undertaken:	
Nature of Assignment:	

--	--

APPENDIX F-1 – RFP PARTICULARS

THE DELIVERABLES

Requirements to support Priority Collaboration Outcomes

OCUL has a strong tradition of collaboration amongst member institutions. OCUL has shared systems through [Scholars Portal](#) (SFX, RACER ILL (VDX), ASK a Librarian); shared consortial purchasing of electronic resources; and shared custom-developed web-based applications (Journals, e-Books, Books/Accessible Content E-Portal (ACE), OCUL Usage Rights database (OUR), GeoPortal). As member institutions' requirements have aligned, the appetite for collaboration has grown. By working together to consolidate common needs, member institutions have been able to reduce the pressure on local resources, allowing them to redirect their efforts to services and resources which are unique to their particular environments. This request for proposal (RFP) builds on this momentum towards collaboration on the largest system which all members share: the Library Services Platform (LSP).

This collaboration assumes the implementation of a single system that would share a common configuration by default, but would also allow for local differences where necessary. This would allow the partners to reap the benefits of collaboration in those areas where it makes most sense to collaborate, while facilitating local differences where necessary. It would also allow for the possibility of collaboration at the outset in some areas while also enabling further collaboration in the future. We recognize that, as a newly forming partnership, some sharing will take longer to achieve for technical and policy reasons, but we need a system that provides the capacity from the outset, as well as ways to phase in as needed over time. This includes adding new partners within OCUL.

OCUL has described collaboration outcomes that are a priority for this project. The successful Proponent will provide a creative solution and services to facilitate success in achieving these outcomes.

VISION (12%)

a) Collaboration Vision

This collaboration assumes the implementation of a single system that would share a common configuration by default, but would also allow for local differences where necessary. This would allow OCUL to reap the benefits of collaboration in those areas where it makes most sense to collaborate, while facilitating local differences where necessary. It would also allow for the possibility of collaboration at the outset in some areas while also enabling further collaboration in the future. As a newly forming partnership, some sharing will take longer to achieve for technical and policy reasons, but OCUL needs a system that provides this capacity from the outset so that features can be phased in as needed over time. This includes adding new partners within OCUL.

OCUL has described collaboration outcomes that are a priority for this project:

- Shared records, cataloguing and electronic resource management
- Shared record loading (bibliographic records)
- Shared discovery

- Shared patron services and policies
- Fulfillment
- Shared analytics, acquisitions and collection management

b) Accessibility and bilingual

OCUL requires a system that is accessible and provides a public interface in choice of English or French.

c) Future Enhancements/roadmap and Supplier vision

The successful Proponent will provide a creative solution, services, and their own strategic roadmap and vision for the future to facilitate success in achieving these outcomes.

BUSINESS

a) Resource Selection, Acquisition and Management (15%)

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, OCUL 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, acquisitions, and resource management in a shared database while ensuring that local fiscal and financial requirements can be met. 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.

b) Description and Metadata (10%)

OCUL 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 in multiple languages. 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

c) Discovery, User Services and Fulfillment (15%)

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. OCUL 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. OCUL seeks a discovery solution/user interface that meets basic and advanced user experience requirements.

d) Physical Circulation (6%)

OCUL seeks a shared LSP solution that can meet the wide variety of circulation and resource sharing needs of its members.

e) Reporting and Analytics (12%)

The selected system 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. Additionally, to ensure that their patrons' needs are being met, OCUL members engage in a continual process of modifying services and workflow based on empirical data. Therefore, OCUL expects its new shared LSP to deliver statistical data and metrics in a timely, actionable manner. The system must support comprehensive, flexible and granular reporting.

Critical for OCUL's priority collaboration outcomes is the ability to use analytics in a collaborative environment to support shared collection management and acquisitions, e.g., the ability to perform collection overlap analysis to support last copy policies.

TECHNOLOGY (15%)

a) Technology

OCUL seeks a solution that will provide a highly secure and reliable cloud-based library system built on current technologies and best practices to support 24/7 access for users, meeting high standards for security privacy, performance and scalability to meet the needs of OCUL now and into the future. OCUL seeks a system that is robust, flexible, extensible, and interoperable, and that can be integrated securely into local campus environments.

- i. Cloud/security/privacy
- ii. System administration and configuration
- iii. Authentication and Authorization
- iv. Extensibility and Interoperability

CUSTOMER SERVICE, IMPLEMENTATION/ MIGRATION AND SUPPORT (15%)

a) Implementation Services and Supplier experience

LSP implementation services including data migration, project management, integration, configuration, testing, documentation and training are integral components in the execution of the chosen solution and the new consortial environment

OCUL seeks partnership with a supplier who can not only deliver a sound solution, but can also deliver high quality services, training, documentation, and support. OCUL seeks a partner with a history and culture of proactively responding to customer needs and suggestions, and supporting the activity of user groups and communities.

OCUL seeks a partner with a strong record of expertise and experience leading an implementation and migration of multiple academic libraries from a mix of different library systems to a shared consortial LSP.

- i) Implementation and Data Migration
- ii) Training
- iii) Support and Documentation

APPENDIX F-2 – RFP PARTICULARS

MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS AND RATED CRITERIA

Instructions to Bidders

Requirements 1.1 to 1.4:

- **Mandatory (pass/fail) - M:** Please answer Compliant or Not Compliant
- **Mandatory with Substantiation (pass/fail) - MS:** Please answer Compliant or Not Compliant and provide explanation to substantiate compliance.

Requirements 2.0.1 to 6.4.5:

- **Rated - R:** Please answer Available (A), Not Available (N), or In development (D)
- **Rated with Substantiation - RS:** Please answer Available (A), Not Available (N), or In development (D), and provide explanation to substantiate your response

These terms are defined as follows:

- **Available (A)** in a released version of the software at time of bid
- **Not Available (N)** in a released version of the software at time of bid
- **In Development (D)** only if it is on your one-year product development plan, otherwise use Not Available (N).

1. Mandatory Requirements

1.1 The Library Services Platform (LSP) must be cloud-hosted or software as a service (SaaS), i.e. the system and associated data must be hosted in the cloud or supplier's data centre and must be web-based for all public and staff interfaces and functions. **M**

1.2 The system must offer English and French interfaces for all public-facing functions of the system. **M**

1.3 The supplier must provide a test environment (sandbox). **M**

1.4 The supplier must demonstrate that the proposed system has the capacity to support the size and scope of the proposed consortial implementation and is scalable for growth. Demonstration of capacity and scalability must include at minimum one current academic consortial customer reference using the proposed system that is comparable in size and scope to the OCUL partnership. **MS**

Rated Requirements

2. Requirements to support Priority Collaboration Outcomes

This collaboration assumes the implementation of a single system that would share common configuration by default, but would also allow for local differences where necessary. This

flexibility will allow OCUL to reap the benefits of collaboration in those areas where it makes most sense, while facilitating local differences where necessary. It will allow for the possibility of collaboration at the outset in some areas while also enabling deeper and extended collaboration in the future. As a newly forming partnership, some collaboration will take longer to achieve for technical and policy reasons, but OCUL needs a system that provides collaboration *capacity* from the outset so that sharing features and new partners can be phased in as needed over time.

The following are high-level priority collaboration outcomes that the LSP must support:

- Shared records, cataloguing and electronic resource management
- Shared record loading (bibliographic records)
- Shared discovery
- Shared patron services and policies
- Fulfillment
- Shared analytics, acquisitions and collection management

These are described in more detail below in 2.1 through 2.6.

2.0.1 Provide an overview of your proposed solution and recommended consortial model to help OCUL achieve these broad collaboration outcomes for users and staff as described above. **RS**

2.1. Shared records, cataloguing, and electronic resource management (ERM)

The partners expend considerable time and effort managing records for non-unique materials (physical and electronic) acquired by multiple OCUL institutions. For example, an item may be purchased by 20 OCUL institutions but each institution must edit, process, and import its own bibliographic record or manually catalogue the item. Colleagues at Ottawa would likely need to ensure that the record supports French language access; other institutions may add appropriate subject headings; while still others may opt for shelf-ready records from vendors. Similarly, a package of e-resources may be licensed consortially for OCUL member institutions but management of those e-resources is still done individually.

With an LSP, OCUL anticipates sharing the effort to manage common e-resources, activation of records, ensuring access centrally, and even renewals processing and troubleshooting. In addition, shared records would allow partner institutions to redirect staff resources from duplication of effort, and refocus those resources on specialized local and special collection development and metadata creation. Shared records would also permit shared patron-driven acquisition projects and other future collaborations such as deeper shared licensing and collection management.

2.1.1 How will your proposed solution support the outcome described above? **RS**

2.1.2 Are there known requirements for standardization or shared data to achieve this outcome, and is there scope for variation at the institutional level? **RS**

2.1.3 How can this outcome be phased in over time if necessary? What are the implications for using the system during phasing? Do you have recommendations for success, e.g. whether it will work best if the collaboration is done from the start, or if it will be easy to make these changes along the way? **RS**

2.2. Shared record loading (Bibliographic records):

Shared record loading is not a new phenomenon for OCUL; OCUL has long been sharing consortially-licensed electronic records from CRKN and Scholars Portal with participating schools, who then individually manipulate the records to format them appropriately for their various library systems. With a shared LSP, the next logical step would be to load electronic bibliographic records once at the consortial level. This would save considerable time and effort across all institutions.

