

Frequently Asked Questions Statewide Database License Procurement Process 2009

Q. Why is OSL involved in the Statewide Database License Procurement?

A. Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 543-060-0020 authorizes the State Library to “negotiate and contract with commercial database providers on behalf of school, public, academic and tribal libraries to provide access to full text periodical databases...” The request for proposal process is outlined in OAR 543-060-0030 (3) “Request for proposal process: The Oregon State Library shall be the fiscal agent for the program and shall use Federal funds under the LSTA to subsidize the program. Oregon State Library shall work with the Department of Administrative Services to procure periodical and newspaper full text databases.”

Q. Who reviewed the proposals?

A. The LSTA Advisory Council has selected a Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee to advise the Council and the Oregon State Library staff in request for proposal development and database product evaluation. Working with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services State Procurement Office and State Library staff, the SDLAC developed the RFP, developed scoring criteria, scored the proposal responses, reviewed and scored trial databases, and recruited volunteer reviewers. SDLAC members represent each type of library included in the statewide database license. External reviewers, who reviewed and scored trial databases, were solicited from each type of library as well.

Q. How can we comment on concerns about the RFP/Solicitation process that is currently under way?

A. Direct your comments to MaryKay Dahlgreen marykay.dahlgreen@state.or.us. The SDLAC will be meeting after the process is complete to review the process and make suggestions for improvement.

Q. How can we comment on concerns about the “apparent successful proposer” Gale/Cengage Learning?

A. Direct your comments to MaryKay Dahlgreen marykay.dahlgreen@state.or.us. Depending on what is submitted, concerns or questions may be brought up with the vendor during the negotiation process. While comments will be shared with the Board during their meeting they cannot be provided with anything more than the “apparent successful proposer” and the contents of the RFP.

Q. Were there criteria rating impact on libraries?

A. There were no criteria rating the impact of a change of vendor on libraries. However, there were a number of mandatory requirements and desirable features that specifically addressed local libraries, including in the Mandatory Requirements 6) Training and User Support, 8) Local Administration Options, 21) Transition Plan and in the Desirable Features 12) Promotional and User Training Materials, 13) Refunds, Credits, 15) Additional Hardware, Software Requirements, 19) Capabilities for Indicating Local Library Holdings. For a complete list of Mandatory and Desirable Features please refer to the RFP posted on the Oregon State Library website at: <http://www.oregon.gov/OSL/LD/technology/sdlp/index.shtml> Mandatory requirements and optional features and functions are laid out in the Technical Proposal portion of the RFP, Section 3.3.2. Evaluation is outlined in Section 4. External Review Questions are Appendix D.

Q. Have titles been compared across products?

A. The Evaluation Committee received direction from the State Procurement Office to evaluate each product independently. However, Desirable Features 23) Full Text Currency and Embargo provided an opportunity to score on currency and depth of collection. Those scores were based on the product description provided by each vendor in the Mandatory Feature 1) Management Summary. For more detail please refer to the RFP posted on the Oregon State Library website at: <http://www.oregon.gov/OSL/LD/technology/sdlp/index.shtml> Mandatory requirements and optional features and functions are laid out in the Technical Proposal portion of the RFP, Section 3.3.2

Q. What about remote access?

A. Remote Access was Mandatory Requirement #10 in the RFP. For more information on the requirement please refer to the RFP posted on the Oregon State Library website at: <http://www.oregon.gov/OSL/LD/technology/sdlp/index.shtml> Mandatory requirements and optional features and functions are laid out in the Technical Proposal portion of the RFP, Section 3.3.2

Q. What databases are included in the Gale/Cengage Learning proposal?

A. We can't answer that question until the Intent to Award process has been completed.

Q. Doesn't the State Library staff and SDLAC understand the large amount of work and trouble to change database vendors?

A. State Library staff and SDLAC members are very much aware of the amount of work and time that will be spent changing vendors. We would also hope that the library community recognizes that the process we are using has been carefully designed to assure that we are using LSTA funds to provide the best value. In arriving at best value, our evaluation included performance factors and other aspects of service and product quality, as well as pricing.

Q. What is the timeline for the remainder of the process?

A. The Oregon State Library Board meets on June 19th to review the recommendation of the LSTA Advisory Council and make a decision. After the Board has made a decision the State Procurement Office will post an Intent to Award on the ORPIN System. Once the Intent to Award process is complete, the State Procurement Office, Department of Justice and Oregon State Library will negotiate with the successful proposer.

Q. What happens if the OSL Board decides not to accept the recommendation of the Statewide Database Licensing Advisory Committee and the LSTA Advisory Council?

A. If the Board doesn't accept the recommendation as stipulated in section 4.4 of the RFP the State Procurement Office reserves the right to cancel the RFP.