Committee Members: Jeannie Dilger, La Grange Public Library (co-chair); Aaron Skog, SWAN Executive Director (co-chair); Ahren Sievers, Elmwood Park Public Library; Tony Siciliano, SWAN; Mary Lou Coffman, SWAN; Kate Boyle, SWAN; Vickie Totton, Cicero Public Library; Rebecca Teasdale, Oak Park Public Library; Pilar Shaker, Hinsdale Public Library

Introduction
The following is a report from the ILS Committee to the SWAN Board on its activity to date. The charge of the Board for the Committee requires a presentation and recommendation to the SWAN Board at its April 19, 2013 meeting.

Committee Recommendations to the SWAN Board
1. Executive Director/Board negotiate a flexible extension to the current Innovative agreement
2. Board hires an RFP consultant & approves funds
3. Board determines composition of the SWAN RFP Committee
4. ILS Search Committee / Consultant conduct focus groups of members
5. RFP Committee / Consultant proceed with a formal request for proposals (RFP) to be completed in 2013

ILS Committee Report
Charge of the Committee
The SWAN ILS Committee will be expected to make written recommendations on the following:

- Timeline and goals for ILS Committee;
- The length of time to extend the current contract with Innovative Interfaces Inc.;
- The primary features the next generation platform will require for SWAN for the next 10 years;
- A process for evaluating ILS options which includes SWAN member library feedback from staff at various levels;
- Decide if a request for proposal (RFP) is needed and if so, design and create one.

The goal is to make a presentation and recommendation to SWAN Board in April 2013.

Timeline & Goals for the Committee: Overview of Work to Date
The ILS Committee was convened for its first meeting on November 18, 2012 and has met 9 times to date. The nine committee members have:
- Conducted research to understand the current ILS software landscape
- Completed interviews with nine ILS software platform representatives
- Conducted interviews with customers of comparable size and make up
- Conducted a membership survey to assist with focus questions
- Completed a preliminary weight scale for ILS software evaluation

**The Nine ILS Platforms Researched**

1. Sierra, Innovative Interfaces Inc.
2. Virtua, VTLS
3. Polaris, Polaris
4. Alma, ExLibris
5. WorldShare, OCLC
6. Symphony, SirsiDynix
7. Evergreen (open-source), Equinox Software
8. Koha (open-source), ByWater Solutions
9. Kuali OLE (open-source)

**Customers Contacted**

1. Bibliomation, CT (Evergreen)
2. North East Kansas Library System, KS (Koha)
3. TRAC, Yellowhead Regional Library System, Alberta, Canada (Polaris)

**Length of Time to Extend Innovative Interfaces, Inc Contract**

The Committee recommends that SWAN extend the contract beyond the 1 year from May 18, 2013 and negotiate terms that allow SWAN to continue its use of the Millennium ILS software to a date of our own choosing, rather than continually extending the contract 1 year. Appendix A of this report contains excerpts of the existing agreement specific to the term and termination.

**Primary Features of the Next Generation Platform**

The Committee focused on five areas during our interviews:

1. Consortia “friendliness” of the software and its design
2. Flexibility for further enhancements and development
3. Complex request & holds management for materials
4. Features pertaining to e-books and other electronic content
5. Openness of the software: methods for 3rd party integration

Based on the membership survey data and a review of the Illinois Heartland Library System ILS evaluation during its RFI, the SWAN ILS Committee created a preliminary weighting and scoring that could be used during SWAN’s formal RFP process.
**Weighting & Scoring (Preliminary)**

### 35 Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adding Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Migration costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Additional licenses - API, SIP, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 30 Consortia Friendly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Resource Sharing (holds, ILL, policies, groupings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of consortia? Multi-type?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ongoing Development on Consortia Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ability to contribute to development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25 Functionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OPAC customization, patron’s Ease of Use and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administration (Ease, Security, Flexibility, Access to Data, report generation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff/client side ease of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Integration of E-resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plays well with 3rd party vendors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10 Scalability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Architecture can handle size of our consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Customers live with comparable numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Future growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 100 Total Points

**Interviews**

The Committee decided it was important to educate its representatives on the current ILS platforms. Nine ILS platforms were identified for research. The Committee created a set of ten questions to conduct the 1 hour interviews with the ILS vendors. Once the interviews were completed, the
Committee completed phone interviews with several library customers to gauge their satisfaction with their respective vendors.

**Vendor Interview Questions**

1. We are large consortia. What are your size limits for this system?
2. How open is this system? Talk to us about patron and staff access to manipulate data.
3. Who are your customers? What about consortial customers: who are the largest? What types of libraries are represented? (Is the system premised on a stand-alone model?)
4. What is the programming language?
5. Can the system work with various display and data content in local, group, and system-wide iterations?
6. How customizable and flexible is the system?
7. What are you doing within the company to prepare for the future?
8. What is your 5-year plan for this product? What are your development plans?
9. Tell us about your goals for patron experience.
10. Tell us about third-party access to and integration of the data, to create a unified experience for patrons.

**Customer Questions**

1. How did you reach your decision? Describe your selection process (board, members, etc.)
2. What were biggest surprises? positive & negative
3. How was your migration?
4. Was there any fall out within your membership over the choice?
5. What has been your customer services experience with (vendor/company)?
6. How well does it work within a consortial environment?
7. What do you think we should know?

Answers to each set of questions above have been compiled by the Committee.

As a result of the research, the Committee concluded that several ILS platforms could offer a compelling solution for SWAN. While some of the ILS’s are not ready for SWAN, others are consortia-ready and could achieve the primary features on which we focused.