2.2.1 How will your proposed solution support the outcome described above? **RS**

2.2.2 Are there known requirements for standardization or shared data to achieve this outcome, and is there scope for variation at the institutional level? **RS**

2.2.3 How can this outcome be phased in over time if necessary? What are the implications for using the system during phasing? Do you have recommendations for success, e.g., whether it will work best if the collaboration is done from the start, or if it will be easy to make these changes along the way? **RS**

2.3. Shared Discovery

Currently, aside from the Tri-University Group (TUG), each partner has a separate OPAC or discovery layer as a means of providing patrons with access to owned or subscribed resources at that institution. Implementation of a single discovery layer would provide the ability to search across all the partner resources in a unified interface. Individual institutions would have a localized instance of the interface which could be configured with branding, languages, a local view of their own institutional collections, and local integrations as a means of highlighting their own resources or collections without impacting other partners. A single discovery interface would also allow users to expand the view to selected or all partners see if a resource is held at another partner library, and empower them to request that resource directly without staff intervention.

In addition, due to existing shared services within OCUL, including shared interlibrary loan service, it is highly desirable to be able to expand the discovery view to include all OCUL collections including those not yet participating in the shared LSP, and to integrate with Scholars Portal content platforms such as the [e-books](#) and [e-journals](#) platforms, [ACE](#), [GeoPortal](#), and [odesi](#).

2.3.1 How will your proposed solution support the outcome described above? **RS**

2.3.2 Are there known requirements for standardization or shared data to achieve this outcome, and is there scope for variation at the institutional level? **RS**

2.3.3 How can this outcome be phased in over time if necessary? What are the implications for using the system during phasing? Do you have recommendations for success, e.g., whether it will work best if the collaboration is done from the start, or if it will be easy to make these changes along the way? **RS**

2.4 Shared Patron Services and Policies

Individual OCUL libraries rely upon institution-specific authentication mechanisms to provide access to patron empowerment features of their ILS and access to electronic resources. In a consortial environment, a shared LSP would contain patron records for all partner institutions as a means of normalizing services and streamlining operations, while at the same time maintaining confidentiality by minimizing the personal details within these records.

While the shared LSP would maintain records for all institutions, members must maintain the ability to use local authentication mechanisms (Shibboleth, LDAP, SSO, CAS) to authenticate users and link them appropriately to their library accounts.

It is envisioned that borrowing policies will be normalized across OCUL institutions to provide consistent terms of service to all OCUL users, but this may take time to achieve, and local variation will be required until this can be implemented.

2.4.1 How will your proposed solution support the outcome described above? **RS**

2.4.2 Are there known requirements for standardization or shared data to achieve this outcome, and is there scope for variation at the institutional level? **RS**

2.4.3 How can this outcome be phased in over time if necessary? What are the implications for using the system during phasing? Do you have recommendations for success, e.g., whether it will work best if the collaboration is done from the start, or if it will be easy to make these changes along the way? **RS**

2.5. Fulfillment

Currently, OCUL uses [VDX software](#) for Interlibrary Loans and borrowing within the consortium. VDX uses Z39.50 to connect to the various catalogues at each OCUL member institution in order to present a unified search across all of OCUL resources. In a shared discovery layer an “OCUL view” which would index all resources at all OCUL institutions could be created, resulting in a seamless interface which would make discovery and direct requesting of resources easy for patrons for all OCUL libraries.

Initially, when not all OCUL libraries are participants, partner policies may take some time to be harmonized. It will be important to maintain flexibility and scope for a mix of direct request borrowing among the partners and Interlibrary Loan outside the partnership, with the goal to integrate further over time.

Among the partners, various fulfillment options should be possible including physical and electronic lending as well as on-demand digitization of requested resources.

Detailed metrics tracking requests and fulfillment can be used to facilitate collection development for frequently requested resources.

Note: the current OCUL ILL system is under review for future replacement.

2.5.1 How will your proposed solution support the outcome described above? **RS**

2.5.2 Are there known requirements for standardization or shared data to achieve this outcome, and is there scope for variation at the institutional level? **RS**

2.5.3 How can this outcome be phased in over time if necessary? What are the implications for using the system during phasing? Do you have recommendations for success, e.g., whether it will work best if the collaboration is done from the start, or if it will be easy to make these changes along the way? **RS**

2.6. Shared Analytics, Acquisitions and Collection Management

OCUL institutions pull statistics from a myriad of systems and sources – journal vendors, link resolvers, library catalogues – all of which require manual manipulation in order to perform in-depth analysis for even the simplest collection management exercises, such as weeding or tracking patron requests. An LSP should consolidate these analytics into a single platform, considerably reducing the time and complexity associated with assessment activities. However, what is more critical for the partners is the importance of analytics in a collaborative environment, e.g., the ability to perform collection overlap analysis to support OCUL last copy policies and the potential for shared collection management and acquisitions.

2.6.1 How will your proposed solution support the outcome described above? **RS**

2.6.2 Are there known requirements for standardization or shared data to achieve this outcome, and is there scope for variation at the institutional level? **RS**

2.6.3 How can this outcome be phased in over time if necessary? What are the implications for using the system during phasing? Do you have recommendations for success, e.g., whether it will work best if the collaboration is done from the start, or if it will be easy to make these changes along the way? **RS**

3. General Requirements

3.1 Accessibility

3.1.1 Describe how the system's staff and public user interfaces are compliant with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). The system should conform to WCAG 2.0 Level AA accessibility requirements and the [Integrated Accessibility Standards, O. Reg. 191/11 \(IASR\)](#) established under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005, S.O. 2005, c. 11 (AODA). **RS**

3.1.2 Describe how the system's staff workflows are streamlined and take into account ergonomics; for example the reduction of repetitive tasks, the reduction of switching between screens and hardware, the provision of shortcut keys, etc. **RS**

3.2 Multilingual Support

3.2.1 The system should allow the public interface labels to be edited by staff, as means of improving/correcting the default language labels or images that are used to display text. Describe the process for editing. **RS**

3.2.2 The system's staff interface should offer similar multilingual capabilities with choice of English or French. Describe the multilingual capabilities of the staff interface. **RS**

4. Functional Requirements

4.1 Resource Selection, Acquisition and 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 effective way possible. In such an environment, OCUL 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 shared LSP, member libraries are seeking to eliminate silos that currently exist within different library services units, providing 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.

Unified Resource Management and knowledge base

4.1.1 Describe how the system provides for the unified management of all resources owned or licensed by the client, as well as non-licensed materials managed by the institution, such as open access resources, materials digitized by the Internet Archive, etc. In general, describe support for the selection and acquisition of physical and electronic resources, metadata management across all resource types, and fulfillment across all resource types **RS**

4.1.2 Describe how the system provides an embedded knowledge base that is fully integrated into the selection, acquisition, metadata management and fulfillment processes for electronic resources. **RS**

4.1.3 Describe the knowledge base and how it provides a unified index with broad coverage of academic content (including but not limited to journals, books, and databases) and high quality metadata. In the event that the knowledge base does not already contain the resources owned or licensed by the client, describe the functionality to allow the client to add new resources **RS**

4.1.4 Describe how the system provides an efficient method of making changes to the knowledge base where errors are detected. **RS**

Selection and Acquisition

4.1.5 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 **RS**

4.1.6 Not all OCUL libraries start their fiscal year on the same date. Describe the solution's ability to function across multiple/variable fiscal years, including spending out of different fiscal years at the same time and the ability to track purchases split over fiscal years **RS**

4.1.7 Describe the solution's support for fiscal-year closing functionality. Include information on: format and length of retention of fiscal close records; how encumbrances are transferred; reports/notifications available to assist required processing of open orders prior to fiscal close **RS**

4.1.8 Describe how the system supports acquisition and management of datasets such as GIS data. **RS**

4.1.9 Describe how the the system supports shared and coordinated acquisitions (electronic and physical), including: shared purchasing, shared vendor records **RS**

4.1.10 Some license agreements require libraries to not reveal pricing to other institutions. Describe what safeguards are in place in a shared system to keep pricing information private if required? **RS**

4.1.11 Describe the product's ability to facilitate fiscal and acquisitions management across multiple, independent accounting units, including scoping and fund management, grouping and reporting **RS**

4.1.12 Describe how the system supports coordinated selection and deselection using shared tools. **RS**

4.1.13 Describe the solution's support for automated reminders, ticklers or alerts, including but not limited to workflow tracking, renewal reminders, consortial payments, order records, claims, system outages, bindings, etc. **RS**

4.1.14 The system should support a hierarchical fund structure that provides the ability to group and report on funds. **R**

