

Request For Information
on a
Statewide Integrated Library System
for the
Libraries of Alaska
(SLED 2)

Background	3
Vision	4
Vendor Response	5
Current Environment	6
Alaska Libraries Overview	6
Public Libraries	6
Consortium Libraries	7
Technology Scenarios Being Considered	9
Components of the Future Statewide ILS	9
Shared Patron Database (Resource Sharing)	9
Authentication and Authorization	10
Traditional Union Catalog.....	11
Federated Searching and/or Full Portal	11
Unmediated Patron Self Servicing of Requests	12
Modules	12
Additional Vendor Information	14
Costs of your solution	14
Specific Questions	14
Appendix A - Authentication and Authorization Usage Scenarios	16
Scenario 1: Internal Password Storage	16
Scenario 2: Multiple Libraries Using the same Authentication Service.....	16
Scenario 3: Multiple Libraries Using Different Authentication Services	17
Scenario 4: Multiple Patron Profiles with Multiple Authentication Sources available	17
Scenario 5: Multiple Profiles Authorizing Specific Actions	17

Background

Libraries in Alaska have a tradition of sharing library resources and coordinating their efforts to deliver information services to all residents of the state. Currently there is the statewide SLED website and several regional library systems. The regional system operating in Juneau serves the Alaska State Library, Juneau Public Library, the SeaAlaska Heritage Institute, and the Egan Library at the University of Alaska Southeast. There are two cooperative systems in Fairbanks. One is used by the North Star Borough Public Library and the Fairbanks School District. The other system operated by UAF is used by the Tuzzy (Barrow) Consortium Library, the Bethel-Kuskokwim Consortium Library, Chukchi Consortium Library, the AKP Museum, the Biosciences, Geophysical Institute and Rasmuson libraries at UAF, and in the libraries at Anaktuvuk Pass, Atkasuk, the Cold Climate Housing Research Center, Kaktovik, FITC (Kodiak), Nome, Nuiqsut, Point Hope, Point Lay, Selawik, and the Seward Marine Center. The regional system in Southcentral Alaska supports the Anchorage Public Library and its branch libraries in Chugiak-Eagle River, Girdwood, Mountain View, Muldoon, and the Samson-Diamond Branch, the Anchorage Museum, ARLIS, the Valdez Consortium Library, the Alzheimer's Resource Library, the Valdez Consortium Library, UAA Career Services Center, the Small Business Development Center and the UAA libraries located in Anchorage, Mat-Su, Kodiak, Homer, and Soldotna. Preliminary planning is underway to add the additional public libraries located in the Mat-Su area to the Southcentral system.

By using today's information technologies, it is possible to deliver more library services to more individuals by expanding access to library collections, electronic publications and to digital images of historical documents. Because of limited budgets and vast geographical distances, Alaska's libraries must exploit information technologies to reach greater efficiencies in delivering their services and in promoting the use of their collections. Such efficiencies can be realized by consolidating the existing regional systems into a single statewide library system. A statewide library system should hold down the annual costs for individual libraries since each participant would pay only a percentage of the total cost, based on their local usage of the system. Now is an appropriate time to plan for a statewide system since the need to upgrade the existing regional systems is on the horizon. Even the most recent of the regional systems were purchased under a statewide contract in 2002. In the foreseeable future, all libraries will be faced with the reality of replacing their existing hardware and upgrading their system software.

This request is part of our research process in preparing to request funding in the next 4 months. We anticipate requesting funding during the next legislative session to take advantage of stimulus funding.

Vision

To provide Alaska residents with 21st century learning experience encouraging knowledge creation and dissemination, cultural enrichment, and intellectual and technical innovation. To enhance and increase service to the Alaska community.

To provide Alaska residents with equal and coherent access to collections in all formats, as well as digital information resources and information services accessible through the Internet, on computers in library facilities, cultural and educational institutions, workplaces, and homes.

To provide Alaska residents with the best possible access to the print, electronic, and other resources of Alaska libraries, cultural and educational institutions in order to give taxpayers the best possible return on their investment while simultaneously maximizing institutions' funding and purchasing power.

Vendor Response

The Alaska Statewide ILS Committee intends to collect information from vendors about statewide ILS and resource sharing product, general functionality, and preliminary costs for planning purposes. Actual procurement of any products will be through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Vendors may choose to respond to certain parts of this RFI or all parts of the RFI. *Vendors are invited to provide information on any of the components individually or in combination. Please include an explanation of how your component or combination of components will integrate with the comprehensive content of the request for information. If you are doing a combination of your components and external components please indicate what partnerships you have or will be using, and how they will interrelate.*

Responding vendors should file their responses with the parties below on or before 06/29/2009 in the following formats.