**Process for Evaluating ILS Options**

The Committee recommends that the process for selecting the next ILS include:

- Focus groups from the existing SWAN member libraries
- Achieve member library buy-in & appreciation of the complexity of the next SWAN ILS
- Allow the RFP to accommodate open-source ILS options to be evaluated alongside traditional proprietary ILS
Decision on Request for Proposal (RFP)

The ILS Committee affirmed with the Board that the choice be narrowed down more before options are brought to members, in demos with small groups. The Board recommended that the Committee conduct demos with the top choices first in order to do this. The Board agreed that more time is needed and estimate that the entire RFP process would be completed in September 2013; they also agreed that a consultant be engaged to create the RFP.

The Committee co-chairs sought clarification with the SWAN attorney on several areas regarding the RFP for SWAN’s next ILS software.

RFP Legal Counsel

From attorney:

SWAN is legally required to bid this work. As you note in your email, SWAN is an intergovernmental entity comprised of libraries and library districts and uses public funds to provide its services. Although there is no requirement in the intergovernmental agreement or bylaws, we would not typically address the bid requirements in either of those documents. Those documents are intended to govern the operation of SWAN, power and authority of the Council, etc. As we briefly discussed, it is possible for SWAN to issue two bids at the same time. One bid could be for the open source and the other for a proprietary system. Both bids should clearly state that SWAN reserves the right to reject any and all bids.

Follow-up Questions from SWAN Board

1. The language you used below specific to “bid” raised concerns among several SWAN Board members. “SWAN is legally required to bid this work,” is what you stated. One board member noted that any ranking or scoring within our RFP would not be allowed in a true bid process. Does this mean that based on the RFP responses SWAN must pick the lowest cost bid?

You are correct that a bid process requires the selection of the lowest responsible bidder. The bid documents, however, could be written to require a certain level of experience and references to allow us to ascertain if the lowest bidder is the lowest responsible bidder. We may be able to eliminate the lowest cost bidder based on set criteria, but it depends on the responses received and how we would set forth the criteria. We could also put in certain optional components of the system (if there are any) as alternate bids and then determine if we want to include them in the contract awarded.

2. Is SWAN buying a service or software with this RFP? In the instance of open-source ILS solutions, the software licenses are free but the vendor provides a set of services (annual support, data migration, software enhancement/development, etc.)

The bid and RFP process will need to be designed together so that services and software purchases allow the proprietary and open-source solutions to bid and be compared side-by-side.
RFP Consultants
The Committee is willing to engage consultants to create SWAN’s RFP and make a recommendation to the SWAN Board. The committee has put out initial feelers for RFP consultants. One consultant has provided a proposal with costs that can serve as a ballpark for the Board’s discussion.

Next Steps
6. Executive Director/Board negotiate a flexible extension to the current Innovative agreement
7. Board hires an RFP consultant & approves funds
8. Board determines composition of the SWAN RFP Committee
9. ILS Search Committee / Consultant conduct focus groups of members
10. RFP Committee / Consultant proceed with a formal request for proposals (RFP) to be completed in 2013

Appendix A: Innovative Contract Terms
14.0 Term
14.1 The term of this Agreement shall be for five (5) years from the effective date of this Agreement, unless sooner terminated in accordance with Article 15.0.

14.2 In the event INNOVATIVE does not desire this Agreement to be extended for an additional five (5) – year term upon the expiration of the term described in Subparagraph 14.1 hereof, INNOVATIVE shall furnish written notice thereof to SUBURBAN no later than January 1, 2002. If such notice is not furnished by INNOVATIVE, SUBURBAN shall have the unilateral right to extend the term of this Agreement for up to an additional five (5) years by furnishing INNOVATIVE written notice of such extension not less than 90 days prior to January 1, 2003. Whether or not INNOVATIVE shall furnish any such notice, SUBURBAN shall have the right to extend the term described in subparagraph 14.1 hereof for one year by furnishing INNOVATIVE written notice of such extension not less than 90 days prior to January 1, 2003.

14.3 Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 in Article 4.0 and Article 23.0 shall remain in full force and effect and shall survive beyond any termination or expiration of this Agreement. Upon SUBURBAN’s discontinuance of the use of any portion of the Software licensed hereunder, SUBURBAN shall furnish INNOVATIVE with a written notice certifying that SUBURBAN has used its best efforts and to the best of its knowledge, all machine-readable code, user documentation or other related materials provided to SUBURBAN with such licenses software, including any copies thereof, whether in whole or in part, have been destroyed or returned to INNOVATIVE.

15.0 Termination
15.1 Commencing three (3) years after the date of this Agreement, SUBURBAN shall have the unilateral right to terminate this Agreement at any time for any reason upon not less than 180 day’s prior written notice to INNOVATIVE, provided the INNOVATIVE shall deliver and SUBURBAN, upon acceptance thereof, shall pay for, in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement, all Equipment and Software which is delivered or then on order by SUBURBAN and delivered by INNOVATIVE within 90 days from the date of such order. However, if any of the Equipment and Software so ordered is not delivered by INNOVATIVE to SUBURBAN within 90 days from such order, SUBURBAN shall have no obligation to pay for such Equipment and Software.

15.2 Commencing three (3) years after the date of this Agreement, INNOVATIVE shall have the right to terminate this Agreement upon not less than 180 days prior written notice to SUBURBAN if SUBURBAN shall fail to perform any of its material obligations hereunder for period of ten days after its receipt of a written notice to cure furnished by INNOVATIVE. In the event of a termination pursuant to this Subparagraph 15.2, INNOVATIVE shall have no further obligations hereunder, and SUBURBAN, upon its acceptance thereof, shall pay INNOVATIVE for all Equipment and Software previously delivered or then on order by SUBURBAN. However, if any of the Equipment and Software so ordered is not delivered by INNOVATIVE within 90 days from the date of such order, SUBURBAN shall have no obligation to pay for such Equipment and Software.