4.1.15 Describe the solution's ability to customize/handle multiple institutional and consortial fund structures. Is it possible to designate unique fund codes for each library within the consortium? Describe how deeply nested allocated and reporting funds can be within the fund structure. **RS**

4.1.16 For each fund, the system should provide links to orders and invoices committed or paid against that fund. **R**

4.1.17 Describe how the system provides real time updates of financial data, that is immediately encumbering funds when an order is loaded and when an invoice is entered the funds move from encumbered to spent. **RS**

4.1.18 The system should allow de-activating funds without acquisition history disappearing. Describe how the system maintains acquisition history when funds are de-activated. **RS**

4.1.19 Describe how the system supports multiple currencies including the ability to set institutional local exchange rates, ability to specify a preferred source for rate information, ability to edit payments to reflect the amount charged. **RS**

4.1.20 Describe how the system handles taxes for material purchasing, including ability to pay taxes at different tax rates based on where the item is received/housed/paid and tracking tax exempt status **RS**

4.1.21 Describe the solution's options for electronic ordering, invoicing and claiming. What services can the solution interoperate with (e.g. YBP, EBSCO, OCLC, Elsevier etc.)? How flexible is the interface for configuration with non-standard vendors? **RS**

4.1.22 The system should provide links from a purchase order to other related information such as invoice, vendor, bibliographic record and license record **R**

4.1.23 Describe how linkages between records are used to reflect changes across the system, for example a change to a vendor name in the vendor record rolls out across records linked to the vendor record. **RS**

4.1.24 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 **RS**

4.1.25 The system should support the ability to automatically create a system invoice from a purchase order. **R**

4.1.26 Describe how the system supports embedded order data workflows, for example business data ingested to the system to add MARC data and create PO and invoice. **RS**

4.1.27 Describe the solution's process for paying items invoiced together but received separately **RS**

4.1.28 Describe the solution's ability to handle institutional and consortial Demand Driven Acquisition integration for both print and electronic workflows **RS**

4.1.29 Describe any facility for collections decision making, for example, vendor recommendations (notifications) for purchase consideration, 'pre-order'/wishlist order records, acquisition-related comments, consortial offers, etc. **RS**

4.1.30 The system should allow for the receipt of single and multi-part resources for all material types. **R**

4.1.31 Describe how the system provides options for item creation upon receipt, including bulk record loads **RS**.

4.1.32 The system should notify staff when an ordered item has not arrived after a predefined interval, and allow for claiming. **R**

4.1.33 Describe the solution's ability to integrate with campus financial systems, including, but not limited to, export and import of financial transactions such as payment of invoices by various methods. Provide information about existing integration options with financial systems, which ones and the level of integration. (Refer to Appendix G for information about participating universities and systems in use.) **RS**

4.1.34 Describe the solution's ability to track patron requests for purchase of materials from the initial request through to receipt and notification. **RS**

4.1.35 Describe the solution's support for storing and sharing vendor data and how it is used in different functional areas **RS**

4.1.36 Describe the solution's support for allowing staff to add custom flags/fields/notes to order records. **RS**

Serials Management

4.1.37 Describe the check-in process for both print and electronic journal issues, including the following formats: microfilm, microfiche, and digital microfilm. **RS**

4.1.38 Describe the solution's integration of serials claiming across workflows including staff notifications. **RS**

4.1.39 Describe how continuing resources are encumbered in the system. **RS**

Electronic Resource Management

4.1.40 The system should include hosting functionality, whereby owned or licensed items may be uploaded to the system to provide access at both the institution and consortial levels, for example when a vendor does not have a platform but simply sends a PDF file of the resource to the institution. **R**

4.1.41 Describe how library staff can access vendor-related passwords, SUSHI parameters, contact information and other administrative information needed to manage electronic resources. **RS**

4.1.42 Describe the workflow management available for electronic resources. This should include reminders for renewal or the ability to track new resources from trials through to access setup. **RS**

4.1.43 Describe the solution's OpenURL resolver or other method for linking directly to resources, and how it integrates with the knowledge base and other electronic resources functionality of the system **RS**

4.1.44 Describe how the knowledge base provides access to platform information, for example, lists of titles on a given platform. Does the system track other platform features e.g., accessibility support, mobile support, citation manager compatibility, etc.? **RS**

4.1.45 Describe the solution's ability to output electronic resource records in customizable ways for integration into library research guides etc. **RS**

4.1.46 Describe how electronic resources are managed locally for collections specific to an institution. Include the procedure for managing collections held by multiple institutions but not the entire consortium. **RS**

4.1.47 Describe how the system enables consortial activation / deactivation of shared electronic resources, and allows flexibility for local variation.. **RS**

4.1.48 Describe provisions for creating custom collections and resources within the knowledge base, for example if a negotiated package is different from the vendor's standard offering, and how individual institutions add resources to the existing knowledge base. How is this custom information displayed to other libraries? **RS**

4.1.49 What is the frequency of updates to the e-resources knowledge base? **RS**

4.1.50 Describe how the system ensures the accuracy of electronic links and allows for them to be corrected. **RS**

4.1.51 Describe how patrons may report e-resource access issues to the library and how the library reports access issues to you. **RS**

4.1.52 Describe any controlled vocabulary applied to resources in the knowledge base including subject headings and status such as peer-reviewed. What is the source of these vocabularies? **RS**

Licensing

4.1.53 Describe the solution's support for the management of license agreements for local and consortial purchases. How can licenses and related documents be 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? **RS**

4.1.54 Describe how the system assists institutions in tracking licensing permissions for various user types, for example, single user, multiple user, alumni etc. Describe any interoperability with the discovery system for providing access. **RS**

4.1.55 Describe how more than one license can be linked to a single resource and how a single license can be linked to multiple resources **RS**

4.2 Description and Metadata

OCUL seeks a solution which supports users in finding, identifying, selecting, and obtaining 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.

Supported Formats, Languages and Scripts; Record Structure

4.2.1 The system should support MARC21 record formats for bibliographic, authority and holdings data and workflows. The system should index and display all MARC21 fields, including information based on indicators and subfields used to support multiple subject heading schemes in bibliographic records. **R**

4.2.2 Identify all metadata schemas that are supported and describe how they are implemented. Describe any included conversion tools or utilities that will translate from one metadata schema to another. Including, but not limited to, MARC21, MARCXML, RDA, Encoded Archival Description; Metadata Object Description Schema, and Dublin Core. **RS**

4.2.3 Describe the strategy, action plan and timeline for implementing new metadata standards and formats as they emerge. Describe your support for Linked Data ingestion, processing and publishing. **RS**

4.2.4 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. **RS**

4.2.5 Describe the solution's support for bidirectional cataloging and support for bidirectional script display (e.g. Arabic, Hebrew). **RS**

4.2.6 Explain the record structure in terms of how various types of records relate to each other, for example bibliographic, authorities, holdings, items etc. **RS**

Record loads and manipulation

4.2.7 Describe how the system supports import and export (with no loss of data) in all customary formats, including the ability to update or overlay existing records. Describe how the system supports scheduled imports and exports **RS**

4.2.8 Describe the solution's ability to protect specific MARC fields and/or subfields in overlay and loading of bibliographic data. What safeguards are in place to prevent improper overlays (e.g. material type mismatches, character encoding differences, match on invalid bibliographic utility number, etc.)? Does the solution allow manual update, overlay, and/or batch overlay of bibliographic data on records with attached items checked out? **RS**

4.2.9 Describe how the solution handles creation of items in batch when the record already exists. Example: If multiple libraries purchase the same collection of items at different times, can the later-purchasing libraries load their items automatically onto the already-existing records rather than having to manually add items to the records? **RS**

4.2.10 For those titles not included in the central knowledge base, describe how the system provides capability for consortially-purchased records to be loaded once while allowing varying institutional entitlements to be managed. **RS**

4.2.11 Describe the consortium or local institution's ability to manipulate data during record loads (e.g., adding fields, deleting fields, etc.). Describe how the system allows institutions to create local rules or load tables for use when loading records. Describe how institutions can share these rules with other partners. **RS**

4.2.12 The system should support the ability to define multiple match points, and to prioritize them, for matching and overlaying records during import. Describe the process or algorithm for record matching. **RS**

4.2.13 The system should support the use of scripts during record load for metadata clean-up on load. **R**

4.2.14 The system should provide the ability to harvest records from an external source (for example, an institutional repository) using standards protocols (OAI-PMH). The system must have the ability to perform crosswalks to accommodate ingest of standards not supported out of the box. **R**

Creating and Editing Bibliographic Records (Cataloguing)

4.2.15 Describe how the system defines master records that can be shared within the consortium. Describe how the system allows institutions to create derivative records from the master record, for example to allow for French and English cataloguing records for the same resource. Describe how the system synchronizes changes made to the master record with any derivatives while protecting local changes. **RS**