One electronic copy to James Huesmann, jlhuesmann@alaska.edu.

One printed copy should be sent to each of the following individuals:

James Huesmann
University of Alaska Fairbanks
Elmer E. Rasmuson Library
310 Tanana Drive, Suite 431
P.O. Box 756800,
Fairbanks, AK 99775-6800

Steve Rollins
University of Alaska Anchorage
Consortium Library
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Linda Thibodeau, Director
Alaska State Library
PO Box 110571
333 Willoughby Ave.
Juneau, AK 99811-0571

Current Environment

The current environment for libraries in Alaska is very diverse. Some of the obstacles we face include vast geographic distances, high latency connection, low bandwidth, various levels of technical expertise, multiple organizational goals, and multiple integrated libraries systems currently in use. The following subsection is overview of the some of the most recent data from libraries across our state. The ability to accommodate all the libraries on the same system is a must.

Alaska Libraries Overview

(The below is not an exhaustive list...)

Public Libraries

Public libraries that are members of a consortium are not included. Statistics are not available for schools libraries except when included with a consortium.

Central libraries	70
Branches	7
Bookmobiles	1
FY2007 Registered borrowers	117,691
FY2007 Volumes Total	1,215,630
FY2007 Circulation Total	1,256,958

Current ILS

Sirsi	6
Follett	18
Alexandria	3
Resource Mate	3
Winnebago	3
Library Concepts	2
Library Pro	2
Library Soft	1
MC2 Systems	1
NSC	1
Spectrum	1
None or N/A	29

Consortium Libraries

Southwest and Southcentral Consortiums

Anchorage Joint Libraries

Central Libraries	4
	[university, public, 2 special]
Branches	11
	[6 public, 5 univ]
FY2008 Registered borrowers	211,000
FY2008 Volumes Total	1,770,000
FY2008 Annual Circulation	1,720,000
Current ILS	Sirsi Symphony 3.2.1J

Matanuska-Susitna Library Network

Central Libraries	38
	[7 public, 31 schools]
FY2008 Registered borrowers	43,991
FY2008 Volumes Total	685,971
FY2008 Circulation Total	842,132
Current ILS	Sirsi Unicorn GL3.0

North and Interior Consortiums

Fairbanks North Star Borough

Central libraries	1
	[public]
Branches	11
	[1 public, 10 schools]
Bookmobile	1
FY2008 Registered borrowers	88,175
FY2008 Volumes Total	561,047
FY2008 Circulation Total	700,814
Current ILS version	Sirsi Unicorn GL3.1J

University of Alaska Fairbanks Library Network

Central libraries	8
	[3 university, 3 consortium, 2 special]
FY2008 Registered borrowers	13,224
FY2008 Volumes Total	1,448,122
FY2008 Circulation Total	693,079
Current ILS	Sirsi Symphony 3.2.1

Southeast Consortiums

Capital City Libraries [Juneau]

Statewide ILS RFI

Central libraries	4
	[state, university, public, special]
Branches	4
	[2 public, 2 state]
FY2008 Registered borrowers	27,454
FY2008 Volumes Total	508,194
FY2008 Circulation Total	208,560
Current ILS	Sirsi Unicorn GL3.1C

First City Libraries [Ketchikan]

Central libraries	9
	[1 university, 1 public, 7 schools]
FY2008 Registered borrowers	10,933
FY2008 Volumes Total	160,000
FY2008 Circulation Total	243,000
Current ILS version	Sirsi Unicorn GL3.1J

Sitka Libraries Network

Central libraries	6
	[1 public, 5 schools]
FY2008 Registered borrowers	10,933
FY2008 Volumes Total	160,000
FY2008 Circulation Total	243,000
Current ILS version	Sirsi Unicorn GL3.1J

Technology Scenarios Being Considered

We envision 3 main redundant data centers that will be located in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau. This should address potential issues that would disrupt network access between major points. If you would be offering a vendor hosted solution, please address how you would overcome any network separations within the state. We will consider commercial, open source and a hybrid of the two.

Components of the Future Statewide ILS

Please respond to how you will be able to provide a solution for any or all of these sections. If you are only able to fulfill pieces, please indicate your capability of fulfilling this piece while another vendor maybe providing another component. Please be specific and detailed about how you intend to insure interoperability.

Shared Patron Database (Resource Sharing)

A shared patron database would have components that would be accessible to all libraries that are members of the system. Each library would have the capability of seeing only the local patrons of their library or group through a default view, but would also be able to expand their search to see patrons in the statewide database. The system should have capability of blocking selected information from libraries outside of the user's home library if required by the local institution to preserve patron privacy.