4.2.16 Describe how the system allows institutions in a consortial environment to provide local fields (e.g. 9XX), notes and copy/item-specific information (e.g., donor, provenance, special printing, binding, damage, genre headings, etc.). How is this local information protected from being overwritten or changed by other institutions? Include information on derivative records from the master record. Include information on local MARC21 fields (e.g. 590) and use of \$5 (institution to which the field applies). **RS**

4.2.17 Describe how staff search, find and select records to edit or import in the system. **RS**

4.2.18 Describe the solution's indexing functionality, including how often the system indexes recent entries and when recent entries are searchable and browsable in staff and discovery tools. **RS**

4.2.19 Describe the solution's ability to refine a search to an individual institution's metadata records on the staff user interface, or expand to the consortial level. Can the scope filter to the sub- institution location level? **RS**

4.2.20 Describe how the solution enables editing of individual and multiple bibliographic records, including the ability to alter any element, field, subfield, or value. Does the solution

have the ability to restrict editing permissions by role? Can individual fields be protected independently of the full record? **RS**

4.2.21 Describe how the solution notifies staff users if creating a duplicate record, including how staff can accept a duplicate if valid, for example English and French records for the same resource. **RS**

4.2.22 The system should support the creation and storing of record templates for use in creating and editing records, including the specification of default fields, elements and values stored in these templates. **R**

4.2.23 The system should support the validation of the appropriate use of elements, fields, subfields and the validation of values in data elements (e.g., fixed field values in MARC fixed fields, validation of controlled vocabularies in the appropriate variable length fields). **R**

4.2.24 Describe the solution's ability to edit or create new material types based on the metadata records but for display for the end user in discovery. **RS**

4.2.25 Describe how the solution supports plugins or linkages to widely-used controlled vocabularies (e.g. LCSH, RVM, Gettys, etc.) and other metadata utilities (e.g. RDAToolkit, Cataloger's Desktop, etc.). Describe if any relevant cataloguing rules, policies or specifications are visible directly in the metadata editor. **RS**

4.2.26 Describe how the solution provides support for linked data for fields such as relationship designators from RDA (composer, editor, etc.) to allow for these fields to be language-neutral, for example use of \$0 with URIs. **RS**

4.2.27 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, CODOC, local classification schema, National Library of Medicine Subject Headings, RVM, and LC Genre Form Terms. **RS**

Holdings and Items Maintenance

4.2.28 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. Describe how institutional holdings are tracked related to master and derivative bibliographic records. **RS**

4.2.29 The system should support the creation of holdings and item records for physical resources, including temporary records (for example, for interlibrary loans). List the fields available/defined in the item records. **RS**

4.2.30 Describe the solution's support for defining multiple holdings locations and sub-locations, both consortially and locally. **RS**

4.2.31 Describe the solution's support for linked records. For example, items bound together with separate bibliographic records but shared holdings records. **RS**

4.2.32 Many institutions share their holdings with OCLC so that they are available to users in WorldCat. Describe how local and consortial holdings can be set in WorldCat for all library resources. **RS**

4.2.33 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. Also describe the process for customizing multiple label layouts and printer options. **RS**

Authority Control

4.2.34 Describe how the solution supports current standards for authority data and allows all relevant bibliographic fields to be authority controlled without intervention by the solution vendor. Describe how the system identifies which fields can be controlled. Describe how authority updates can be done centrally and any update tracking capabilities. Include information on staff user roles related to authority control. **RS**

4.2.35 Describe the default authority control workflows and the ability to customize these workflows. **RS**

4.2.36 The system should support more than one global authority file for subjects, for example LCSH and Répertoire de vedettes-matière (RVM). Describe how the solution manages the import and export of authority data with one or more authority vendors. **RS**

4.2.37 Describe how the solution supports automated authority control, or the automatic flipping of name and subject headings from unauthorized to authorized forms as shown in name and subject authority records. How does the solution handle near (not exact) matches of controlled headings? Describe how authority data is managed and shared by the solution for individual libraries and at the consortial level. **RS**

4.2.38 The system should flag authority changes that require staff intervention. **R**

4.2.39 Describe how the system accommodates local information in authority files, for example, the addition of classification numbers for literary authors or series. **RS**

4.2.40 The system should allow the the creation or loading of local authority files and records for subjects (including genre terms) and names. **R**

4.2.41 Describe how the solution supports unique persistent identifiers in authority records and linked data applications. **RS**

4.2.42 Describe how the system includes authority records or linkages from linked data sources such as VIAF. **RS**

4.2.43 Describe how the solution manages and displays cross-references for staff users. Describe how locally created cross-references will be preserved and displayed. **RS**

Bulk Processing and Quality Control

4.2.44 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.

RS

4.2.45 Describe how sets of records are identified for global data change and what safeguards are in place before changes are made **RS**

4.2.46 Describe the solution's standard database maintenance reports including, but not limited to, headings, data duplication, etc. **RS**

4.2.47 Describe how the solution supports bulk deletion processes at the local and consortial levels. Describe how deletions occur at the bibliographic, holdings and items levels. **RS**

4.2.48 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? **RS**

4.2.49 Describe how the solution provides the option of export and import of all types of records for manipulation by third-party applications, e.g. MARC Edit. **RS**

4.2.50 Describe the solution's ability to allow individual institutions to suppress their own items from the OPAC without affecting other institutions' items on the same bibliographic record. **RS**

4.2.51 Describe how the solution tracks changes made to individual records. Is there a version history available, and does the solution support reinstating a previous version of a record? Does the solution have the ability to revert batches of record updates? **RS**

4.2.52 Describe the ability of the solution to search, store, and perform operations with external Excel, CSV, or text data lists. **RS**

4.2.53 Describe how the solution allows full regular-expression Find and Replace changes in library data. **RS**

4.2.54 Describe how the solution handles moving an item while retaining data such as user statistics, last date used, and date created. **RS**

4.2.55 Describe how the solution allows records to be merged. **RS**

4.3 Discovery

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. OCLC 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. OCUL 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

4.3.1 The system should provide a single unified discovery solution, customizable for institutional branding, that enables discovery of resources owned, managed or licensed by the client, regardless of format or resource type, in local or consortial collections and beyond. Users should be able to refine searches to institutional and sub-institutional levels. Describe how your solution provides this. **RS**

4.3.2 The system should offer English and French interfaces for all functions of the system involving direct end user interaction (search, search refinement, patron functions, patron notices, contextual help). The user should be able to switch between languages without losing current context. All functions, including indexing, should be fully functional independent of the language of the interface or the document. The system should display in unilingual English to those who select the English interface option and unilingual French to those who select the French interface option. ("Interface" does not include metadata.) Describe how your solution provides this. **RS**

4.3.3 Describe how the system optimizes discoverability in web indexes such as Google (search engine optimization) **RS**

4.3.4 Describe how your solution will provide library users with an intuitive interface that searches disparate resource silos (e.g., local and/or digital collections, vendor-supplied electronic resources, manuscripts and archival material, LibGuides 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. **RS**

4.3.5 Describe how the system complies with NISO's [Open Discovery Initiative](#). **RS**

4.3.6 Describe how the system offers flexibility in the configuration and presentation of search scopes **RS**

4.3.7 The system should, upon authentication, be able to direct the user to the appropriate view for their home institution. **R**

4.3.8 Describe how the system seamlessly integrates data from the knowledge base and local sources. **RS**

4.3.9 The system should update the discovery interface in real-time upon activation or deactivation of packages in the knowledge base. **R**

4.3.10 Describe how your solution will enable users to discover the availability, status, and location of specific resources. **RS**

4.3.1 Describe how the system allows customization of the interface by institutions, for example the suppression of specific elements, the addition of custom page elements, the capacity to create customized labels based on information in the records etc. Describe how individual institutions may configure and customize their own versions ("view") of the discovery layer without impacting other institutions. **RS**

4.3.12 Describe how the interface allows for the inclusion of javascript as well as other standard web protocols. **RS**

4.3.13 Describe how the solution facilitates both known-item searches and open-ended searches (including authors, titles, subject terms, or other identifying information) using an intuitive and efficient interface with relevant results. **RS**

4.3.14 Describe how the solution facilitates expert searching features for researchers who require more control in formulating search statements and handling results **RS**

4.3.15 List the out of the box standard indexed fields (e.g. author, title subject, series, etc.) **RS**

4.3.16 Describe how the institution may configure the data elements to be used for search and display. **RS**

4.3.17 Describe how the system allows the creation of additional indexes without intervention from the vendor, for example journal title, local fields, map scale, etc. **RS**

4.3.18 Describe any pre-filters a user can select before beginning the search **RS**

4.3.19 List the out of the box standard browse (left-anchored) indexed fields (e.g. author, title, subject, series, call number, ISBN/ISSN, publisher, notes etc.) **RS**

4.3.20 Describe how your solution enables users to refine and sort their search results, for example expanding/limiting a search to a wider/narrower scope. Include a comprehensive list of all refinement and sorting criteria supported by the system. **RS**

4.3.21 Sorting and refining by date is a common user task. Describe how your system indexes and normalizes date information to support these tasks. Describe any limitations to date sorting and refinement. **RS**

4.3.22 Describe how the discovery interface makes use of authority data such as see and see also references to get the user to the most relevant results. **RS**

4.3.23 Describe any additional search aids for users such as did you mean, search suggestions, autocomplete, spelling corrections or any other ways to help a user identify and use alternate search strategies **RS**

4.3.24 Describe how the system presents fulfillment options and the level of customization to display the institution's preferred fulfillment options for a particular resource. **RS**

4.3.25 Describe how the system brings together print and electronic records for the same work **RS**

4.3.26 Describe how the system handles getting the user to the full text of an electronic resource **RS**

4.3.27 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? **RS**

4.3.28 The system should be able to display the relevant terms of use for licensed electronic resources. Describe how the system allows individual institutions to update and display locally negotiated terms of use/rights at the package and title level **RS**

4.3.29 Describe the level of article and other vendor-supplied record indexing in the discovery system and how this integrates with local records. Include any customizations that can be done to weight results (e.g. put the book before book review, articles higher than newspaper articles, local holdings over consortia holdings etc.) **RS**

4.3.30 Describe how the discovery interface supports multiple subject heading and classification schemes. Which ones are supported out of the box? **RS**

4.3.31 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? **RS**

4.3.32 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? List the export formats. **RS**

4.3.33 Describe the help available to users from within your solution's interface. How will you respond to users who contact you directly for assistance? How customizable is the help information by institution? **RS**

4.3.34 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. **RS**

4.3.35 Describe how your solution may allow institutions to link to more information, such as LibGuides, Finding Aids etc. **RS**

2.3.36 Documents in the central index with unspecified or unknown language should be assigned to a neutral category during indexing, rather than a default language such as English. **R**

4.3.37 Users should have the ability to see the source record in the front end "staff view" e.g. MARC, Dublin Core XML etc. **R**

4.3.38 Describe how the system brings new additions to the database to the user's attention within the search results. **RS**

4.3.39 Describe how the system allows users to discover library resources outside of the discovery layer. For example, through indexing in Google, through external search boxes in other library systems etc. **RS**

4.3.40 Describe how the information in the search results can be used to populate forms for ILL requests, report a problem etc. **RS**

4.3.41 With the current proliferation of browsers and devices, the user experience should be platform agnostic. Describe how your end-user interface will meet those user needs regardless of mode of access. **RS**

4.4 Physical Circulation

OCUL seeks a shared LSP solution that can meet the wide variety of circulation and resource sharing needs of its members.

General

4.4.1 Describe how circulation policies and practices are defined and configured in the system. **RS**

4.4.2 Describe how borrowing parameters are defined and configured in the system. **RS**

4.4.3 Describe how the system offers a high degree of flexibility in the definition of circulation parameters: from a common set for the entire consortium, to specific rules for

individual institutions and libraries/locations. Describe how the solution provides for the coexistence of consortial lending rules and local lending rules. **RS**

4.4.4 Describe how the solution integrates lending rules with library hours and closures, including how the system incorporates a 24 hour clock. **RS**

4.4.5 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. **RS**

Patron Management

4.4.6 Describe how the system can contain user accounts for patrons of all member institutions as a means of normalizing services and streamlining operations ("one library card"). **RS**

4.4.7 Describe the elements and structure of a patron record in the solution and how patron records are created. **RS**

4.4.8 The system should allow authorized staff to create, modify, merge and delete patron records, individually and via bulk load from external systems. Describe the ability to update patron records both individually and globally. **RS**

4.4.9 Describe how the system allows automatic and manual blocks of patrons from borrowing and other services both at the consortial and local level. **RS**

Fines and Fees

4.4.10 Describe how the system supports the assessment of fines and fees. **RS**

4.4.11 The system should allow full and partial payment of fines and fees in accordance with or integrated with campus payment methods. **R**

4.4.13 The system should be able to integrate with the campus financial system in a way that fine payment in the circulation system is reflected in real-time in the student's record in the finance system. **R**

4.4.14 Describe how the system supports transfer of delinquent patron account data to university registrar's systems. **RS**

4.4.15 The system should allow an authorized staff to manually add or waive a fine or fee. **R**

4.4.16 The system should allow for the return of lost items and refund of amounts paid. **R**

4.4.17 Describe how the system supports automatic reordering for a lost item that has been paid by a patron. **RS**

4.4.18 The system should provide an audit trail for patron billing: links between patrons and items billed must be retained for a configurable period. **R**

4.4.19 The system should support the ability to print receipts. The system should also support sending receipts by email or SMS. **R**

4.4.20 The system should provide print templates that can be modified as needed, e.g. for receipts, holds wrappers etc. **R**

4.4.21 The system should allow authorized staff to view the details of a fine incurred, including the item which incurred the fine, the time period involved and any payments made, cancelled or reduced. Details of the due date, date and time paid should be kept in the history of fines paid. **R**

Requests

4.4.22 Describe the hold/holdshelf management capabilities of the solution. **RS**

4.4.23 The system should support holds and recalls of currently checked out and in library materials. **RS**

4.4.24 Describe the mechanisms for tracking items in transit for delivery from and to their home libraries **RS**

4.4.25 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 **RS**

4.4.26 The system should support holds and staff workflows for processing holds for on-order and in-process materials. **R**

4.4.27 The system should allow staff to configure the eligibility criteria for holds and/or recalls using a variety of parameters (location, item type, reserve status, patron type, etc.). **R**

4.4.28 Describe the ability to track use of non-circulating materials that patrons would be allowed to “check out” for in-library use only. **RS**

4.4.29 Describe how the solution enables batch check-in and check-out **RS**

Other Circulation Functions.

4.4.30 The system should support self-checkout using standard protocols (e.g. SIP2). **R**

4.4.31 The system should be able to incorporate barcode as well as other identifiers (e.g. RFID tag identifiers) for charging out physical items. **R**

4.4.32 The system should communicate with third-party ILL systems using standard protocols such as ISO10161, NCIP or APIs. **R**

4.4.33 The system should support offline circulation transactions when the system is unavailable. If a site loses access to the shared solution, what kinds of activities (e.g. checkout, check-in) would the site be able to continue? Describe the process involved in

resynchronizing the local site with the shared solution after the issue has been resolved.
RS

4.4.34 Describe how the system provides advance booking and scheduling of equipment, materials and rooms, including items of varying loan periods that may require unique loan and requesting rules. **RS**

4.4.35 The system should support anonymization of completed transactions, including loans, fines and fees, reservations, etc. This function should be configurable. **R**

4.4.36 Describe how the system supports smart fulfillment using a set of business rules making use of library user data and item data to determine the most effective fulfillment method. All options to fulfil a request to be presented to a library user via the discovery interface. **RS**

4.4.37 Describe how the system supports the definition of a holds ratio for items, for example to initiate automated push of information when a certain number of holds/recalls are on an item, so the item can be considered for reserve or ordering multiple copies.
RS

4.5 User Services and Fulfillment

4.5.1 Describe the information and interactions available to the user related to their library account and account status. 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. **RS**

4.5.2 Describe how the system supports seamless user-driven workflows initiated from discovery, including (but not limited to) requests/holds, renewals, bookings, digitization on demand, patron driven acquisition, at both the consortial and local levels. **RS**

4.5.3 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. Describe same workflow but for a consortial item. **RS**

4.5.4 The system should support automated sending of notifications (overdue items, hold pickups, checkout receipts, etc.) to all types of patrons by email and alternate contact formats if email account discontinued or disabled. The scheduling of the notifications should be configurable. **R**

4.5.5 The system should send notifications by SMS if selected by the user. **R**

4.5.6 Describe how the system allows staff users to customize, design and brand print and electronic notifications (templates) **RS**

4.5.7 Describe how the system supports digitization on demand and its workflow, allowing users to place digitization requests via the discovery interface. Describe how requests are fulfilled. **RS**

4.5.8 Describe the patron self-service features of the system, including holds, bookings, renewals, notice preferences, self-updates of patron information, etc. **RS**

4.6 Reporting and Analytics

The selected system 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 partner. Therefore the system must support comprehensive, flexible and granular reporting.

Critical for OCUL's priority collaboration outcomes is the ability to use analytics in a collaborative environment to support shared collection management and acquisitions, e.g., the ability to perform collection overlap analysis to support last copy policies.