The concept also includes the ability to have multiple profiles or groups associated with each patron. For example a patron might be a member of a public library group as well as a school library. The capability of having multiple profiles associated to the same patron implies the need for a hierarchy that determines which patron profile is most appropriate to use. In the general case of a patron, the most liberal borrowing policy associated to that library and individual combination should be used. In the more complicated case of a user account that has a patron, staff, and administrator profile, the profile with the least amount of privileges should be used. Patron profiles or groups should be capable of facilitating access to licensed resources.

The system should have the capability to disassociate patrons from their checkout history. The patron should be able to choose if they want to keep or remove their history.

The system should have the capability of loading records in batch from an external system from the school or local government agency, i.e. Banner.

Authentication and Authorization

The traditional integrated library system solution tends to address authentication with the fundamental assumption that all patrons would be authenticating directly against a credential repository housed on the library system. Unfortunately this paradigm will not work for the system being investigated. The capabilities required for successfully being able to accommodate this multi-tier and multi-consortia system's authentication needs include the following.

- Ability to provide an internal authentication source.
 - Secure storage of password
 - Non-plain text storage (hashed version likely desired)
 - A self reset system for those locally stored passwords.
 - A local credential activation system, to setup mechanisms for self reset.
- Ability to use one or more external authentication sources. Below are examples of some of the desired external authentication mechanisms.
 - Kerberos
 - LDAP
 - Active Directory
 - Radius
 - Shibboleth
 - CAS
 - Others (MyAlaska?)
- Ability to use an external authentication system multiple times for different external system. ie. 3 different LDAP systems that point to 3 separate authentications sources
- Ability to assign authentication system on a per patron basis
- Ability to assign authentication system on a per library, consortium, or group basis
- Ability to separate out authentication from authorization
- Ability to support batch importing of user accounts
- Ability to support batch exporting of user accounts
- Ability for patrons to select most appropriate to them authentication source when multiple sources are available.

The traditional integrated library system solution has done a decent job with the authorization component of user management. User management has often fallen to a policy associated directly with the patron profile. Although this suits the majority of the problem, in addition to this capability the following are desirable.

- Ability to associate user accounts to multiple profiles
 - Staff Profile from Library 1
 - Staff Profile from Library 2
 - Patron Profile from Library 1
 - Patron Profile from Library 2
 - Administrative Profile from Library 3
- Ability to associate patrons to multiple libraries

Please indicate how your proposed solution will address the above desired points for both authentication and authorization.

Traditional Union Catalog

1. Physical Union Catalog

A physical union catalog refers to a single database that includes bibliographic records representative of the titles held by the libraries contributing to the union catalog database.

A physical union catalog generally uses a single master bibliographic record for each unique title with holding statements for the various participating libraries attached to that bibliographic record.

The catalog must have capability for local customized gateways where a library or group of libraries can default the search to their materials only and expand the search as desired.

2. Virtual Catalog

The term "virtual catalog" refers to one or more technologies that allow existing standalone automated systems to be searched at the same time with results displayed so that the searcher can see titles, holdings, and availability information. The concept of a virtual catalog may be implemented with libraries having independent catalogs from two different vendors or from a single vendor.

- *The concept may also include, but is not mandatory, the idea that the software may allow the user to initiate actions from one independent automated system that will be carried out in another independent automated system.*
- *A variation of this concept exists when a number of libraries have independent systems produced by the same vendor. In some cases vendors provide proprietary gateway software which allows searching other sites from that vendor and also allows users to initiate searches and other transactions between systems.*
- *The catalog must have capability for local customized gateways where a library or group of libraries can default the search to their materials only and expand the search as desired.*
- *Support or plans to support NISO Circulation Interface Protocol (NCIP)*

Federated Searching and/or Full Portal

Allows a single interface for all library resources including library catalogs, full text databases, digitized resource databases, web links, commercial vendors' sites (Amazon), and other sources of information. Portals generally contain the following components: 1) a single user interface, 2) user authentication, 3) resource linking, and 4) content enhancement. Portal administrators should be able to effectively and easily manage different user groups as well as different locations within a larger entity (i.e. different members of a consortial system may customize the portal). In addition, a portal should include an easy to use federated search/meta-search protocol that searches across vendors, and allow the user to customize the interface, vary access by user, and offer communication such as chat and email.