4.6.1 Describe how the system supports the ability to generate, export and use robust, granular and customizable reports and analytics capabilities for all of the client's data hosted on the vendor's servers (including but not limited to holdings, funds expenditures, usage, patron and staff activity, licenses, discovery) at a consortial as well as an institutional level. Describe any abilities to drill through from the reports to individual titles. **RS**

4.6.2 The system should provide the ability to perform collection overlap analysis and spending overlap analysis. **R**

4.6.3 The system should support the ability to run reports on large volumes of data with no negative effect on system performance. **R**

4.6.4 Describe the array of variables for which reporting tools can gather statistics. For all reporting, updating, importing and exporting functions, describe the level of staff expertise needed to perform the operation. **RS**

4.6.5 Describe how institutions can export or access their data for analysis in local tools **RS**

4.6.6 The system's reporting tool should support configurable, role-based report generation and views such that users will only be able to view reports and data according to his/her role. **R**

4.6.7 The system should provide customizable tools to visualize report data, such as a user-defined dashboard, charts, graphs, etc. **R**

4.6.8 Describe how the system's reporting tool analyzes historical data and provides trends analysis for a variety of variables including usage and expenditure. **RS**

4.6.9 The system should allow reports to be run on a schedule, and notify staff when complete. Describe the output options for viewing and manipulating data and reports. **RS**

Collections and ERM

1.10.2 Describe how the system complies with industry usage reporting standards including SUSHI and COUNTER for electronic resource usage. **RS**

4.6.10 The system should allow the loading of externally generated usage data, including but not limited to past usage data collected via other usage reporting tools. **R**

4.6.11 Describe how the system supports ongoing evaluation and decision-making related to existing electronic resource subscriptions at the institution and consortial level by enabling reports to be generated on the following: **RS**

- usage, including simultaneous users
- cost, including cost per use
- price increases
- licensing and changes in license
- changes in the titles list of a package
- trend analysis reports
- titles overlap analysis
- titles not being used
- titles due for renewal

4.6.12 The system should provide usage reports by platform and publisher. **R**

4.6.13 The system should automatically calculate cost per usage **R**

4.6.14 Describe the solution's ability to ingest and manage usage statistics for electronic resources at the local and consortial level. Describe the ability to combine any usage statistics with other data such as acquisitions data, vendor data, link resolution etc. Can these statistics be reported out at both levels in a flexible customizable format? **RS**

4.6.15 Describe ERM reporting functionality, including whether field selection and output criteria can be customized locally. **RS**

4.6.16 Describe ERM exporting functionality, including whether field selection and output criteria can be customized locally. (For example, exporting of all active titles). **RS**

4.6.17 The system should support export and import of data in KBART format and import of ONIX base license data. **R**

4.6.18. Assigned members of staff should be able to run reports on roles, attributes and permissions to support actively managing system security **R**

4.6.19 Describe the reporting related to multiple currencies. How can reports show the base currency, the exchange rate and the currency conversion.

5 Technology Requirements

OCUL seeks a solution that will provide a highly secure and reliable cloud-based library system built on current technologies and best practices to support 24/7 access for users, meeting high standards for security privacy, performance and scalability to meet the needs

of OCUL now and into the future. OCUL seeks a system that is robust, flexible, extensible, and interoperable, and that can be integrated securely into local campus environments.

5.1 Cloud Solution

5.1.1 The system should be available as a multi-tenant cloud-hosted solution, leveraging the benefits of multi-tenancy and cloud technologies, and ensuring that all users are on the same and latest stable release of the system at all times. Describe the architecture of the system and how the model provides the benefits of cloud hosting and rapid development and deployment, and how it adds value for a consortial implementation such as this one.

RS

5.1.2 The system should be fully web-based, providing full access to data and functionality without the installation of client software other than a web browser. **R**

5.1.3 Describe where the data centre and servers are located for the proposed system and whether data hosted for the Ontario partners will be stored on servers located in Canada.

RS

5.2 Performance

5.2.1 The system should provide a high level of availability of 99.9x% that meets cloud computing industry standards, with system status information constantly accessible including when system is down. Describe your uptime record. **RS**

5.2.2 The system should perform with a response rate similar to any other networked desktop application. **R**

5.2.3 Describe how you assess and monitor performance and ensure high availability, and how this is communicated to customers. **RS**

5.3 Security/Privacy

5.3.1 Describe what steps you have taken to secure the cloud environment, including information about specialist staff dedicated to this. **RS**

5.3.2 Describe how the solution assures data protection and provides high security capabilities including secure https transmission for all pages with 256 bit encryption and security certificates provided by the supplier. **RS**

5.3.3 Describe how the system maintains personal information securely. Two-factor authentication should be available, but optional at the user level. **RS**

5.3.4 Describe how the system maintains privacy and security of patron information, and options to store and use minimal patron information in the system. Are there options such as tokenization, using a single identifier for patrons, e.g. barcodes, and not requiring personal information, such as address and phone numbers, to be stored? **RS**

5.3.5 The vendor should have procedures to immediately report any investigative request for records connected to the library and will not share online behaviour data with any third party without permission. **R**

5.4 System Administration and Configuration

Testing

5.4.1 There should be a ‘test environment’ or ‘sandbox’ where patches, new features, etc. can be fully tested before deploying the changes to the production system, and that can be used for training and development purposes. The test system should be a full mirror of the production system, and available during implementation and for ongoing operations. The test environment should have the following characteristics as a minimum:

- Pointed to a recent (within the last 3 days) copy of production data.
- Fully functional, including security and authorization
- Full access to APIs
- Fully documented list of bug fixes and features added to release candidate along with testing notes from the QA process.

Describe the available test environment. **RS**

Configuration, customization & audit trail

5.4.2 The system should come with a set of “Out of the Box” definitions and configurations so that the library need only make minimal changes to the standard settings. **R**

5.4.3 The system should allow authorized staff to configure various aspects of the system (e.g. fulfillment policies, patron groups, import profiles) without vendor intervention. Provide an overview of what types of things can be configured -- what is the difference between configurations, customizations, and things that would require professional services? **RS**

5.4.4 The system should allow customization of workflows in order to accommodate specific library needs without vendor intervention. **R**

5.4.5 The system should record and display ‘created by’, ‘last updated by’, and (where applicable) ‘modified by’ information for records. In addition, any changes to records should be recorded with type of change, date, time, and the user making the change. **R**

5.4.6 Describe any alerts you have for customers related to processing queues in a multi-tenant environment and any visibility into queued jobs/processes. **RS**

5.4.7 Describe your change control procedures and how the users receive prior notification of scheduled downtime for maintenance or upgrades. Is there any client input into timing of upgrades to ensure adequate integration testing or scheduled downtime? **RS**

5.4.8 Describe your record for typical amount of downtime, both unscheduled and scheduled, for the last three years and how you schedule it to cause least disruption to customers. **RS**

5.4.9 Describe what processes, tools and standards you have in place for source code control (i.e. Subversion, etc.) to manage the code and deployment to the various environments (Test, Production) **RS**

5.5 Authentication and Authorization

5.5.1 Describe how the system integrates with standard authentication systems at the local level, including LDAP- based, CAS, or Shibboleth authentication systems. List the authentication systems with which the system can integrate. **RS**

5.5.2 Some OCUL patrons may have identities with multiple institutions. How would users with multiple affiliations be supported in the system, with respect to user identification/authentication and permissions on their accounts? **RS**

5.5.3 In order to address confidentiality and to facilitate user access across institutions, describe the minimum information needed to identify a user in the system. **RS**

5.5.4 Describe how the system supports robust and granular role, attribute and permission-based authorization for users and staff at both the institutional and consortial level. **RS**

5.5.5 The system's authorization system should be flexible enough to accommodate distributed workflows, so that staff at different institutions can work together on activities such as shared cataloguing, collection management, ERM, analytics etc. **R**

5.5.6 Describe your roles and permissioning workflow including profiles for common roles. **RS**

5.5.7 The system must be able to restrict visibility and user access to resources (via discovery system) based on institutional affiliation. **R**

5.6. Extensibility and Interoperability

5.6.1 The system should enable the partners to develop extensions to the core software (e.g. through use of APIs), as well as integrate the software with local institutional and third party systems. The supplier should provide detailed documentation. Provide a description and sample documentation (documentation may be provided via a link). **RS**

5.6.2 Describe how and to what extent the system will interoperate with third-party institutional systems, including the following list (respond to each). Include a description of the role of open APIs, standards-based system interfaces, and use of particular standards and protocols.

See Appendix G for information about systems currently in use at each institution. **RS**

- A. Interlibrary loan
- B. Cataloguing utilities
- C. Institutional or other digital repository software/platforms
- D. Self-check-out
- E. Electronic course reserves (e-reserves)

- F. Learning management
- G. Finance
- H. Student information
- I. Human resources
- J. Procurement
- K. Campus authentication
- L. Online payment/e-commerce systems used for payment of fines (PCI-DSS compliant?)
- M. Reporting tools
- N. OCUL Usage Rights (OUR) database

5.6.3 Describe APIs and/or other interfaces or tools available to support integration and interoperability .Describe any restrictions or limitations on use of these APIs and tools. Describe how the supplier provides direct access to client-supplied data via APIs. Describe the API architecture, e.g. RESTful design and use of other industry standards such as JSON, XML, etc. **RS**

5.6.4 The supplier should provide support for sharing of customer-developed extensions. Describe the support (including documentation and online forums) provided for APIs and web services that enable the client to integrate and extend system functionality. Describe how upgrades may impact customer-developed extensions. **RS**

5.6.5 Comment on use of the system with custom hardware and software, for example hand-held scanners, RFID pads, wayfinding software etc. **RS**

5.6.6 Describe the availability of a payment gateway compatible with institutional financial systems and that will support an ecommerce system that allows for the real-time payment of fines **RS**

5.6.7 The system should allow specified fields to be protected from being overwritten by updates from external systems. **R**

6.Customer Service and support

6.1 Implementation and Data migration

Please note: The project is for a phased implementation and migration of thirteen (13) institutions as soon as practicable, and future implementation of additional partners on an individual basis or in small groups. At point of selection, three (3) additional libraries will consider whether to join and in which cohort. In future other OCUL libraries may wish to join in to the shared LSP. Information about the partners is provided in Appendix G.