Portals may involve multi-protocol searching. Examples of protocols that may need to be accommodated include Z39.50, HTTP, SQL, XML. In addition, various formats and metadata standards should be supported such as MARC, EAD, Dublin Core, TEI, and XML. The National Information Standard (NISO) Open URL standard can facilitate linking from citations to full-text articles.

Generally, the more different types of databases to be linked and the more sophisticated the application, the more initial and ongoing configuration that is needed, training, troubleshooting, and technical/configuration support should be available from the vendor.

Unmediated Patron Self Servicing of Requests

Allows library staff and/or patrons to monitor the status of a request throughout the request process. It also allows library staff to take and record specific transactions and to maintain statistical information about requests. The following is not an exhaustive list, but a starting point. Please indicate any other patron self services that you can provide.

- *For patron self-service search and discovery, including federated and faceted search capabilities.*
- *For unmediated patron self-service requests of wanted library materials.*
- *For delivery of library-supplied materials to locations requested by patrons, with payment options for home and office deliveries.*
- *For delivery of materials electronically as a priority when possible.*
- *Patron Profile management, password changes/resets, holds, self renewals*

Modules

The following are a list of modules that are currently deployed at one or more of the libraries or currently being investigated. Please address how your proposed solution will provide each of these key features and/or interface to external modules.

- *Printing*
 - *The ability to print any screen in any module*
- *Acquisitions*
 - *Electronic ordering*
 - *Ability to configure ordering parameters for each member institution*
 - *Ability to create and maintain Archival Appraisal records*
 - *Ability to maintain donor / provenance only by owning library.*
 - *Ability to show on order records in the catalog.*
- *Circulation*
 - *Hold maintenance*
 - *The ability to change transaction data after transaction has been initiated*
 - *Checkout policy configuration on per item, per location, per institution, and per patron type.*
 - *Receipt printing*
 - *Wireless inventory*
 - *Automated billing*
 - *Batch load of patron records*
 - *The ability to interface with the University Banner system to update student information and financial accounts*

- *The ability to provide user information to collections agency*
- *Online payment of overdue fines and fees*
- *Reserve desk capability*
- *Check out recall capability.*
- *Cataloging*
 - *Authority control*
 - *The ability to index any Marc tag or EAD, including fixed fields*
 - *Import of standard bibliographic and authority records*
 - *Export of same standard bibliographic and authority records*
 - *Ability to create mapping between different standard formats for importing and exporting*
 - *Global update, replace and modify all fields in a MARC or EAD record*
 - *Ability to identify and upgrade Archival Appraisal records.*
- *Patron Interface*
 - *The ability to configure the public catalog interface by individual institution.*
 - *Allow searching by individual institution, and to be able to broaden search to include local or statewide institutions.*
 - *Ability to control access levels for different user levels (students vs. staff in a school setting)*
 - *A single user interface to access electronic resources, including the local catalog and databases as well as statewide resources.*
- *Serial Control*
 - *Predict issues*
 - *Checkin*
 - *Modify issues*
 - *Claiming*
 - *Marc holdings statements*
- *Inter Library Loan*
 - *Unmediated patron requests*
 - *Library initiated requests*
 - *Electronic document delivery*
 - *Payment options for home and office delivery*
 - *Checkout via temporary circulation record via regular circulation*
- *Outreach*
 - *Bookmobile*
 - *Mail services*
 - *Homebound services*
- *Reports*
 - *Statistical reports for each module component*
 - *Suite of delivered standard reports covering basic activities and needs*
 - *The ability to create customized reports*
 - *Institution specific reporting*
 - *Global editing for bibliographic, item, and user records*
- *Materials booking*
 - *The ability to book items like audiovisual equipment or kit materials for a future date and time.*
 - *The ability to limit view of bookable items to specific patrons, i.e teachers.*
 - *The ability to group similar resources for finding a like available item.*
 - *The ability to display booking resources or groups on a calendar.*
- *Electronic Resource Management*
 - *The ability to manage databases/electronic resources from multiple vendors/platforms.*
 - *The ability to consolidate and customize statistics and reports from multiple resources/vendors if compatible (i.e. COUNTER).*

- *Easily add/remove resources.*
- *Should interact with financial and acquisitions modules.*
- *Identify and display characteristics of license agreements and business terms.*
- *Security features for different user groups.*
- *Should conform as closely as possible to the Digital Library Federation Electronic Resource Management Initiative.*
- *Application Programming Interface*
 - *Command line utilities for automating certain module components*
 - *Programming libraries available for interfacing with your product directly*

Additional Vendor Information

Please provide any additional information, recommendations, or comments that you feel describes an aspect of your capability that was not directly addressed above.

Costs of your solution

Please articulate the cost of your solution, please specifically articulate the costs for the following:

1. Hardware costs.
2. Other initial start up costs
3. Ongoing maintenance and licensing.
4. Number of staff needed to operate.
5. Technical ability of staff needed to operate.

Specific Questions

RFI#1 Please address how you would facilitate upgrades to your software, working with these 3 main data centers, in a way that prevents long periods of down time. Be sure to include what methods you will be using to access the servers if any, and what level of access you need to the servers.

RFI#2 Please provide a list of customers that we can contact about your product. We would like to speak to following customer categories.

- Existing customers willing to discuss the report
- Brand new customer (within past 18 months)

- Customers they have that are similar configurations to what would be proposed to us for implementation.

RFI#3 Please provide an estimate for a time line on migrating to your product? Are there any infrastructure items that your solution depends on to be deployed prior to migration?

Appendix A - Authentication and Authorization Usage Scenarios

This appendix section contains example scenarios that Authentication and Authorization component abilities would be trying to address. This is not an exhaustive list of scenarios but an attempt to explain why some of the requests are needed.

Scenario 1: Internal Password Storage

Many of the libraries wanting to participate in this larger system will likely have no large IT infrastructure that will be facilitating some sort of Single Credential or Single Sign On system. Because the institutions do not have this larger infrastructure, it will be sufficient for their patrons to have an internally stored password. The password mechanism should not be reversible by any Library System Administrators, to protect both from the liability of having such access to private patron data and from the potential of system compromise for the purpose of mining important information. Therefore the password storage mechanism should be secure to prevent retrieval from anyone but the patron. Since there is a greater chance of a patron forgetting their password on different system, the patron should also have the ability to perform a self reset of their password by one or more mechanisms.

These mechanisms might include, but are not limited to:

- a temporary time based token sent to their email which will allow the patron to login and change their password immediately
- a web based reset capability where they can answer a secret question that they had to setup the first time they activated their account
- a context based piece of information related to their current account standing.
 - Enter the bar code on a current book you have checked out.
 - Enter the due date for an item checked out.
 - Enter their current late charge amount.

Scenario 2: Multiple Libraries Using the same Authentication Service

Participating institutions might have need for the same back-end authentication service. For example, the Rasmuson Library and the Juneau Public library might have decided that the most appropriate authentication solution for them is LDAP and both institutions have separate LDAP instances. There would exist a need for them both to be able to configure and LDAP module associated to the each library and associate the authentication mechanism to their library's profiles. In this case two LDAP authentication mechanisms need to be configured, and a choice about the appropriate one has to be made.

Scenario 3: Multiple Libraries Using Different Authentication Services

Participating institutions will need to have the ability to configure different authentication services for their location. Although the Rasmuson Library needs to use the LDAP authentication back-end, the Anchorage Public Library might want to use an Active Directory back-end. Each institution will expect to be able to have only their patrons directed at that authentication service. Any patron profile associated with Rasmuson Library would then have the ability to use the LDAP backend and those from Anchorage Public would be able to use their Active Directory credentials.

Scenario 4: Multiple Patron Profiles with Multiple Authentication Sources available

There are many patrons who are already part of multiple libraries in the same towns or across towns. These patrons should be able to choose the authentication system most appropriate to them. Take the example of Noel Wien Library in Fairbanks, and the Rasmuson Library in Fairbanks. Currently a person can have both a Noel Wien account and a Rasmuson account, including different card numbers and separate profiles. When the same patron identification number will represent the same patron across two institutions, then there will be a need to have that patron associated to multiple profiles. With the requirement to have multiple profiles which can represent different institution policies, the patron will have to be able to choose which one they want to use to authenticate themselves. That is, if they seldom use the Rasmuson library, but always use their Noel Wien patron account, it would make sense that for every time they authenticated for either, they would use the same credential set and be able to choose which credential set was most appropriate for them. This could be part of the patron self service area. This capability of choosing should be selected to limit the person to only authentication options that are associated with the patron profile types they have.

Scenario 5: Multiple Profiles Authorizing Specific Actions

In the envisioned system having multiple participating libraries, it is desirable to have profiles that will enable patrons, staff, and administrators to only do what they need as it pertains to the systems they should be maintaining and modifying. Take for example a Staff Librarian named James who works at Library 1, but frequents Library 2. Since these systems are hooked together, he should not have the ability to change information related to non-patron functions within the ILS. James should not be able to modify catalog records belonging to Library 2 although he is a cataloger at Library 1. His higher level privileges at Library 1 should not affect his Library 2 patron access, and his lower level privileges should at Library 2 should not affect his privileges at Library 1.