6.1.1 Provide a proposed implementation / migration plan to migrate the separate partner library systems into an integrated consortial system with shared records and collaborative functionalities as described in this RFP. Provide a description of the following elements in the migration plan: **RS**

- a. Timeline and grouping of libraries
- b. Roles and responsibility
- c. Collecting information from campus units

- d. Data review
- e. Invalid data and data that didn't migrate
- f. Project management
- g. Downtime

6.1.2 Describe the recommended or typical migration timeline for an organization such as OCUL. Include recommendations regarding the grouping of libraries and the number of stages. **RS**

6.1.3 Describe the respective roles and responsibilities of OCUL staff, staff at individual libraries, and the supplier, during the implementation process. **RS**

6.1.4 Describe information required from non-library institutional campus units, such as campus IT departments regarding LDAP, Shibboleth, SSO and identity management. Provide examples of forms used to collect this information where available. **RS**

6.1.5 Describe project management services offered to accomplish a project of this scale. **RS**

6.1.6 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. **RS**

6.1.7 Describe your experience migrating data from the library systems in use by OCUL as listed in Appendix G. 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. Describe whether notes associated with records (e.g. orders, patrons, etc.) are migrated. **RS**

6.1.8 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. **RS**

6.1.9 Describe the ability during migration to merge similar bibliographic records without loss of locally-created data. Describe the ability to preserve important local data during migration, such as local fields and notes essential to maintain for special collections. **RS**

6.1.10 Describe the ability to exclude records from merging, for example preventing a French record merging with an English record for the same resource, or preventing records with similar metadata but in different formats from merging (e.g. electronic and print, VHS and DVD) **RS**

6.1.11 Describe the ability during migration to handle and resolve duplicate barcodes. **RS**

6.1.12 Describe the ERM migration process. List the systems from which the company have successfully migrated ERM information. What data formats does the solution support? What formats are not supported? Describe the roles and responsibilities of the supplier, and any third-party vendors, and the customer in the ERM migration process. Can data be migrated into the ERM from systems that currently do not have an ERM? **RS**

6.1.13 Provide recommendations on any data that you are not able to migrate, or would recommend against migrating and why (e.g. acquisitions? serials patterns?), and how the transition can be accomplished most efficiently. **RS**

6.1.14 Describe the data review period and whether OCUL (or individual institutions) would have access to all or only a portion of their data to review before the migration. What reporting would be available during this time to help determine if there were issues with data pre- migration? **RS**

6.1.15 Describe how invalid data (data found in the current system that will need to be cleaned or corrected before migration) is handled. Can this be done in transition? Will libraries receive reports of data found to have problems during migration? If not, when and who would be responsible? **RS**

6.1.16 Describe contingency practices for records which unintentionally do not migrate. **RS**

6.1.17 Describe the process to add new institutions or groups of institutions in future. **RS**

6.1.18 Describe the support offered by the company in the year following migration to address potential lingering migration issues. Will OCUL be assigned a specific post-migration support group or liaison? **RS**

6.1.19 Describe services available to advise the partners on strategy to develop new optimal unified discovery, fulfilment, and resource management for users and for staff, and to advise on where it is necessary or recommended to agree on standards and policies, and where there is flexibility for local variation. **RS**

6.1.20 Describe the availability of the test environment (“sandbox”) for testing and development purposes, both prior to and during implementation, and for ongoing operations. **RS**

6.2 Training

6.2.1 Describe the proposed training plan for this project, including options for on-site and web-based training, strategies for geographically distributed partners, and considering the phased implementation and potential for future addition of more partners. **RS**

6.2.2 Describe options for ongoing training. **RS**

6.2.3 Describe how you provide updated training or training materials for new features. **RS**

6.3 Support

The partners seek a long-term partner committed to customer service and open to customer feedback.

6.3.1 The supplier should demonstrate ten (10) years in the specific field with recent and similar projects enjoying excellent references.

6.3.2 The vendor should provide support during regular business hours Eastern and Central Standard time (EST and CST), with 24/7 emergency support. Describe overall support model and options, including availability, escalation procedures, emergency support procedures, customer involvement in product enhancement process, user groups, etc. Provide a copy of your standard support agreement and indicate any implications for how it works in a consortial environment (e.g. who can contact support etc.) **RS**

6.3.3 Describe aspects of the support model that are specific for the consortium. E.g. Can any staff member submit support cases directly, or is there a limit on designated representatives? **RS**

6.3.4 Describe your proposed incident response procedures, addressing specifically how you will manage unscheduled outages, interrupted services, or a customer's report of degradation in service. Include specifics as to how you will investigate and resolve service level interruptions. **RS**

6.3.5 Describe how emergency support is available 24x7. List any web sites used for support purposes. **RS**

6.3.6 The supplier should provide high quality, current, detailed documentation for all functions. Describe how you provide access to customer resources including:

- a. An extensive knowledge base with information to assist customers in troubleshooting issues and FAQs.
- b. Access to product information such as release notes, user group presentations, etc.
- c. Access to all software documentation.
- d. Information regarding upgrades and patches. **RS**

6.3.7 Describe how customers are made aware of software updates and how the supplier ensures customers have sufficient lead time to prepare and train staff or communicate to users as needed. **RS**

6.4 Product Development and Enhancement Plans

6.4.1 Provide a 1 year and 3-year roadmap for system development, highlighting development that you would see as having particular interest for OCUL. **RS**

6.4.2 The partner libraries have a history of actively participating in vendor-specific 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 and influence development priorities. Include information about annual conferences and attendance, and regional interest groups (particularly in Canada and North America). **RS**

6.4.3 Describe how users will be notified of upcoming or new product features including minimum notification times for non-security updates. **RS**

6.4.4 Describe how requests for enhancements are handled: **RS**

- a. How priorities are set for enhancements
- b. What role a user group has in this process

6.4.5 Comment on opportunities for the partnership to work with you as a partner to develop functionalities that are important to the partner institutions and may require development. **RS**

APPENDIX G – PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES

The 13 members for the first phase implementation are:

- Algoma University
- Brock University
- Carleton University
- University of Guelph
- Lakehead University
- UOIT
- University of Ottawa
- Queen's University
- Trent University
- University of Waterloo
- Western University
- Wilfrid Laurier University
- York University

The 3 additional members who may join in the near term are:

- Nipissing University
- OCAD University
- University of Windsor

Other OCUL members may join in future. A full list of OCUL member institutions can be seen at:

http://www.OCUL.ca/about_member.html

Detailed Profiles on Participating Libraries are provided below (see Appendix G- an Excel document which is also provided.)

Appendix G Participating Universities. The libraries are listed in two groups: the 13 members for the first phase implementation, and the 3 additi

- Name of the Institution	Number of your 2016/17 student FTE:	Number of your 2016/17 library staff FTE:	Number of your 2016/17 faculty/staff FTE:	Total number of bibliographic records (all formats)	Number of print titles (monographs and serials) in your collection:
Thirteen members of initial implementation:					
York University	52418	172	3692	3378958	3052685
Wilfrid Laurier University	18903	61	574	1210573	1157163
Queen's University	22,461	110	8593	3001047	2033224
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	11065 (Durham) + 10000(UOIT)	780 (Durham) + 1550 31.5 (UOIT)	1,369,286	63,997	
Carleton University	26807	130	2843	2347457	1005898 + 31189 = 1,037,087
University of Ottawa	37,907	150	3,132	3771512	2,395,841

- Name of the Institution	Number of your 2016/17 student FTE:	Number of your 2016/17 library staff FTE:	Number of your 2016/17 faculty/staff FTE:	Total number of bibliographic records (all formats)	Number of print titles (monographs and serials) in your collection:
Western University	36901 (from OCUL site)	150 1396 (from Western Facts)	32.5 approx 1,000	4331066	2,640,907 (includes all 3 storage locations)
Lakehead University	7974	32.5 approx 1,000	717873 approx 348000		
Brock University	17215.5	50.1	1464	800190	417448
University of Waterloo	34325	136 1233 faculty; 2377 staff	2302043		1709318
University of Guelph	21,813 (UG FTEs: 19,512, GR FTEs: 2,301)	120	2,790	2298106	1,941,095
Trent University	7753	25.66 FTE	223 (2013-14 CUJO FTE)	856398	390,000
Algoma University	1205.35	5	136	136824	136124

- Name of the Institution Additional members who may join in the near term:	Number of your 2016/17 student FTE:	Number of your 2016/17 library staff FTE:	Number of your 2016/17 faculty/staff FTE:	Total number of bibliographic records (all formats)	Number of print titles (monographs and serials) in your collection:
Nipissing University	Nipissing: 4542.81; Canadore: approx 3000	24.284	Nipissing 556; Canadore	396423	164016
OCAD University	3915	19.7	0	72957	69627
University of Windsor	19,729	71	1,270	1997222	957213

Appendix G Participating members who may join in the near term.

- Name of the Institution	Number of electronic titles (monographs and serials) in your collection:	I.L.S and vendor	Discovery layer and vendor	Link resolver / knowledge base and vendor	ILL platform (excluding RACER)
Thirteen members of initi:					
York University Wilfrid Laurier University	1378722 408929	Symphony - SIRSI Dynix Voyager (ExLibris)	VUFind – open source PRIMO (ExLibris)	SFX – Ex Libris SFX (ExLibris)	OCLC WorldShare ILL platform.
Queen's University University of Ontario Institute of Technology	970973 1141116	Voyager, Intota (ERM) (Ex Libris, ProQuest /Ex Libris) Sirsi Symphony, Sirsi Dynix	Summon (ProQuest/Ex Libris) Summon, ProQuest	360 Link /Intota (ProQuest/Ex Libris) Intota version 1, ProQuest	Relais
Carleton University	1032183 + 114,118 = 1,146,301	Innovative Interfaces Inc. (Sierra)	Summon (Proquest)	360Link + 360Core (Proquest)	RACER
University of Ottawa	1,328,775	Millennium / III	Primo / Ex Libris	SFX / Ex Libris	

- Name of the Institution	Number of electronic titles (monographs and serials) in your collection:	ILS and vendor	Discovery layer and vendor	Link resolver / knowledge base and vendor	ILL platform (excluding RACER)
Western University	469,301	Sierra/Innovative	Summon/ProQuest	360 Link/ ProQuest	
Lakehead University	299000	Voyager/Ex Libris	EDS/ Ebsco	SFX/ExLibris	none
Brock University	382742	Millenium. Innovative.	EBSCO EDS	SFX	OCLC Worldshare
University of Waterloo	90988	Voyager (Ex Libris)	Primo (Ex Libris)	SFX (Ex Libris)	none
University of Guelph	In catalogue: 698,865; e-Journal Titles from SFX: 108,658	Voyager by Ex libris	Primo by Ex Libris	SFX by Ex Libris	Relais express (NOW), article exchange and worldshare (Soon).
Trent University	510,000	SIRSI-Dynix Symphony	N/A	SFX for A-Z Serials List	
Algoma University	44264 journal titles managed through SFX. Approximately 700 monographs managed through EBSCO Discovery Service	Evergreen ILS (BC Libraries Coop/ CONIFER)	EBSCO Discovery Service	SFX (Ex Libris/OCUL)	OCLC Worldshare

- Name of the Institution Additional members who	Number of electronic titles (monographs and serials) in your collection:	ILS and vendor	Discovery layer and vendor	Link resolver / knowledge base and vendor	ILL platform (excluding RACER)
Nipissing University	199447	Symphony 3.5.2.1.1076/Sirsi/Dynix	N/A	SFX - Ex Libris via Scholar's Portal	Relais Express
OCAD University	310951	Horizon / Sirsi Dynix	Summon / Proquest	360 Link /Proquest	
University of Windsor	1040009	ALMA (Proquest/Ex Libris)	PRIMO (Proquest/Ex Libris)	n.a. (is part of ALMA)	use Worldshare when necessary

Appendix G Participating

- Name of the Institution	Cataloguing utility and vendor	IR or other digital repository software/platform(s)	Self-check system	E-reserves software and vendor	Learning Management System and vendor
Thirteen members of initi.					
York University	Validator - Library Systems & Services; RDA Toolkit - RDA Steering Committee; Cataloguer's Desktop and Classification Web - Library of Congress; OCLC.	Dspace, Isandora	Bibliotheca hybrid self check 1000 - Minitex	N/A	Moodle - open source
Wfrid Laurier University	n/a	bepress	3M (Bibliotheca)	ARES (Alias)	D2L (Google)
Queen's University	OCLC, 360 Updates (ProQuest/Ex Libris); YBP records, miscellaneous record loads (e.g. Oxford Online, Films on Demand etc.)	Dspace, AtOM (Archives)	MeeScan, Sentry	Ares - Alias Systems	Brightspace -- D2L
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	OCLC	Dspace	n/a	n/a	Blackboard and D2L
Carleton University	OCLC Cataloging and Metadata Subscription	Some custom, moving to Isandora / Artudis	3M	ARES	Moodle
University of Ottawa	OCLC	Dspace	Sentry	n/a	D2L/Brightspace

- Name of the Institution	Cataloguing utility and vendor	IR or other digital repository software/platform(s)	Self-check system	E-reserves software and vendor	Learning Management System and vendor
Western University	Backstage/Backstage Library works (for authority records); Coultts/ProQuest (cataloguing); Amilivre (cat); Cassalini (cat)	bepress/Digital Commons	3M bibliotheca	Ares/Atlas; Sierra/Innovative	Sakai/Aperoo Foundation (open source)
Lakehead University	various Z39.50 - Bookwhere, OCLC Z39.50	DSpace	none	none	D2L
Brock University	YBP and Coultt's	D Space	Sentry Technology	Ares Atlas	Sakai
University of Waterloo	OCLC (bibliographic); Peter Ward (authorities)	DSpace; Islandora	Bibliotheca 500	Ares (Atlas)	Desire2Learn (D2L)
University of Guelph	Ybp, Gobi, send us shelf-ready materials (processed, stamped, and cataloguing/Marc record (print and e) as specified	DSpace, Dataverse, Ormeka	3M	ARIES	Brightspace (Desire2Learn)
Trent University	OCLC	Islandora	N/A	N/A	Blackboard
Algoma University	Evergreen ILS cataloguing module (freely available copy cataloguing)	Drupal + PostgreSQL for archival holdings (archives.algomau.ca)	None	None	Moodle (Moodle)

- Name of the Institution Additional members who	Cataloguing utility and vendor	IR or other digital repository software/platform(s)	Self-check system	E-reserves software and vendor	Learning Management System and vendor
Nipissing University	MARC Edit	N/A	N/A	N/A	Nipissing: Blackboard; Canadore: D2L
OCAD University	Connexion / OCLC + Bookwhere /Webclarity	EPrints / USouthampton	N/A	APES / Atlas Systems	Canvas / Instructure
University of Windsor	OCLC	BePress	n.a.	n.a.	Blackboard

Appendix G Participating

- Name of the Institution	Financial system	Student information system	HR system	Procurement system
Thirteen members of Initi				
York University	Peoplesoft - Oracle	Custom-built system that is primarily composed of Java applications with an Oracle database	Peoplesoft - Oracle	Sm@rtBuy, Peard US Bank software system, and Peoplesoft Exp
Wilfrid Laurier University	Millenium	Banner	Banner	SciQuest
Queen's University	PeopleSoft	PeopleSoft	PeopleSoft	SciQuest (now Jaggaer)
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	Banner	Banner	Banner	Banner
Carleton University	Banner Finance	Banner Student Information System & others	Banner HR	SciQuest EShop
University of Ottawa	Banner	Peoplesoft	Banner	SciQuest

- Name of the Institution	Financial system	Student information system	HR system	Procurement system
Western University	PeopleSoft	PeopleSoft	PeopleSoft	SciQuest
Lakehead University	Colleague (Datatel) / Ellucian	Colleague/Ellucian	don't know	don't know
Brock University	Workday	working towards implementing Workday	homegrown. Working on Workday implementation	Workday
University of Waterloo	Unit 4	Peoplesoft	Workday (in implementation)	Unit 4
University of Guelph	Oracle e-business Finance Suite	Ellucian Colleague	SumTotal Payroll + plus custom applications built in Oracle APEX	Oracle e-business Finance Suite
Trent University	Colleague by Ellucian	Colleague by Ellucian	Ceridian -- HR system is in transition	Colleague by Ellucian
Algoma University	SAGE 300	OASIS (developed by university ITS department)	SAGE - HRMS	None

- Name of the Institution Additional members who	Financial system	Student Information system	HR system	Procurement system
Nipissing University	Nipissing: WebAdvisor/Ellucian; Canadore: ? unknown	Nipissing: WebAdvisor/Ellucian; Canadore: Banner	Nipissing: WebAdvisor	unknown; not sure what is meant by this question; not sure what information is required
OCAD University	Colleague / Ellucian	Colleague /Ellucian	Colleague / Ellucian	Colleague / Ellucian
University of Windsor	Oracle Cloud Financial (goes live Feb. 2018)	Oracle Cloud Peoplesoft Campus Solutions (goes live Feb. 2018)	VIP (DLGL)	Oracle Cloud Financial (goes live Feb. 2018)